LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity

Founded 1921 *Editor :* **R. PALME DUTT**

- For 33 years this most widely read monthly journal of the Labour and progressive movement in Britain has exercised what is universally recognised as a unique influence in helping to build up left-wing opinion in the Labour and trade union movement.
- Its monthly commentary on the political scene at home and abroad by the editor has been widely appreciated.
- In addition to its circulation in Britain, it is bought in 56 countries overseas.
- The average NET paid circulation during 1953 was 13,380 copies each month.
- In the authors' index for that year, the following are a few of the names which appear :

  R. Page Arnot ; J. D. Bernal, F.R.S. ; Dr. E. H. S. Burhop ; W. J. Ellerby ; The Rev. Stanley Evans ; Benjamin Farrington ; Monica Felton ; J. B. Figgins ; Wm. Gallacher ; G. C. T. Giles ; Paul Hogarth ; John Horner ; T. A. Jackson ; Janet Jagan ; Ivor Montagu ; John Platts-Mills ; D. N. Pritt, Q.C. ; Andrew Rothstein ; Louis Saillant ; Jean-Paul Sartre ; and Gordon Schaffer.

The January contents include :

Outlook for 1954, by *R. P. D.* ; A Common Policy for Labour, by *Harry Pollitt* ; The Italian Socialist Party and the Policy of Unity of the Masses, by *Pietro Nenni* ; The Real Terrorists in Kenya, by *Monica Whately* ; Bias in Political Economy, by *R. L. Meek.*

An indispensable weapon in the fight for Labour Unity.

Order (1s. 6d.) from all newsagents. Or try a half-year's postal subscription (9s.) from

LABOUR MONTHLY

M1, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

JANUARY 1954 THE MARXIST QUARTERLY L&W

The Marxist Quarterly

JANUARY 1954

THE POSITION OF BRITAIN
Emile Burns

SCIENCE IN THE SERVICE OF SOCIETY
J. D. Bernal

T. S. ELIOT
Alick West

COMMUNISM AND MANKIND
John Gollan

FOLK-SONG FOR OUR TIME ?
A. L. Lloyd

LIVES OF LABOUR LEADERS
R. P. A.

2s. 6d.

LAWRENCE AND WISHART

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth In Cyprus
Web: http//www.KibristaSosyalistGercek.net
http://www.kibristasosyalistgercek.net/intro.htm
E-mail: info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

ADVISORY COUNCIL:

J. D. Bernal
L. Cannon
M. H. Dobb
R. P. Dutt
D. D. Evans
B. Farrington
J. Gardner
Margot Heinemann
Rodney Hilton
H. Howarth
H. Levy
Abe Moffat
Ivor Montagu
Andrew Rothstein
Jack Ryan
J. R. Scott
W. Stevens
George Thomson
Alick West

No. 1. JANUARY 1954

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of Aims	2
The Position of Britain: *Emile Burns*	3
Science in the Service of Society: *J. D. Bernal* ...	3
The Abuse of Poetry and the Abuse of Criticism by T. S. Eliot: *Alick West*	22
Communism and Mankind: *John Gollan*	33
Folk-song for our Time?: *A. L. Lloyd*	47
Lives of Labour Leaders: *R. P. A.*	57
Recent Books	62

The Marxist Quarterly *is published by Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.,* 81 *Chancery Lane, W.C.2. Subscriptions* (11*s. per year, post free*) *should be sent to Central Books Ltd.,* 2 *Parton Street, London, W.C.*1.

Editorial communications should be sent to the Editor, Emile Burns, 27 *Bedford Street, London, W.C.2.*

The aim of The Marxist Quarterly *is to cover a wide range of subjects which are of interest to all progressively minded people, no matter what their particular field of work may be.*

There will be articles on science and the arts, history, philosophy, economics and politics, which will be presented in such a way that they can be understood and appreciated by all readers, and not only by experts.

Our aim is a materialist, scientific approach. We shall criticise tendencies to idealism and the retreat from science in the writings and theories of today.

The Marxist approach to the study of social development, as well as of external nature, gives knowledge that can be used to help society forward. Our task is not merely to interpret the world, but to help to change it.

We wish to give full opportunities for discussion of problems of general interest, and we invite criticisms and suggestions from our readers. We ask them also to do what they can personally to make The Marxist Quarterly *more widely known.*

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

EMILE BURNS (Editor)
MAURICE CORNFORTH
JOHN GOLLAN
CHRISTOPHER HILL
JOHN HORNER
ARNOLD KETTLE
JAMES KLUGMANN
JOHN LEWIS
JACK LINDSAY
DONA TORR

The Position of Britain

EMILE BURNS

At the Trades Union Congress last September, the General Council presented an Interim Report on Public Ownership. This took as the determining factor in shaping policy "the extreme precariousness of the position in which this country now finds itself". It stated that in spite of some improvement in the trade balance "the fundamental insecurity of Britain's position remains, and there is no reason to think that it is due to temporary factors which will disappear in time". The adverse factors—which, if we read the Report literally, the General Council regards as with us to all eternity—were listed as:

> "the fall in the value of our overseas investments, the worsening of the terms of trade compared with before the war, the burden of defence, and the growing competition in world markets from such countries as the U.S.A., Japan and Germany"; together with "the deficit with the dollar area".

A similar picture was drawn by the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party in its home policy statement *Challenge to Britain,* presented to the Labour Party Conference four weeks later. This contains a section dealing with "The problems we face", the most important of which are indicated as: Britain has been forced to realise its foreign investments; high prices for the food and raw materials we import and relatively low prices for the manufactured goods we export; the dollar gap; the burden of military defence; the difficulty of finding export markets.

In the view of the industrial and political leaders of the Labour movement, the combined weight of these factors lies heavy on the future of the British people. It is taken for granted that the burden cannot be cast aside. There is no alternative prospect, at least for the years immediately ahead. Therefore the policy put forward has only the limited aim of gradually and painfully effecting some slight improvement in this "precarious" situation. All more far-reaching policies must wait. Later on, perhaps; but in any case not now.

The detailed policies put forward by the trade union and Labour Party leaders (though more fully developed by the latter) were adopted at the corresponding conferences by majorities, against minorities of some two million. These policies have as their common foundation the following assumptions, which they take over without questioning from the spokesmen of British imperialism:

(1) The continuance of the Cold War and the consequent burden of armaments as the essential background for many years ahead—at least for the remaining period of the Tory Government and the next five years of a Labour Government, as indicated in *Challenge to Britain.* This implies also the continued subordination of British policy to that of America.

(2) Associated with this, the restriction of Britain's major trade prospects to the capitalist world ; hence the need to strive to maintain and if possible enlarge Britain's share in shrinking markets, against ruthless competition from better-equipped rivals. The alternative of trade with socialist countries is dismissed as of little importance, and in any case not possible in view of United States opposition.

(3) Therefore the necessity for sacrifices by the workers ("not only of material benefits but of many cherished habits and traditions"), partly in order to provide higher profits which can be invested in making Britain's industrial equipment more efficient to face competition, partly to keep down production costs for the same purpose. The movement's attitude to nationalisation, it is argued, should not be based on a "doctrinaire" approach, but on whether, in any particular industry, State ownership would increase "efficiency".

(4) At the same time, the exploitation of the colonial peoples must be extended and made more intense, partly to provide raw materials that can be sold to the United States to reduce the dollar gap, partly as another source of profits for capital investment. The "military commitments" involved in this connection are an essential part of the total burden which the British people must shoulder in order to ease balance-of-payments difficulties.

It is easy enough to criticise the details of a policy worked out on this foundation. Hundreds of amendments to *Challenge to Britain* were sent in by Constituency Parties and trade unions. But it is the foundation itself that has to be cleared away before any policy that can serve the people of Britain can be put into operation. The whole structure of the present official Labour and trade union policy would fall in ruins if the Cold War and the arms programme were repudiated, for the "extreme precariousness" of Britain's position is due in the first place to this country being tied to the American imperialist plans of war against the socialist States.

The first serious step towards improving Britain's position is therefore to break free from these entanglements and carry out a consistent policy of peace, trade and friendship with all countries. This would mean the lifting of the intolerable burden of our present arms expenditure. It would ease our trade difficulties, opening up new expanding markets in the socialist countries. And since an independent lead by Britain would certainly be followed by other countries now in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, there would be an expansion too in capitalist markets, because purchasing power hitherto absorbed into military budgets would then be released, and many existing import restrictions abolished. It is true that such a change in policy would not solve all problems for the British people, but it would at once remove Britain from the "precarious" list, and not a shred would be left of the arguments for "sacrifices" by the working class.

The fight for this policy of peace is therefore at the very heart of every endeavour to safeguard the future for the people of Britain. As the Communist Party's programme, *The British Road to Socialism,* states :

> "Unless such a policy for peace is fought for and won, the post-war gains of the working class, already under attack, will be completely lost, and there can be no lightening of the burden on the working people, improvement of living conditions, or solution of Britain's problems."

In the course of the three years that have passed since this programme was issued considerable sections of the British people have been won for the policy of peace. The two-million minorities against the official policy at both the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference in 1953, and the growing trend to the left in the lower ranks of the trade unions and Labour Parties, show this.

Even more widespread than the direct support of a peace policy is the resistance to the consequences of the war policy, expressed in the struggle of millions of organised workers for wage increases. It must not be supposed that this reflects merely the normal economic demand of the workers in a period of rising prices. Not so many years ago it was possible for the employers and many of the leading trade union officials to counter this normal economic demand, and induce organised workers to accept "frozen" wages, by political arguments : the need to accept sacrifices because of the dangerous dollar gap, the danger of an attack by Russia, the danger of prices rising if wages rose, the need to export to pay for imports without which the people would starve. The wages movement of the present period shows that these arguments are losing their power over the minds of the workers, and this in itself is an important political advance, to which the work of the Comunist Party has largely contributed. In the minds of militant trade unionists and Left Labour Party members, the American threat to Britain is now more important than the dollar gap ; not Russia, but America, is seen as the driving force to war ; the rise in prices is understood, not as some "vicious spiral" initiated by wage increases, but as the deliberate act of the Tory Government in removing food subsidies, putting up the rate of interest, and now raising rents ; the need to export to competitive capitalist markets is regarded as of less importance than the need to end the restrictions on exports to the socialist countries.

Although these conscious replies to the capitalist arguments may be made as yet only by the militants in the trade union and political movement, their influence is undermining the influence of those who repeat those arguments from positions of authority in the Labour movement.

Thus the fight against the consequences of the war policy has become, not only in theory but in fact, closely linked with the fight against the war policy itself. The demand for a meeting of the Great Powers with the aim of easing international tension, put forward by the officially-banned British Peace Committee in its petition campaign in 1952, is now almost everywhere supported.

This general desire of the people for peace is also helping to broaden the fight against the *consequences* of the war policy, which is an important means of mobilising wider sections of the people against the war policy as a whole. The wage demands bring millions of workers into action, help them to see the causes of the rise in prices; they unite different unions, different sections of industry, the skilled and the unskilled, the men and the women, and thus give the whole working class the sense of strength and confidence which is essential for the political struggle. The fight against high prices links closely with the fight for higher wages, drawing the housewives closer to the industrial movement. The fight against economies in the social services draws in even wider sections of the people—including professional workers. The fight against the trade bans, an essential part of the struggle for Britain's independence from American control, brings together not only industrial workers who feel the danger of unemployment, but even capitalist groups directly interested in opening up new markets. The fight against two years' conscription has its special appeal not only to youth but to all parents.

In the struggles on wages, rents and prices, in the movement for peace and trade with the socialist countries, the conditions foreseen in *The British Road to Socialism* are in process of being built up:

> "In order, therefore, to bring about a decisive change in Britain, the millions of workers in the trade unions, co-operatives and individual members' sections of the Labour Party will have to use their political and industrial strength to make it impossible for either the right-wing Labour leaders or the Tories to carry on their present pernicious policy."

Another factor of great positive significance for the future is the growth in the British Labour movement of interest in the position of the colonial peoples, and resentment at the consequences of the colonial policy which, as we have seen, is implicit in the assumptions made by the Labour and trade union leaders. This interest was particularly marked in connection with the Tory Government's action in British Guiana, and the Labour leaders' attempts to establish a boycott of Dr. Jagan were a signal failure.

Growing concern over what was happening in Kenya was heightened by the Press reports of the Captain Griffiths case. It is becoming more widely realised that it is impossible to reconcile the intense exploitation of the colonial peoples with any democratic advance for them.

These profound changes in the outlook of the more politically conscious sections of the working class movement, and among far wider sections the growing disillusionment with one aspect or another of the war policy and its consequences, are the starting point for all political activity in 1954.

The conditions for the further development of the fight against the war policy are extremely favourable. But its success depends on the extent to which the unity established on the wages issue can be established on every issue directly affecting great numbers of people. The campaign against all increases in rent is now of very great importance, and it can have decisive results. The continued campaign against high prices is also of great significance. But these campaigns can remain without influence on the general position of Britain unless they are given a deep class content and are linked with the peace issue. Growing signs of a developing economic "recession" in the United States give added urgency to the pressure for breaking away from American bans and opening up trade without restrictions with all the socialist countries. The proposed Four Power Conference on Germany makes it urgent to mobilise support for a solution which will not only hinder America's war plans and stop the rearming of the Nazis in West Germany, but will unite Germany. The United States has found it increasingly difficult to prevent the Korean Political Conference, and pressure is growing for a general Far East settlement and the inclusion of People's China in the United Nations.

In considering Britain's position in 1954, we must not lose sight of the fact that the changes that have occurred in Britain have also taken place in one degree or another in every capitalist country. Strong as American monopoly capitalism seems, in one country after another (particularly in France and Italy) it is coming up against an unbreakable force—the people. This has prevented it from carrying out its timetable for German rearmament and the formation of the "European army"; it has slowed down every aspect of preparation for war, while hostility to American bases and American policy has grown.

At the same time, the contradictions between American monopoly capitalism and other capitalist countries are becoming more pronounced, causing divisions in the capitalist ranks in France, Japan, and even to some extent in Britain. British imperialism has lost effective financial control over Canada and South Africa; it is struggling to retain Australia and New Zealand, already militarily united with America in the Anzus Pact, though it is reduced to sending a Queen to counteract the omnipotence of dollars. In the Middle East, American finance and in-

fluence is replacing British; after Persia, Egypt—hence the division in the Tory ranks on Britain's policy in connection with the Suez Canal zone. The trade contradictions with America grow more intense every day, and increasing numbers of British capitalists are opposing American schemes to undermine British trade.

Nor can we leave out of account the great advances that have been made in the socialist countries and will be carried much further in 1954, in contrast to the "precariousness" of the capitalist world. The overall decision that the progress already made in the development of heavy industry has created a sufficient basis for a great expansion of the consumer goods industries and substantial advances in the standard of living not only offers a propaganda contrast to capitalism, but means the almost indefinite widening of the prospects for trade. It is also delivering a fatal blow to the propaganda that the U.S.S.R. is preparing for war.

* * *

Britain's position at the opening of 1954 is therefore only "precarious" in the sense that the Tory Government still holds office and is carrying out a policy at home, abroad, and in the colonies, which is bringing increasing hardships for the British people and endangering their future.

What is new in 1954 is that the pressure of the peoples for peace, for a break with America's war plans and an end to international tension, has begun to influence the course of events. In Britain itself, resistance to the Tory policy, slowly maturing throughout 1953, has now reached a stage in which millions of workers are pressing wage claims in defence of their standard of living, and can no longer be held back by allegedly patriotic appeals whose real purpose is to maintain Britain's course towards disaster.

World conditions, as well as the changing outlook among the British working class, are favourable for the further development of this movement. Confidence and initiative in 1954 can bring down the Tory Government and thus transform the outlook for Britain.

Science in the Service of Society

J. D. BERNAL

The great new growth of science in the Soviet Union is not an isolated or an accidental event. It marks the beginning of a new phase in the history of science. That history shows that in the past the growth of science has been very uneven. There have been short and brilliant periods of rapid advance followed by long periods of stagnation or even of decay. For a long time the explanation for this was not apparent, but the moment that the history of science was looked at in relation to economic and social history, the reasons became clear. Each great advance of science coincided with the advance to power of a new social class. The scientists themselves were nearly always men of that class and the movement of science itself partook of the nature of a revival of knowledge or a crusade against ignorance. The beginning and most fruitful period of the science of the Greeks occurred in the sixth century B.C. at a time when a new commercial class, the maritime traders and manufacturers, were ousting the aristocratic landowners. It took place in the age of the tyrants, when Miletus and Samos, the homes of the first Greek scientists Thales and Pythagoras, were the wealthiest and most active ports of the Aegean in their time. The same is true of the movement which gave rise to modern science—the scientific revolution of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton; it coincided in time and place with the rise of the bourgeoisie and their taking over of power in the most advanced States, Holland and Britain.

Science was invoked by new people for two purposes which though similar were clearly distinguishable: a practical purpose of improving technique and getting money and power, and a theoretical purpose of attacking and destroying the ideology of the class they were supplanting. Once those immediate needs had been met the interest in science waned, especially when it was noticed that it could be used equally well to attack the ideas and even the wealth of the newly established masters. Thus the second burst of modern science occurred at the end of the eighteenth century with the rise of the new machine industry based on the coal of Scotland and the Midlands. At the beginning it won enthusiastic support from the propertied classes but after the century was over it had become associated with the dangerous radicalism of the French Revolution, and a strong anti-scientific reaction markedly slowed down its progress.

These processes which have gone on in the past have not ceased today. Indeed, they are reaching a pitch of intensity greater than any before because of the new, much closer relations which science has

with every aspect of present-day life, not only in industry but in agriculture and health as well. Where science before had been only an auxiliary, useful to call in to help in special difficulties such as the establishing of a calendar or finding the longitude, now we have whole industries like the electrical and chemical industries, entirely founded on science. Even the homes, the last refuges of traditional life, are rapidly filling with scientific gadgets. The new and rapid growth of science here also coincides with great social changes. We are witnessing a struggle in the field of science, between the last stages of its use in the service of profit in the hands of the bourgeois capitalists, and the first stages of its use in the service of society in the hands of the workers.

As we stand in the middle of this period of transition, it is difficult to appreciate the scale and the decisiveness of the change which is going on, but when it is over, what will be most apparent will be the rapidity of the transformation of science. That rapidity could be judged from the scale of increase of scientific research over the last forty years. In 1914, at the outbreak of the First World War, Britain and Germany were the leading scientific countries. They could muster between them some 80,000 scientists of whom 20,000 at most can have been occupied in research. It is doubtful whether there were as many in the rest of the world put together. In 1939, on the eve of the Second World War, the old supremacy had been challenged by that of America and the Soviet Union, where there were respectively 70,000 and 80,000 active scientific research workers. Great as that change was, it is entirely dwarfed by the transformations of the last fifteen years. The numbers in those two countries have now become 150,000 and 190,000, more than double, and new forces are emerging in Eastern Europe and in China.

At first sight it might seem that, judging from these figures, the effort of capitalist countries was matching that of the socialist countries, but this is a temporary illusion which overlooks the enormously greater speed of advance of the latter and the totally different character of the utilisation of science in both cases.

We are familiar enough from recent experiences with the reasons which have given rise to the rapid increase in scientific effort in such countries as Britain and America: it was a direct consequence, in the first place, of the Second World War and then of the cold war which followed it. Directly or indirectly, more obviously in the United States, where some 80 per cent of university scientific research is undertaken for the military departments, the new growth of science has been for military purposes. Inevitably, some benefit has accrued to industry and even civil life, but it has been relatively on a very small scale and the position of science in these fields in both countries is extremely precarious, as witness the alarm calls by responsible bodies such as the Advisory Council on Scientific Development and the Department

of Scientific and Industrial Research in this country, and the corresponding complaints of the meagre support afforded to the National Science Foundation — $4.75 million as against $2.2 billion for war research in 1953—in the United States. Science, indeed, in these countries is involved in a fatal paradox. It is needed for defending, not the countries, but the interests of the capitalists in them against the growth of Socialism. But both by its economic effects in hastening technological unemployment and economic crisis and by its ideological effects in leading to a criticism of the system itself, its use is felt to be dangerous. It has to be encouraged and discouraged at the same time: pushed forward by grants and held back by secrecy and security checks.* Even more serious, as will be shown, is the limitation on the absolute scientific effort imposed by the class structure of capitalist societies which cannot, by their very nature, make use of more than a small fraction of the existing human scientific potential. This limitation, which has long been criticised on theoretical grounds as unnecessary, is now generally shown to be so in practice by the development of the Soviet Union.

* Now even the carrying out of military research, if it is not of an immediately lethal character, is being challenged. In a Senatorial Sub-Committee of Appropriations on June 24, 1953 (see *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, IX*, No. 8, October 1953, p. 302) we find the following dialogue:

"*Senator Ferguson*: Then I want another one. How can you get under Air Force research an analysis of the Soviet socialist system? Now, what has that got to do with research in the Air Force? You are spending at Harvard University money on analysis of the socialist system of Russia.

"*General Yates*: Yes sir; this is an extremely important area.

"*Senator Ferguson*: You tell me what the socialist system has to do with your making better airplanes. Is this one of your projects? Have you reviewed this one, the analysis of the Soviet socialist system?

"*General Yates*: Yes sir.

"*Senator Ferguson*: You explain on the record how that is part of the research of the Air Force. . . .

"*General Yates*: This is to determine how to carry on psychological warfare against the Soviet and the satellites. This is a pattern to determine their vulnerability and what type.

"*Senator McClellan*: What do you get, just a lot of professor theories and all that stuff? Is that what you get out of it? To me that is simply throwing money away, nothing else. If we have not sense enough in the Army and the Navy and the Defence Department and as American citizens to know how to counteract Soviet propaganda without hiring a bunch of college professors to write out a lot of theories, this Defence Establishment is in one darn bad shape in my opinion. This is money just literally thrown away. I cannot see it any other way, Mr. Chairman.

"*Senator Ferguson*: I share the Senator's view.

"*Senator McClellan*: I want to support this thing and get some fighting equipment and personnel, and I want to go along with every dollar that is needed, but it is these things, Mr. Chairman, we run into of just throwing money away that makes it difficult for us to go in here and defend the budget when you feel it has all these hidden extravagances and waste in them. I want to support an appropriation that will get this job done.

"*Senator Ferguson*: I share these views, I think personally we are just becoming ridiculous. We are just so extravagant that it shows a form of insanity. If you want my honest opinion here, I think it borders on insanity."

The growth of science in the Soviet Union from very small beginnings in 1917 to its present size, comparable with if not exceeding that of the United States, is not, as it has been there, one of reaction to a war situation; it has been part of a definite policy for the use of science adopted from the outset of the new régime by Lenin, who himself had taken it from the works of Marx and Engels. The way in which science has grown and has been used in the Soviet Union deserves the most careful study because it illustrates both the possibilities and the difficulties of transferring an occupation which has been effectively that of an élite in the service of a ruling class to the whole population for its own benefit. This could not be done all at once by decrees, however well-framed and loyally carried out. It was a process, slow at first and, indeed, only now getting into its full stride.

The first stages, which covered roughly the first ten years of Soviet power, were largely a matter of consolidating and preserving what was left of the heritage of science from Tsarist times, excellent in quality but scanty in quantity and depleted by the effects of the war and the panic emigration which followed the Revolution. Luckily, the suspicious and obstructive attitude which the Tsarist régime had taken to science ensured that the great majority of Russian scientists were, from the start, in sympathy with the Revolution and co-operated most willingly with it from the moment of the seizure of power by the Soviets.

From the very beginning, the old Academy of Sciences took a lead in reorganising the scientific effort of the country and giving it a new direction. It showed itself willing to participate in the practical plans for salvaging and rebuilding the economy of the country. Such a plan was actually prepared by Lenin in 1918 and laid down the broad lines which were afterwards followed. It involved the rational concentration and distribution of industry; the need to secure the maximum possibility of production of raw materials; the forward-looking idea, so much ridiculed by H. G. Wells, of the electrification of industry and transport; and the application of science to agriculture.

This was only part, and can be seen now as the less urgent part, of their tasks. Before it could be undertaken, the first need was to build up a new body of scientific workers on a scale hitherto never envisaged. It was necessary to recast the whole of teaching and organisation of education to fit it for the new society. New universities and technical schools had to be founded and, somehow or other, staffed. In the earlier days this meant that the older scientists were overwhelmed with teaching duties and that research was relatively neglected except in certain favoured areas, such as Pavlov's great Institute at Koltushi. The old experts had to occupy themselves with creating new experts. Inevitably that took time. It was not until the early thirties that the results of this policy were beginning to make themselves felt. The great works of the first and second Five-Year Plans were providing a field of action for the newly trained engineers and scientists.

It was only in the second phase, which lasted until the outbreak of the Second World War, that it was possible to do more than consider the handling of urgent tasks and the providing of new trained personnel. It was only then, with the experience which was flowing in all the time from the new constructions, that it was possible to begin to see something of the strategy of the development and application of science and the organisation of scientific education and research needed to make it most effective. This resulted in the building up of what might be called the new Academy system which is, interestingly enough, a reversion to the original intention of the scientific academies of the seventeenth century, namely, as bodies themselves actively carrying out research into the laws of nature and their application for the benefit of man. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Academies had, and still have in capitalist countries, turned into purely honorific bodies having little corporate function except the organisation of lectures and the distribution of medals.

The All-Union Academy of Sciences, though a direct continuation of the old Russian Academy and retaining all, or nearly all, the old Academicians, now transformed itself into an active research body, taking over and creating numbers of research institutes for the conduct of which each Academician is personally responsible. Each institute functioned not only as a research centre but as a training ground for post-graduate study where degrees similar to our Ph.D. and D.Sc. could be worked for. These institutes, coupled with the Universities and a number of more practical institutes set up for scientific research and development by the Universities, work closely together on a three-fold programme of extending the range of scientific knowledge, of utilising that knowledge in the plans of construction and of training ever increasing numbers of new scientists.

How successful they were is shown by the achievements of the Soviet scientists in the war against Hitler. They showed themselves in every way a match for the scientists of Germany, where Russian science had been considered to be a negligible offshoot of the science of the Master Race. It is particularly interesting that, great as the demands of the war were and terrible the sacrifices which were willingly offered by scientists who continued to work during the rigours of the siege of Leningrad and as voluntary exiles in Siberia, science was not subordinated to war needs to nearly the same extent as it was in Britain and America. Universities continued to function and the continuity of pure research was not interrupted. All the war did was to slow down but never to halt the progress of science.

The first years after the war were occupied in the absolutely necessary tasks of reconstruction after the devastation wrought by the Nazis, who

took particular pains to destroy every trace of scientific work in the areas they occupied, even to the extent of wrecking all the instruments of the Pulkovo Observatory. Apart from the tragic and irreplaceable loss of scientists killed in the fighting or dying from cold and starvation in the battle areas, this period of recovery was extraordinarily short. Already, by 1949, most of the lost ground had been recovered and in many fields, science was already expanding vigorously.

It was during this period that the second of the necessary tasks of making science the possession of the whole people was seriously undertaken. The directive of Lenin, in 1919, was to "take over the entire culture that capitalism left behind and build Socialism with it. We must take all its science and technique, all its knowledge and its art." But it was evident that in this taking over, culture in general and science in particular could not remain unchanged. Science had grown up with capitalism ; it was imbued through and through, particularly its theoretical foundation, with the economic and political ideas of capitalism. Now, at the outset, Marxists with more enthusiasm than sense had demanded the immediate creation of a proletarian science to replace a bourgeois one, just as the enthusiasts whom Stalin ridiculed demanded the setting up of proletarian railways.

The process of studying and understanding the underlying ideas of science and the bringing of them into harmony with the new social trends is bound to be a long and difficult one, and it would have been absurd to wait until it was complete before making use of science as it was, bourgeois ideas and all. Nevertheless, the time for undertaking such a re-evaluation had to come and it was further stimulated by the considerable physical and intellectual shake-up of Soviet science during the war. It was then, for instance, that the methods for increasing crop production proposed by Lysenko, in the face of official scientific disapproval, were tested in practice. At the same time the new generation of Marxist theorists, now well versed in modern science, were meeting a new generation of scientists who were beginning to absorb the basic ideas of Marxism.

One further element essential to the transformation and to ultimate satisfactory synthesis, was the new interest in the history of science and technology by which the rising Soviet scientists were able to feel their affiliation with the hitherto unrecognised and neglected scientists of Tsarist times and to appreciate, for instance, the heroic work of Lomonosov, the fisherman's son, who not only virtually founded science in eigtheenth century Russia, but literature and historiography as well. This phase of intellectual reformulation of the basis of science is still continuing, in an atmosphere of controversy which, exaggerated as it is by the capitalist Press, appears strange and violent to scientists brought up in the intellectual torpor of a régime where scientists can afford to differ, as nobody cares very much what they think anyhow.

In the last four years it is evident that Soviet science is entering into a new phase, one of such rapid growth, development and activity, as completely eclipses everything that has gone before. I can say this with confidence, as I have followed the progress of science in that country and made repeated visits for over twenty years and have just had the chance, together with a group of scientists from the British organisation, Science for Peace, to make an intensive and detailed study of the present state of scientific research and education.

It is now apparent that the policy of the previous years is beginning to show massive results and the outlines of the place of science in the communist society of the future are beginning to be visible.

What distinguishes science under capitalism from science under Socialism is not only the large scale of scientific enterprise and the fact that it is incorporated into a definite plan for increasing productivity and improving the standard of life. Even more fundamental is the realisation of the idea that not only the results of science are for the use of the people and not for private profit, but that the people themselves must take an active part in all scientific enterprise. The way for this was prepared by thirty years of Soviet education in which the part devoted to science is far greater than that in capitalist countries. In the Soviet secondary schools, for instance, more than half of the lesson hours are given to scientific subjects, including mathematics, as compared with a third in the Grammar and a fifth in the Secondary Modern schools in our country. Further, the enormous interest and prestige of science among the population as a whole is encouraged by vast quantities of popular scientific books and periodicals which do not there, as here, have to stand competition with sex and crime. In the field of practice these ideas are encouraged by the development of Soviet industry and agriculture in which the general objectives of recent years have been the abolition of arduous tasks and the introduction of machines and even more automatic processes. This implies a step to a far higher technical level among the workers in factories and collective farms and one which can be made without the danger of unemployment which so disastrously holds back technical advance in capitalist countries.

The idea that greater mechanisation will drive society into a division of a set of managers and a vast crowd of robots is a typical perversion of a decaying capitalism and, appropriately, the man who coined the phrase "The Managerial Revolution" is the most blood-and-atom crazy of American reactionaries. The logic of improved mechanisms and, even more, of automatic factories, is that they need for their successful operation people of higher mental and technical qualifications, capable not only of ensuring that they work properly, but able to see further into how they should be improved. When the navvy, with his pick and shovel, is replaced by the gigantic drag-line or suction excavator, the operators of these machines need to acquire the skills of a pilot and operational

research worker. To use less skilled men is to waste the potentialities of expensive machinery.

With a new generation of scientists themselves coming from worker and peasant stock and in close contact with the factories and the fields, it is much easier to co-operate with workers themselves knowing something of science and conscious of the advantages which will accrue to them individually as well as collectively from every new improvement which is introduced as the result of new ideas.*

Even in this community of training and interest there still remains too great a division between theory and practice and the objective that is now being aimed at is to remove this last gap by literally carrying out in the shortest possible time Stalin's proposal of universal higher education :

> "It is necessary, in the third place, to ensure such a cultural advancement of society as will secure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development and in a position freely to choose their occupations and not to be tied all their lives, owing to the existing division of labour, to some one occupation."
>
> J. Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow, 1952.

To get some idea of the magnitude of this aim it is only necessary to say that there are at present something like 19 million Soviet young men and women between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three. The business of giving them higher education for even part of this time will involve training at least one million professors and lecturers ; but such astronomical figures are not inaccessible in the light of the progress of recent years. Already primary and secondary education is being provided for some 55 million children. Since 1937 the number of students in higher educational institutes has grown from under 500,000 to nearly 1,500,000, a three-fold increase in fifteen years which included the terrible years of the war. At the present rate the goal should be attainable in thirty years and may be even sooner as the rate itself may be increased.

* The contrast between the conditions under capitalism and Socialism are well brought out in the experience of a scientific worker who, after many years in the United States, returned to his native Hungary. When in Chicago, he produced many plans for new or improved scientific devices, but when he offered these to his employers he was invariably told that they were either uneconomic or impractical. Nevertheless he subsequently noted that many of his ideas were developed and used without his being given any credit for them. In his new post in Budapest he has continued to offer technical suggestions, but in contrast to his earlier experience, most of them are taken up immediately and put into production. Scarcely three months go by without his receiving substantial financial rewards for his suggestions.

Why can such a prospect be practically envisaged in the Soviet Union, when here there are ever-increasing complaints that we have reached the limit of the intellectual capacity of our country when we are giving higher education to less than 100,000, or 4 per cent of the age group ? The fact is that, even on the showing of the absurdities of a system of intelligence tests which are far more tests for class than ability, we are still making use of no more than 20 per cent of available ability. Further, if we accept the American intelligence tests the proportion is even smaller, for there, where some 8 per cent of the population get a college education—for what it is worth—the army intelligence tests showed that even in the higher brackets (intelligence quotient 130+) only one-third had had a college education. We can, as the experience of the Soviet Union shows, immediately almost double our output of scientists by giving the women an equal chance of education compared with the one in eight they have at present. (In 1952 3,984 men and 509 women took honours degrees in scientific and technical subjects.) We could also add to the man-years available by exempting, as they do in the Soviet Union, all students in higher education from call-up. But this is not all. We have been brought up on the opinion that only a small number are suited to derive advantage from higher education, but perhaps that is not so much the fault of the human material as that of the higher education.

At any rate, in the Soviet Union it is still considered that everyone is educable, that is, that it is worthwhile to see what a person has in him by giving him the best chance to show it. This has been done already to a degree which the overall figures just quoted bring out. The fact is that the improvement and extension of Soviet education, though carried out over a vast area, has necessarily reached the higher level in those places which had initial advantages, namely in the towns and industrial areas.

Seven-year (incomplete secondary) education for all was achieved in the main centres of the Soviet Union as early as 1935. It was completed in the whole country during the first post-war Five Year Plan. The present Five Year Plan provides for full (ten-year) secondary education to be achieved in the larger towns by 1955 and for conditions to be prepared for its extension to the whole country by 1960. In the 120 largest towns of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (accounting for about half the population of the U.S.S.R.) 97 per cent of the children completing seven-year school will be staying on for full secondary education by 1954.

Universities and higher educational institutes draw for the most part from secondary schools, although the channels of entry directly from the bench and field are still open. It is where the secondary education is compulsory that it is possible to see what proportion can be taken

into higher education. On the average this is about 25 per cent but in a number of cases, not only in such cities as Moscow but in remote Georgia, it rises to 100 per cent. Now, there is no reason to believe that the boys and girls of these schools are any different from the others. If they can get profit from higher education so can everybody, and there is certainly no lowering of standards. The five-year university courses, including one or two years' research, which everyone must take are as thorough and stiff as anything in Britain. This is a real demonstration in practice of a new phase in the development of science, one in which it is being taken over by the people as a whole.

In parallel with the rapid development of scientific education has gone a development of scientific research of a new kind. The organisation is that of the Academy system already described but the mode of work —and the direction—are also largely new creations and are still in a state of rapid evolution. The problem before the scientists of the Soviet Union has been that of combining the most rapid intrinsic development of scientific knowledge with the service to be given to the industrial and agricultural enterprises of the country. The transition from a state of affairs in which both the development and use of science is largely unconscious, or at best *ad hoc,* to one which is conscious and planned, has also taken time and has had to go through a number of stages. But it has by now reached a state in which the new general principles are appearing. One initial advantage was that the central direction of scientific research and development lay with the Academy of Sciences itself, that is, with professional scientists. The planning of science has not been something imposed from outside or above but generated among the body of scientists themselves. The plans for science as they are made today are drawn up in the first place by the half-a-dozen scientists in each of the thousands of separate laboratories. These plans are combined together to form those of the institutes and these in turn united to make up the plans of the sections of the Academy. The initiative and the detailed programmes rest with the individual scientists tempered only by discussion with their immediate colleagues. It is clear that the higher levels of planning can only be effective in distributing the weight of effort in the different sections and that this, in fact, can only be done by bodies in which the various sciences are represented. The relation of the plan to the national economy comes when it is submitted by the Academy to the Soviet government. There, the relations of research, both short and long term, in connection with such subjects as industrialisation and development of arid zones or mineral resources, are discussed. The Academy may take back from these meetings directives which will give still further emphasis and demand a greater effort in certain sectors. The plans are nearly always revised upwards rather than downwards. The finances of the Academy are limited only by the acceptance of the pieces of research set out in the plans. There is no fixed budget and the general atmosphere

of scientific work in the Soviet Union is operating under conditions which all scientists have always wanted, without any consideration of cost and with the responsibility for any extravagance thrown on to the scientists themselves and not determined for them by some non-scientific bureaucrats.

Until recently there was a real limitation in such matters as apparatus by the productive capacity of the instrument industry, but that has largely vanished. The magnificent equipment of the Soviet laboratories with high-grade standard equipment now in mass production, as well as with fine workshops for individual pieces of apparatus, would make the British and even the American scientists very envious if they could see it.

The working out of a proper balance between fundamental and applied science has taken years but a definite philosophy is now emerging. In the report by the President of the Academy of Sciences it is discussed in relation to the fifth Five Year Plan (published by the S.C.R. Science and Engineering Section, October 1953). One can see the emergence of some new general principles although the basic objective remains the same:

> "the working out of theoretical problems in all fields of knowledge and of strengthening ties between science and industry.
>
> "Primarily, our task is to make a very great improvement in the quality of the work of our scientific institutions and scientists and to increase the productivity of their labour. Scientific staffs must be directed towards solving the main problems of science and defining these main problems exactly and precisely. By bringing science in every way closer to the practice of building Communism, to industry and to production, by absorbing the experience of industry and of the innovators in production, we must solve the most important theoretical problems of science."

In science everywhere the emphasis is now on the growing points:

> "In the development of the physico-mathematical and natural sciences as a whole, it is necessary to concentrate forces primarily on the investigation of new, rapidly developing and promising fields and problems in these sciences. Such fields and problems are connected above all with vigorously developing new techniques: radio engineering, the utilisation of atomic energy, automatics, plastics, large-scale agriculture. Such rapidly developing fields and problems are often found where two or more sciences overlap—radiochemistry, geochemistry, biogeochemistry, biochemistry, biophysics, crystallochemistry, chemical physics, organic physical chemistry, radio-astronomy.
>
> "Just as a developing plant organism has precise growing-points, so science, in the given conditions of each period, has its own precise main growing-points. To master them in today's science and to know how to foresee tomorrow's 'growing-points' is our task."

It can be seen from this that what is being attempted is not only the intensification of the individual sciences but a far greater combination of sciences than has hitherto existed. Another aspect is the relation of fundamental problems to utility. The concept that the history of the past is not something dead but still active is one which is specially fostered all over the field of science. For instance, cosmogony and geology, the problems of the origin of the stars and of the earth with its subsequent history, are considered far from merely speculative exercises. There, the interest in them is because they are important guides to the discovery and utilisation of mineral resources. We have not, in this country, a single chair in geochemistry, let alone cosmochemistry. The almost complete separation that exists with us between the theorists and the practical prospector hampers both the development of our theoretical science and the utilisation of our natural resources.

Another field where a combined attack is being intensified in the Soviet Union is the development of electronics with the automatisation of industry. Here higher mathematics, physics and mechanics combine to achieve the radical transformation of industry from traditional practice to the direct application of scientific analysis. Chemistry also is not neglected and the possibilities not only of conventional plastics but also of the new silicone and fluorine plastics have been energetically followed. It is interesting to note that this work is also linking with biology. The study of protein synthesis, already successfully carried out by Bresler, using enzymes under pressure, is part of the work of the Institute for the study of high molecular compounds.

Science in the Soviet Union is not isolated. It is a very conscious part of world science. How closely it is integrated with it is shown by the setting up of a special Institute of Information by the Academy of Sciences which already contains the largest, most thoroughly organised abstracting system in the world. But the Soviet scientists do not only want to take in the scientific knowledge from other countries. They are equally concerned with sharing their own knowledge and in profiting by common discussions between scientists. The abiding impression that I got from my recent visit is the sincere desire of the scientists of the Soviet Union to re-establish the closest and most friendly relations with all scientists of other countries and to give their support to every move in that direction.

The picture of the world of science today shows almost more clearly than in any other section of human activity the difference between the ruling conceptions of capitalism and Socialism. But the scientists in the different parts of the world are not sundered in their lives or work by any such differences. Any British scientist would be at once at home in a Soviet laboratory and would immediately appreciate the conditions of work there and at the same time be able to contribute something of the wealth which a continuous and consciously maintained tradition of science has given to the workers of this country.

We cannot fail to recognise the scale and capacity of scientific work in the Soviet Union and now also in the countries that have chosen it for their model. It has already the scale, and even more important the rate of growth, that will in a few years transform it from one merely comparable to the most advanced capitalist science to one of a different scale altogether.

The intrinsic logic of the development of mechanised production demands an increasing share for science. This cannot be met under existing capitalist conditions. The resources of science are already strained to the utmost, diverted as they are there largely to military purposes. It is only by throwing the whole of science open to the people that its adequate utilisation under modern conditions can be achieved. Science can no longer be monopolised. In the absence of war, the superiority of the system of science for the people over science for profit is bound to become more and more evident and will be one of the factors that will determine whether the continuation of the capitalist system is compatible even with the mere existence of human society, let alone its advance to a happier state.

The Abuse of Poetry and the Abuse of Criticism by T. S. Eliot

ALICK WEST

Rebel in youth and early manhood, respectable in middle age, officially honoured in advancing years—that is sometimes the story both of politicians and of poets.

T. S. Eliot's writings record the decay as it is lived in the man's consciousness. His past and present are there to be compared. His work covers thirty-five years of change. His earliest poems, *Prufrock and Other Observations*, date from the first years of the First World War and earlier; *Gerontion* and other poems appeared in 1920; in 1922 was published *The Waste Land*, which *The Times Literary Supplement* described as a parody "without taste or skill", and F. L. Lucas as another instance of "that squalor which seems perpetually to obsess Mr. Eliot with mixed fascination and repulsion", while Dr. Leavis declared that Eliot had given a new direction to English poetry. The poems of the following years, *The Hollow Men* (1925) and *Ash Wednesday* (1930), aroused no such violent clash of opinion; but some doubts were heard whether Eliot was not losing his poetic power. His last poems, *The Four Quartets*, were written between 1934 and 1942; they were received with stronger doubts, and with more fulsome praise. In the meantime, with *Murder in the Cathedral* (1935), Eliot had turned to poetic drama, and his two post-war plays—*The Cocktail Party* (1949), *The Confidential Clerk* (1953)—were first performed at the official Edinburgh Festival.

If, not knowing the author, one read *The Cocktail Party* and then *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*, it would hardly, I think, come into one's mind that they were the work of the same man. And he would have been a very shrewd critic who, on reading the satirical *Mr. Eliot's Sunday Morning Service* (1920) could have foretold that in 1939 the same author would have written *The Idea of A Christian Society*, or who could have discerned in Eliot's attack on individualism in his first collection of critical essays, *The Sacred Wood* (1920), that in fifteen years the enemy would have become the "Liberalism" which contemporary fascism was also selecting as a vulnerable point of attack.

These changes in Eliot's work, and in the official attitude towards it, are part of the general political and social change of these years. Through Eliot's poetry and criticism we can see the general change at work in individual thought and emotion. And as we try to follow its working, it becomes plain that Eliot's writings, however obscure they may appear,

express a conflict which everybody must fight out. In the battle of ideas Eliot succumbed for the same reasons as make others besides poets cease from rebellion and become respectable. He was largely unconscious of the continual pressure of imperialist ideology; he never seriously criticised his early idealism; he remained ignorant of Marxism. He studied theories of poetry; but he never studied the theory of society which would have enabled him to understand and make himself a part of the creative forces of society, so that his rebellious poetry would have become revolutionary poetry.

II

In his early critical writings Eliot recognised that a poet needs knowledge of more than poetry. In the essay which sets out most clearly the fundamental principles of his criticism, *Tradition and the Individual Talent* (1919), he wrote:

> "It [tradition] involves, in the first place, the historical sense, which we may call nearly indispensable to anyone who would continue to be a poet beyond his twenty-fifth year."

And the essay ends with these words:

> "And he [the poet] is not likely to know what is to be done unless he lives in what is not merely the present, but the present moment of the past, unless he is conscious, not of what is dead, but of what is already living."

That is well said. But the ideas are valuable only potentially; they still have to be applied. The poet must know history: what happened in history, and what is its meaning for us? The poet must be conscious of what is already living: what was it that in 1919 was already living?

Eliot's answer to these questions robs his ideas of their potential value. What has happened in history, he says, is the disaster of the bourgeois revolution in the seventeenth century, and the meaning of history for us is that we must arrest the decay of culture which that revolution started, or of which it was a sign; and what is already living is what has always been living—God and the Devil.

The reactionary idealism of these answers is already seen to be implicit in *Tradition and the Individual Talent*, when it is read in the light of Eliot's later work.

The essay states an important truth: that literature cannot be understood or valued if it is regarded as having been made out of nothing but the emotions of one individual; nor can an individual create good literature if he regards his own emotions as its only source.

What source, then, has literature outside the emotions of one in-

dividual? Eliot's answer is contained in the following passage, which continues the quotation already given:

> ". . . the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with the feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional."

Before examining this passage, let us recall some facts about the development of literary and critical theory.

Three years before Eliot was born Bernard Shaw had made in passing a profound remark which pointed forward to the work that criticism had, and still has, to do: Shakespeare's tragedies, he said, were the product of early capitalism; what, then, is their meaning and value for Socialism? And in this same period William Morris was asking of writers, artists, and all those who, thanks to their membership of the exploiting class, had been able to acquire knowledge of culture, that they should identify themselves with the workers and place that knowledge at the service of the workers in their fight for Socialism.

During Eliot's lifetime literary criticism has been set a completely new task through the spread of Marxism and the advance of Socialism. It has to work over again the whole of past literature in the light of those laws of movement of society discovered by scientific Socialism, and with the knowledge that the working of those laws makes certain the victory of Socialism. It has to help the working-class movement to make that literature its own and to equip itself for creating the new literature of humanity freed from exploitation. Eliot's contemporaries—Gorky (whose name Eliot does not, I think, once mention—just as he only mentions William Morris in an occasional passing reference to his poetry), Plekhanov, Mehring, Lukacz—have begun a revolution in literary criticism. Compare with this revolution the conceptions underlying Eliot's *Tradition and the Individual Talent.*

Eliot merely limits individualism: the source and content of literature are to be found not only in individual inspiration but in the tradition of the literature of Europe—which means, in fact, of Western Europe, Eliot not being concerned with the literature of any countries outside it (though he has dallied with Indian philosophy). And the cultural life embodied in this tradition was, according to Eliot, at its purest until the time of the bourgeois revolution, when there took place a "dissociation of sensibility" from which literature has never recovered.

Such limitation of individualism is not new, nor is the concept of a West European tradition as a transcendent spiritual reality at its most intense in feudalism. There has always been such a strain in bourgeois thought and feeling; for the bourgeoisie compromised intellectually with feudalism no less, or even more, than it did politically. They have always made propaganda with feudalism when they felt their power threatened. Burke, fighting the French Revolution and perverting all the resources of the English language to consecrate Windsor Castle as the new Church, consciously used tradition against democracy; out of English tradition he tried to make chains for the English people, so that they should feel themselves, not the citizens of a democracy, but the humble subjects of a State majestic with all the authority of the past. When Marxism showed men how to make the future, the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie intensified the exaltation of culture, particularly in Germany, where Eliot studied before the First World War at a time when reaction was carrying on a mass propaganda campaign of "Kultur" against Socialism, and when the writings of Nietzsche, Gobineau and Stewart Chamberlain were providing material for the beginnings of fascist ideology.

This glorification of the culture of the past, especially of hierarchic feudalism, was part of that turn from democracy to reaction which Lenin notes as characteristic of the change from competitive to monopoly capitalism. That is the political background to Eliot's assertion that literature can neither be understood nor created except through sacrifice of the personality to the West European tradition.

The influence of the propaganda of "culture" and feudal tradition which imperialism employed against democracy and Socialism killed what might have been fruitful in Eliot's conception of the relation of the individual writer to society.

The poet, he said, must be conscious "of what is already living". The propaganda of imperialism, through all the opinion-forming organs which it controls, prevented Eliot from knowing what was already living. It isolated him from the new growing forces.

He wrote this essay in 1919, two years after the socialist revolution; but he wrote as if that revolution had never taken place, as if there were not a thought of it in his mind. If imperialist propaganda had not blinded Eliot, if he could have applied his principle that the poet must be conscious of what is already living, there is no telling what he might not have accomplished.

Therefore Eliot himself lacked the historical sense which he rightly said the poet must have. For he was unaware that with the October Revolution a new era in human history began. That ignorance is the cause of his limitations and of his decay both as critic and as poet.

Imperialist propaganda also limited Eliot's historical sense by imbuing him with idealism. Though he rejected the belief that a work of literature could be interpreted as the creation solely of an individual mind, he

still believed that literature itself was the creation solely of mind. He therefore accepts tradition as a given ideal reality, and he remains completely incurious as to how what we have inherited ever came to be created. He assumes the existence of language, rhythm, images, poetic forms. He takes thought for granted. History for Eliot is the history of abstract mind, and it begins in classical Greece; and even classical Greece is little more than one of the sources of "West European culture".

The span of history for Eliot is limited by class society—class society without a beginning, class society without an end. And therefore from class society the class struggle is—apparently—eliminated. History and tradition are to be conceived as timeless, as simultaneous existence and simultaneous order (in a feudal "organic" sense)—terms of thought which make it necessary to separate history mentally from time, movement, conflict, reaction, and advance. He dissociates tradition from the struggle of the men who make it.

This conception of a timeless tradition, a mental entity separate from and higher than individual minds, without material cause or foundation, is indistinguishable from the conception of deity. It is not only a term of literary criticism, but also an act of moral command and of moral submission. To sacrifice the personality, as Eliot bids us, to tradition means in effect to submit to the political power which has used idealistic conceptions of tradition as one of its main weapons; it means surrendering that faith in democracy which this capitalist propaganda of tradition has been primarily aimed at destroying; it means denying the class struggle and the culmination of the class struggle in the victory of the socialist revolution; it means accepting the social relations of which we are in fact part as being absolutely beyond our power to change, more remote from our reach than deity is from humanity. In calling for the sacrifice of personality to tradition, Eliot is a spokesman for imperialism; he is also sacrificing his own personality to imperialism.

This concept of tradition denies the class struggle; but both in its elaboration since the time of Burke and in its use by Eliot himself a definite aim in the class struggle is being pursued. Like those before him who had appealed to tradition, Eliot clearly recognises the fact of the class struggle. He fights it with skill. He diverts attention from the present day (as long ago as the 1880s Shaw had said that capitalism could no longer find apologists) to the bourgeois revolution (which he speaks of, not as a revolution, but as the Civil War). There he finds the cause of that "dissociation of personality" from which literature has in his opinion never recovered, and which he considers to have been a disintegration of tradition. He openly recognises the struggle between feudalism and capitalism, and he exalts the "integrated" man of feudalism above the "disintegrated" man of capitalism in order to attack, not capitalism, but democracy and revolution; and in order to attack democracy and revolution, not in the seventeenth century, but today.

Eliot is right in repeatedly saying that he does not wish to return to the past; he wishes to use the past against the present and the future.

For this purpose the past must remain mysterious. Just as Eliot turns the tradition of literature against democracy, so he pontifically forbids us to use for the better understanding of literature the knowledge gained in the fight for democracy. He ends an essay on *Hamlet* (1919) with:

> "under compulsion of what experience he attempted to express the inexpressibly horrible, we cannot ever know. . . We should have to understand things which Shakespeare did not understand himself."

We understand what Shakespeare did not understand! Impious thought! But we do. Because the world today is advancing to the complete and final overthrow of capitalism we can understand, as Shakespeare himself could not, that his tragedies express the humanism and the inhumanity of the advance from feudalism to capitalism. His work lives in the fight for democracy and Socialism not only because through carrying on that fight we can understand him better than he could be understood before, but because he inspires us to fight with higher spirit. His work becomes part of us.

That is the unity of personality and tradition which literary criticism must help to achieve. Eliot's critical method means the separation of personality and tradition. For tradition can neither be understood nor lived by those who make of it a weapon against the working class. Yet that is the *essence* of Eliot's criticism. It is not criticism, but an abuse of criticism.

III

According to his critical theory, Eliot's life should have been the continual extinction of his own personality, the repeated sacrifice of himself to tradition. How in practice was he to make this sacrifice? Where was he to find tradition? What did George V, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the hard-faced business men of the "Hang the Kaiser" Parliament, and the present Baron Archangel of the Murmansk intervention care for the timeless, simultaneous order of European poetry? The war had not been fought for literature, but for profits. Who was serious about art? Eliot's best criticism was the answer he once gave to that question: Marie Lloyd. In the music hall, he said, tradition was alive.

But he did not write songs for her. He made what E. M. Forster in an essay in *Abinger Harvest* well called "the slighter gestures of dissent". Highly conscious that the ruling class, to whom through his deification of tradition he was intellectually yielding, in practice cared nothing for tradition, he avenged himself and the literature he loved (so far as he could love anything) by mimicking exactly the false tone of the conceited pseudo-cultured drawing-room:

So intimate, this Chopin, that I think his soul
Should be resurrected only among friends. . . .

says a lady over the afternoon tea-table. The "I" of these poems feels himself to be in some way an accomplice of this falsity:

I smile, of course,
And go on drinking tea.

But how can he break through all the intangible lies which he countenances by listening to them?

Do I dare
Disturb the universe? . . .
No! I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be;
Am an attendant lord. . . .

In the earlier poems, the sense of isolation in a social environment indifferent to culture and of frustration except for the "slighter gestures of dissent" is expressed again and again in images of loneliness, fear, and cruel futility:

I have seen eyes in the street
Trying to peer through lighted shutters,
And a crab one afternoon in a pool,
An old crab with barnacles on his back,
Gripped the end of a stick which I held him.
(*Rhapsody on a Windy Night*)*

Yet, looking at Eliot's development, it is not so much the dissent which is the essence of these poems, but rather their orthodoxy, to use the term which Eliot half-substituted for "tradition" when in 1934 in *After Strange Gods* he reformulated the central idea of *Tradition and the Individual Talent*.

Eliot's desire to be united with his society was stronger than his critical consciousness of its pseudo-culture. Where and how he sought that union is determined by his idealism, and by the American-Bostonian social background from which he never broke away ("one has a feeling at moments", says E. M. Forster, that for Eliot "the Muses are connected not so much with Apollo as with the oldest county families").

As in his critical thought Eliot was making a deity out of tradition, so in his poetry he is one of those whom Lenin called "god-seekers".

* The effect of this image is increased by the occurrence in *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* of these lines: "I should have been a pair of ragged claws Scuttling across the floors of silent seas."

E. M. Forster said of *The Waste Land*:

> "It is about the fertilising waters that arrived too late. It is a poem of horror. The earth is barren, the sea salt, the fertilising thunderstorm broke too late. And the horror is so intense that the poet has an inhibition and is unable to state it openly."

That is only a part of the truth. *The Waste Land* is composed in such a way that when the reader comes to the last thrice-repeated word "Shantih" and, turning to the Notes for explanation finds " 'The Peace which passeth understanding' is our equivalent to this word", he shall be retrospectively moved by a sense of this religious peace, and shall humbly recognise that the peace does pass understanding. And the reason for the absence of open statement is the fact that not by open statement but only by indirect and irrational suggestion could the "old disused God-factory" (to render a phrase from one of Eliot's early French poems) be got working again.

The tricks by which Eliot manufactures deity merit study, but in a short article they can only be very inadequately indicated.

Seeing that an important element in his technique is his use of colloquial idiom and of images which contemporary Georgian poets would have rejected with disgust, Eliot, so far from being a poetical augur who has to work a religious miracle, might appear to be a realist in poetry. To call him so would be a misuse of the term. He does not use the rhythms of common speech because he loves the common people; nor does he use only these rhythms. He does not use the images of everyday life because he enjoys it; nor does he use only such images. He combines the poetical and the not-poetical, according to the Georgian poets' understanding of the poetical and the not-poetical; and the not-poetical is not valued in itself, but as the foil to the poetical. Rhythms and images of common life are used to subordinate common life to a higher mystery.

This movement towards mystery is present in Eliot's earlier poetry. In *Sweeney Agonistes*, for instance, phrases which might have been sung on the music-hall are repeated until they acquire a metaphysical ominousness which would have killed any music-hall act. In his later work, the mystifying movement becomes stronger and more deliberate; it may be briefly exemplified by his poem *Triumphal March* (1932).

The poem opens with lines giving the ring of hooves and the excitement of a procession:

Stone, bronze, stone, steel, stone, oakleaves, horses' heels
Over the paving.
And the flags. And the trumpets. And so many eagles.

Then the verse imitates, with a slight superciliousness, the chatter of

the waiting anonymous crowd. But it suddenly interposes, in a different rhythm and language, the reflections of a higher and impersonal mind:

> Here they come. Is he coming?
> The natural wakeful life of our Ego is a perceiving.
> We can wait with our stools and our sausages.

The effect of this contrast is not to remind us that the natural wakeful life of our Ego is not only a perceiving but also an eating; its effect is, on the contrary, to insinuate the vulgar inferiority of those for whom their natural wakeful life *is* an eating, especially if they eat sausages (contrast Eliot's own superior menu given in the epigraph to *The Sacred Wood*: "I also like to dine on becaficas").

There follows, in the manner of Whitman (whom Eliot borrowed from, but, I imagine, detested), an itemised list of the procession:

> 5,800,000 rifles and carbines,
> 102,000 machine guns *etc.*

At last *he* comes:

> There he is now, look:
> There is no interrogation in his eyes
> Or in the hands, quiet over the horse's neck,
> And the eyes watchful, waiting, perceiving, indifferent.
> O hidden under the dove's wing, hidden in the turtle's breast,
> Under the palm tree at noon, under the running water
> At the still point of the turning world. O hidden.

Listen to the faint Georgian poetic tremor of the voice, the slightest of discreet heart-throbs, in that repeated "O hidden".

Then back to the sausage-eating crowd:

> That is all we could see. But how many eagles! and how many trumpets!
> (And Easter Day, we didn't get to the country,
> So we took young Cyril to church. And they rang a bell
> And he said right out loud, *crumpets.*)
> Don't throw away that sausage,
> It'll come in handy. He's artful. Please, will you
> Give us a light?
> Light
> Light
> Et les soldats faisaient la haie? ILS LA FAISAIENT.

This last line ("And the soldiers made a cordon? THEY DID") is taken from *L'Avenir de l'Intelligence*, by the French Royalist writer Charles Maurras, whom Eliot admired as an exponent of the "classicism" which he himself professed.

What has happened in this poem? The people have been degraded into a mob. They chatter, they goof, they eat sausages, they are so vulgar that the mystery of the elevation of the Host reminds them of crumpets and they laugh as at a good joke.

But now a no less significant transformation takes place. One of the mob asks for a light; and lo! the religious miracle is worked. That ordinary phrase "Please, will you give us a light" is broken, the rhythm changed, and the time slowed down. In his later poetry of *The Four Quartets* Eliot was to expound at length that in the sphere of higher reality time, like the West European tradition, is timeless, that time is "not our time" but God's; being, however, a good Protestant, or at least an admirer of Anglicanism, he feels himself at liberty to use God's time for his own purposes. So before the word "Give" he makes a pause of a fraction of a second of plain ordinary time. As a result, in the intonation of "Give us a light" there is already a hint of mystery. A longer passage of God's time and Bergsonian *durée*. And now what has happened to that match in the previous line but one? Look, it is illuminating the whole universe! *Light*. And now what has happened to that sausage-eating crowd? Look, they are all kneeling in adoration! Reader, pious or impious, kneel with them; and observe that around this light there are bayonets.

The trick is not, of course, worked only by these last four lines. Eliot endeavours through the whole structure of the poem to induce in the reader the sense of mystery. He compels the mind to make leaps which reason cannot follow. By dissolving objective reality into absolute abstraction, but at the same time presenting with a kind of pomposity some gobbets of matter, such as the sausages, he aims to arouse in his passive readers—and contrary to what many critics say, Eliot demands passivity—a sense of some inexplicable and potent unity, with which the incantatory rhythm of the poem as a whole and the list of the armaments exhort and warn the submissive readers to identify themselves.

The poem blurs and wipes out what Blake called "the bounding line".

> "The great and golden rule of art, as well as of life," he said, "is this: That the more distinct, sharp, and wiry the bounding line, the more perfect the work of art, and the less keen and sharp, the greater is the evidence of weak imagination, plagiarism, and bungling. . . . What is it that builds a house and plants a garden but the definite and determinate? What is it that distinguishes honesty from knavery but the hard and wiry line of rectitude and certainty in the actions and intentions? Leave out this line and you leave out life itself."

In the *Triumphal March* there is no bounding line between:

> And the eyes watchful, waiting, perceiving, indifferent.
> O hidden under the dove's wing, hidden in the turtle's breast.

The second line and the two following may be taken as the exclamation of the higher mind who interpolated the previous utterance about the Ego ; having no verb (the absence of verbs and the ambiguity of their subjects is part of Eliot's confusing abuse of language), they are also in apposition to "he" : it is the Leader who is "hidden under the dove's wing", and it is with him that one is merged "at the still point of the turning world" (a favourite phrase of Eliot's, and the expression of the same idealistic unity of the temporal and the timeless as in his critical theory). The impersonal and higher mind which haunts Eliot's poetry is indistinguishable from the Leader, as Goebbels' propaganda pictured him, riding on horse-back, a knight in shining armour. It is from fascism that the vulgar sausage-eating mob, awed by the cordon of bayonets, are to receive illumination.

All Eliot's poetry obliterates "the definite and determinate . . . that distinguishes honesty from knavery". Its aim is to confuse the reason ; to isolate the reader from objective reality and his fellow men ; to mesmerise him into surrender to the power of reaction ; to extirpate from his mind even the thought that he can change the world. That is the *essence* of Eliot's poetry. It is not poetry, but the abuse of poetry.

IV

The day before I saw *The Confidential Clerk*, I had been at the Cultural Conference organised by the Communist Party, at which John Gollan spoke so magnificently on the theme "What Communism means to Mankind".

Reading Eliot's dead notes towards the definition of the word "culture", one must hear in one's mind the living accents of those delegates to the Cultural Conference from factories and mines who know themselves to be the makers of culture.

"Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in different ways," said Marx ; "the point, however, is to change it".

"That", says Eliot, "is the voice of the Devil. The world cannot be changed ; for God cannot be changed. The world cannot be interpreted. The mystery must be humbly affirmed"—except by the élite who rig it.

That is Eliot's "culture". It is more dangerous than barbarism.

Communism and Mankind

JOHN GOLLAN

The starting point of our whole outlook is the essential humanism of Communism. Man is the centre of our system. We have faith in mankind. Our views are scientific views, and we want to use the objective laws of social development of capitalism and Socialism, in order to build Communism, to eliminate want, suffering, oppression and disease. Moreover, the social revolution, the transition of humanity from capitalism to the higher system of Socialism, can only be accomplished by the activity and struggle of man.

We are concerned about the flowering of the individual ; that is why we are concerned about society and social systems. For only in a socialist society can each individual truly flourish.

When the old pioneers sketched the vision of the society beautiful, they were accused of being dreamers. To this Ernest Jones answered :

> "But dreams are only the light of a clearer sky, too brilliant for our naked eye, and when we behold its radiance we turn aside and call it dreams. Ah, believe me, all thoughts which were ever born in majesty and expired in grief, which time has raised to maturity and glory, all of them were first described as empty dreams."

Now in the U.S.S.R., the course is set to achieve the dream, to raise it to maturity and glory, and the reality is more striking, grander than Ernest Jones could have foreseen. Arising out of the labour, the sacrifice and experience of building Socialism, striking out on new paths hitherto untrodden by man, has come the law of Socialism formulated by Stalin :

> "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques."

But this great achievement is not only the result of the experience of Socialism. We are standing on the pinnacle raised by the efforts of man over thousands of years of development. Each new generation of man has risen higher, but up till now they have been held back by class divisions.

Out of the mighty forward movement of humanity has come that deep understanding of the whole course of social development which is concentrated in Marxism. Now we are bringing to fruition all the efforts

of the past, and the great force driving on this historical development is the working class. The time has come for great social changes.

What is new in the twentieth century is the foundation, organisation and growth of the Marxist Communist Party, scientifically inspired, based on the strength and power of the working class, rallying all that is progressive in the Labour movement and humanity generally. The power of organisation of the Party, its theory and action, bring a resolution, courage, clarity, farsightedness, sense of principle and ability, that is at once the guarantee of Socialism and the weapon for its achievement.

Our struggle for social freedom is in direct descent of all the great struggles for liberty. The British people have an inspiring history. In generation after generation great progressive forces and thinkers have emerged in the struggle against the old. The modern working class is the culmination of all this. They are the standard bearers of progress.

That is why we British Communists are the heirs of the Tolpuddle Martyrs, the Chartists and all that is best in Britain's history.

The French Communists are the descendants of the French Revolution and the Paris Commune.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has realised and extended to the whole people the fruits of the struggles of all the progressives in Russian history.

The Chinese are carrying forward the anti-imperialist revolution commenced in 1911, and the American Communists are today the true heirs of the American Revolution.

Our humanism descends from the great humanists of British history. It was William Morris who said that man was perfectible. The struggle for a better man is implicit in our literature. "Freedom," said Winstanley the Digger, "freedom is the man that will turn the world upside down, therefore no wonder he hath enemies." "True freedom lies in the community in spirit and community in the earthly treasury." And Robert Burns wrote of the revolution :

"The Golden Age will then revive
Each man shall be a brother
In harmony we all shall live
And share the earth together
In virtue trained, enlightened youth
Shall love each fellow creature
And future years shall bear the truth,
That man is good by nature."

Communism is proving that today !

Modern capitalism has long reached the stage where it is the enemy of mankind ; it looks upon the people as objects of exploitation.

It is just over a hundred years ago that the Tolpuddle Martyrs were transported in chains to Botany Bay for daring to organise a union.

It is less than a century ago that working-class agitation first won the vote. Every advance we had to fight for, we had to wrest by force from capitalism and its political parties. In a debate on the Reform Bill Ernest Jones said :

> "What has been the voice of the masses—that nation within a nation, the working men—whom you would place outside the brotherhood of man ? Show me any great measure . . . which they did not either originate or support. Look at Catholic Emancipation ; look at the admission of Jews to Parliament ; look at the abolition of taxes on knowledge ; look at the extinction of West Indian slavery ; look at Free Trade ; look at Reform. Who were *for* these ? The men you would exclude from the vote. Who were against ? The classes who exclude them."

The whole bloody history of the Tories denies these gentlemen the right even to use the words liberty, humanity and freedom. They will now say they have changed, have grown benevolent. What nonsense !

What kind of humanists are they who deny the old age pensioners their miserable £2 ? They speak of a property-owning democracy ; they have *all* the property, we have *a little* of the democracy.

They are as vicious as Judge Jeffreys when they protect their sacred right of profit. Theirs is a mentality that will spend more on war to protect their tottering system, than on education, health, pensions and social welfare put together.

These self-styled democrats have rushed cruisers and troops to crush democracy in British Guiana, and we will not be worthy of the name of Communist unless we rally the Labour movement to halt this crime. They slaughter the Kenyans. They throw 300,000 men against the Malayans.

Their imperialist system has reduced the colonial world to abject poverty and misery for the profits of the trusts. The last Unesco Report shows that there are no schools for half the world's population. The latest Report of the Food and Agricultural Organisation shows that half mankind lacks sufficient food.

Even now they are whittling away at hard-won rights and liberties in Britain with emergency powers, purges and persecution.

Self-styled patriots, they have sold out our country to the United States of America, which has now taken over the major role of the murderer of liberty and the strangler of popular revolutions.

They show a contempt for humanity, a contempt for liberty except the liberty of their own class to exploit. Their enjoyment of exploitation means a denial of real democracy and progress. They must be cleared out if Britain is to advance on the road to Socialism.

THE CONTRAST OF PERSPECTIVES

At a time when the poisonous alleged New Thinking, produced in order to justify the abandonment of Socialism, comes from the Labour leaders, it is essential to re-state what Socialism is.

Socialism means the placing of real political power in the hands of the working class, taking it out of the hands of the monopolists. This is necessary not only because Socialism can come in no other way, but also because only in the act of taking power do the people throw off their degradation and rise to the stature of man.

Socialism means the expropriation of the capitalist class, taking the great industries, the land and the banks away from them and placing them in the hands of the people by measures of socialist nationalisation.

Socialism means the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, the abolition of private profit.

Socialism means the freeing of society from the fetters of capitalism so that it can flourish.

Socialism means the end of imperialism and colonial exploitation.

These are the great social acts carried out by the Russian Revolution, which have laid the basis of fundamental social change in the Soviet Union, a change which is attracting hundreds of millions of people all over the world.

In *The State and Revolution,* written in 1917, Lenin said that the expropriation of the capitalists:

> "will facilitate the enormous development of the productive forces. And seeing how capitalism is already retarding this development to an incredible degree, seeing how much progress could be achieved even on the basis of the present level of modern technique, we are entitled to say with the fullest confidence that the expropriation of the capitalists will inevitably result in the enormous development of the productive forces of human society."

This statement was one of those prophetic glimpses based on the scientific outlook for which Marx and Lenin were famed. The reality has proved even finer than the vision.

Georgi Malenkov told the Supreme Soviet in August this year that in the course of twenty-eight years up to 1953 the output of industrial production in the U.S.S.R., had increased twenty-nine times over. Production of steel has gone up twenty-one times, coal nineteen times, electric power forty-five times. "The chemical industry and engineering have grown at an even faster rate," he said.

This is the basis of the confidence of Communism, a confidence which now expresses itself also in the gigantic constructions of Communism, the avowed purpose of which is to transform nature itself. These great advances, unparalleled in the history of capitalism, are only possible

because they were accompanied by profound social changes.

After the second Five-Year Plan Molotov could proudly announce:

> "The chief historical task assigned by the second Five-Year Plan has been accomplished. All exploiting classes have been completely abolished; and the causes giving rise to the exploitation of man by man and to the division of society into exploiters and exploited have been done away with for all time."

This was the aim of the pioneers of Socialism—of Morris, Keir Hardie and Tom Mann. It is fashionable among the Labour leaders to sneer at these men who founded the British Labour movement, but it is the Communists who have made the aims of the pioneers a reality. In achieving them, they reached a significant milestone in the history of society.

And now our friends in the U.S.S.R. have set the Soviet people and mankind a new and glorious goal. Marx in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* wrote that the first stage of our new society would be the socialist stage, the stage in which "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" would still govern even after exploitation was abolished.

But then he said would come the higher—the communist phase.

> "In the higher phase of communist society," he wrote, "after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therefore also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banner: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"

What is called for here is a tempestuous advance, not only in production, but abundance for the people—a development of science and culture giving man the opportunity and will to move forward to a stage of life never known before.

It was in pondering over this and the experience of thirty-seven years of the building of Socialism, and in taking into account the new Soviet man, that Stalin in his *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* laid down the broad lines of advance to Communism in the Soviet Union.

Three main things would be necessary to pave the way to Communism in the U.S.S.R. They were:

A continuous expansion of all social production with a relatively higher rate of the expansion of the means of production.

Raising collective farm property to the level of public property, and gradually to replace commodity circulation by a system of products exchange.

And a great cultural advance, polytechnical education for all, for which a six-hour then a five-hour day would be necessary; a radical improvement in housing, and real wages at least doubled.

These are no propagandist aims. Already the fifth Five-Year Plan has proclaimed the aim of an increase of consumer goods by 1955 by 65 per cent and raising real wages by two-thirds.

In his speech to the Supreme Soviet, Malenkov declared they would reach these aims much sooner. He called for an abundance of food for the population and raw materials for light industry in two or three years.

In every People's Democracy the perspective is one of a rapid rise in living standards. Now the great People's Republic of China is on the march. Who can doubt what these 500 million industrious people, with the enormous untapped resources of China, now they have broken forever with feudalism and imperialism, will do in the next ten or fifteen years, with the brotherly aid of the mighty industries of the U.S.S.R ?

Truly this is our century, the century of Socialism, the century of advance to Communism for all mankind.

But look at the perspective for capitalism. It is plagued with uncertainty, it has lost its confidence of Victorian days. Churchill has referred to the terrible twentieth century.

We are in the midst of the general crisis of capitalism, bringing with it the crisis of British imperialism—and the alliance with America won't save it, it will hasten its end. The sustaining of militarism has become the main task of the capitalist States, burdening their economies, draining their wealth. Instead of the working day becoming shorter it becomes longer. The threat of unemployment grows. The cost of living soars beyond the capacity of the workers to buy. Social standards are systematically lowered.

Food consumption in Britain is lower per head today than in 1938. Long ago the reformist leaders abandoned Socialism; they replaced it with the slogan of the so-called Welfare State. Today two-and-a-half million people in Britain are on poor relief and everyone talks of the crisis in the Welfare State.

In the *Challenge to Britain*—Labour's election programme—all that can be offered the people is:

> "The Plan for Britain which we outline in the following pages will involve sacrifices not only of material benefits but of many cherished habits and traditions."

And the greatest crime of capitalism is the murder of people's minds, the breeding of passivity, the fostering of the war outlook and the frustration of generation after generation of young people.

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY

They cannot deny the stark contrast of the hopeful, confident perspective of Communism, and the hopeless barren perspective of capitalism. But the capitalists and the right-wing Labour leaders then attempt to argue that in our socialist world there is totalitarianism and tyranny, but in their so-called free world there is liberty and happiness for all.

The free world is variously described. Sometimes it is called the Western World, but in the same breath we are told it includes Japan, Formosa and Siam in the Far East, and Africa—though Africans are never consulted about this. Geography is not elastic to that extent, even although the Atlantic of the Atlantic Pact laps the shores of Greece and Turkey. No, it is not the Western World.

Sometimes it is called the Christian World. President Eisenhower in particular is fond of invoking God as a front for the State Department. But among the peoples included in this free world, mostly against their will, are Buddhists and Mohammedans and even the head-hunters beloved of General Templer. No, it cannot be the Christian World.

Sometimes it is called the Democratic World. But it includes Franco and the Shah, both dictators, installed by counter-revolution. It includes that great democrat Chiang Kai-shek. It includes Africa, where the peoples are shot down and jailed for demanding elementary democratic rights. It includes British Guiana, where six-inch guns are trained on Parliament Buildings to blast a freely elected government out of existence. No, it is not the Democratic World.

Examine as you like, the only formula that fits is the Capitalist World, whose God is Mammon; whose religion is profit; whose democracy is a means to keep the trusts in power.

In his latest pamphlet *What is Democracy*? Bertrand Russell writes that:

> "West of the Iron Curtain the word democracy is generally taken as implying that ultimate power is in the hands of the majority of an adult population. East of the Iron Curtain it means military dictatorship by a certain small minority of people who have chosen to call themselves democrats."

Lord Russell conveniently forgets, to start with, the crime that whatever democracy is enjoyed in the capitalist world is built on the denial of democracy to untold millions of colonial people.

But let us look at the two major capitalist States. We take first the United States. It has become customary to refer to President Eisenhower's

Administration as the Government of ten millionaires and a plumber—now slightly out of date, of course, because the plumber has quit.

Consider Britain ruled by the Tories; the party of the monopolists. If we take a small, but representative sample of twenty-eight British trusts, including ten insurance companies, the Big Five Banks and thirteen great industrial concerns, we discover that past directors hold eleven out of thirty-two Government ministerial posts, including the Foreign Office, the Treasury and so on. Eighteen of their directors sit in Parliament, seventy in the House of Lords. They hold twenty-five other semi-Government positions, including the Chairmanship and two Governorships of the B.B.C., and the Chairmanship of *The Times*. They have seven positions in the Royal Household.

Government of the people all right—but the right people, not the common people. After this we can appreciate Mr. L. S. Amery's subtle definition of democracy in Britain—"government of the people, for the people, *with, but not by,* the people".

Does anyone now seriously claim that the Labour Government changed this in any real way? The Labour Government was a government on behalf of the trusts by the right-wing Labour leaders. They left the capitalist State exactly as they found it. They left the material basis of capitalist political power, capitalist private property, undisturbed in the hands of the trusts.

Of course in their wild moments, they talk about the revolution under Labour rule, the cautious revolution, the silent revolution, one even calls it the absent-minded revolution—everything in fact except the social revolution. It was so cautious, so silent, so absent-minded that none of us, Churchill included, have noticed it.

The crux of democracy is: do the people actually run the country? And to run the country the people must own the country. Is there any nation where the Government is not in fact run by those who own the country?

The great struggle around policy now being waged in the Labour Party is between those who want the common people actually to run Britain—who want the great trusts and banks to be taken from the capitalists and made the property of the people—and the right-wing leaders who preach class collaboration, who want to preserve capitalism, and who now and then have the privilege of acting as a government of capitalism through a permanent State machine dominated by representatives of the trusts—and who say falsely that the common people could never run the country.

Democracy is more than a question of a vote, it is a question of who in fact has State political power, who in fact owns and runs the country.

In the Soviet Union these issues have long been resolved. The right-wing leaders, the Tories and Bertrand Russell can argue from

now till doomsday—but there are no landlords, capitalists or profiteers in the U.S.S.R. State power is firmly in the hands of the people. The factories, workshops and collective farms are the people's property. The army, the police and the judiciary are run by the people and for the people.

Millions of Soviet citizens and their organisations are drawn into active administration of the State, economic and cultural life. Before the Five-Year Plans are adopted they are discussed, and if needs be amended, by every Soviet factory and collective farm. A nationwide discussion preceded the adoption of the new Soviet Constitution, a discussion which produced 120,000 amendments and suggestions.

It is the finest achievement of the Communist Party which leads the Soviet people, that it has brought about the unfolding of the democratic life of the people on a scale never attempted before in history.

Precisely because the people are the masters of society, all the people are developing into advanced human beings with a high level of knowledge and understanding and a full appreciation of culture. Man's stature is raised in every way. Such people cannot live except under the highest democracy.

THE OPPORTUNITIES UNDER COMMUNISM

Once society has been freed from the fetters of capitalism, great new opportunities arise for man. Communism ends the subjection of one to another, ends the subjection of any person, woman, youth or race, and raises the whole of society to be masters of their own fate, masters of nature.

Only with the ending of capitalist exploitation can mankind really be free. This has been accomplished, or it is well on the way to being accomplished, in the socialist part of the world. The fight for the new against the old is an essential part of life. And this continuous pressure of the new, live, developing forces, the surging creative urge of mankind now frustrated by capitalism, reaches its highest expression in communist society. Communism's aim is to raise the development of man and the level of existence.

Our new society not only gives mankind the ultimate assurance of abundance but in doing so it changes labour and the attitude to labour. Utilising the highest techniques and the most complex machines and power, labour becomes more and more rich, skilled and creative, ceases to be a matter of brutal degrading drudgery.

Already Marx foresaw labour ceasing to be merely a means to live but becoming in itself the first necessity of living.

What did he mean? Under capitalism we work for someone else, for profit for the employer. Real social co-operation for the common good is impossible, as private profit, not the common good, is the aim of capitalism. Society is composed of antagonistic classes with

conflicting interests, and the interests of the exploiters predominate. But break this and the real social man emerges ; exploitation, the basic reason for social antagonisms, disappears. In working for society, man is working for himself ; in working for himself he is working for society. Every increase in production is expressed in higher standards, in a better society, in a richer, fuller life. Labour becomes really creative, really social. It becomes honoured and valued. It is expressed above all in the joy of collective creation. It becomes a pleasure instead of a burden.

The double exploitation of women ceases. Marx wrote in one of his letters :

> "Anybody who knows anything of history knows that great social changes are impossible without feminine ferment. Social progress can be measured exactly by the social position of the fair sex (the ugly ones included)."

Even the enemies of Communism are forced to admit that our new society gives equal opportunity for women. Equal opportunity is made a reality in education, in equal pay, in providing the creches and the nurseries, in providing the housing conditions, domestic labour-saving devices and communal facilities. And above all we give the right to the job, however high and important, based on qualification alone, irrespective of sex.

And the result of all this ? A great new additional force, now latent, is gained for society. We got a glimpse of what women could do when given a chance in the late war. The achievements of the Soviet Union would have been impossible without the Soviet women.

Youth ceases to be an object of cheap labour and becomes the most treasured possession of our society. Wordsworth wrote at the time of the French Revolution: "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, but to be young was very heaven." For our young people life will have a purpose.

The whole generation of youth will know that it is destined to become a force which takes society even higher than today. It will be confronted with a challenging, ever-expanding horizon of opportunity. Instead of the deadly frustration of capitalism, there will be the confidence arising out of all-round development.

In many ways the greatest thing about our way of life is what Communism offers to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. Look at what has happened in the Asiatic republics of the U.S.S.R. From poverty, racial oppression and backwardness, to new socialist nations, fully literate, running their own affairs, with complex modern industries and highly skilled mechanised agriculture, the flowering of national culture, a new dignity, a new power—and all in twenty-five years !

Look at China whose age-old culture and civilisation will rise to new heights and glories. Look at Viet Nam and Korea whose epic resistance

to imperialist oppression is yet another proof that really free societies can never be suppressed.

What would happen if the whole of the countless millions of Asia and Africa were socially free and independent ? We would see a great leap forward in history, the unleashing of such boundless human and material potentialities as to dismiss the ghosts of Malthusianism forever from the historical scene. Communism will accomplish precisely that. It will be a unique enrichment of the whole of mankind. The so-called developed peoples and countries are only a minority of the nations of the world.

Neither Eisenhower nor Churchill have enough soldiers to keep the great national liberation movement from achieving its historic mission. And it is our duty to do everything within our power to assist it to victory, otherwise we shall never have freedom ourselves.

FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MAN

The aim of Communism is abundance for all. Only we are bold enough to advance this aim, but it is a practical aim.

The way to abundance lies along the road : first, of social liberation which breaks the fetters of capitalism holding society back ; second, in the great consequent advance in technique and labour ; and third, arising out of this the very transformation of nature to meet the ends of man.

But all this also calls for the cultural re-education of society.

The concept of capitalist education is to keep the workers in their place, training the privileged few for executive positions, soaking them in an ideology which ordains that the capitalist class is the class destined to rule and the working class to be ruled. It is the modern version of "The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate, God made them high or lowly and ordered their estate" (*Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 573, verse 2). But Communism, in order to achieve abundance, instead of limited education for a restricted sphere demands an all-round education and training to give each individual the highest qualifications and develop the confidence and ability of all to help society forward and serve it in any capacity. This was grasped by William Morris. He claimed full educational opportunity for all :

> ". . . opportunity, that is, to have my share of whatever knowledge there is in the world according to my capacity or bent of mind, historical or scientific ; and also to have my share of skill of hand which is about in the world, either in the industrial handicrafts or in the fine arts ; picture painting, sculpture, music, acting, or the like ; I claim to be taught, if I can be taught, more than one craft to exercise for the benefit of the community. You may think this is a large claim, but I am clear it is not too large a claim if the

community is to have any gain out of my special capacities, if we are not all to be beaten down to a dull level of mediocrity as we are now, all but the very strongest and toughest of us."

This is our aim: to assure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities. All will receive an education of a level to enable them, in Stalin's words, "to become active agents of social development"; freely to choose their own occupation, not tied all their lives to one job due to the existing division of labour. And for all to take advantage of such facilities, the working day will have to be cut to six or five hours.

It is on this background we can look forward to the great objective of the abolition of the essential differences between manual and mental labour by raising the cultural and technical qualifications of all.

Capitalism not only has no intention of ever providing such facilities, it is not only incapable of providing such facilities, it dare not provide such facilities. Yet surely the provision of such opportunity is the quintessence of individual liberty.

Life becomes full and free: abundance on the one hand, and the flowering of education, art and culture on the other.

Look at the picture of culture under capitalism. Marx said that capitalist society turns all the most hallowed traditions into a source or profit—and he might have added, if they don't pay off, they are allowed to rot. Our national cultural heritage is subjected to the American offensive from Hollywood, the cult of violence, the culture of the juke box and Coca Cola. Those who scream about Western values allow our national theatre to beg for money, allow our great orchestras to limp along in a condition of near bankruptcy. They even allow Westminster Abbey to fall into decay. Cultural cliques produce their abortions for other cliques in an atmosphere of decadence and decay. Cold war propaganda, thinly disguised, is passed off as drama and literature.

The people are profoundly dissatisfied at being deprived of cultural opportunity. The other side of the picture is the way in which the people's organisations are fighting to provide the cultural facilities and opportunities the State denies us.

What a difference under Communism. Culture for us is indeed the very purpose of life. This is the essence of what Marx spoke of when he referred to the all-round development of man. Always the people have striven for this. What is distorted under capitalism into commercialism, or frustrated by lack of means, is released, and develops under Socialism and Communism. This deep urge in man has the opportunity for full satisfaction.

This cultural need arises out of the life of the people. Therefore in every country there will be a great cultural development based on the finest creators of the past, but filled with the outlook and confidence of the communist man.

The very concept of culture in all its forms gets a new significance. Only the great realists of the past had an appreciation of the struggle of man for a better life, but with the period of Socialism and Communism the whole of culture will be inspired by the great understanding that nothing in man's life is passive—always life means creation, the advance of the struggle for the new against the old.

That is why culture imbued with socialist realism not only gives a deeper understanding of the life of men and their struggle, but also has the vision of the future which acts as the inspiration and motive force in the life of men.

WHERE DO WE STAND IN BRITAIN?

Such is our goal. But Communism is not only a future stage of society. It is also the understanding, the action and movement to bring that stage of society into existence.

For us in Britain Communism means the struggle of the working people for political power, because that is the first condition for realising the ultimate aim. This is the basic meaning of the programme of the Communist Party, *The British Road to Socialism,* which we ask all to study.

The British Labour movement is at the turning of the ways. There is a crisis in policy following the experience of Labour rule. The best forces of the Labour movement are seeking a new radical way forward—that is to be found in *The British Road to Socialism.*

What are its essential ideas? To create unity of the people in struggle which is developing now on the various issues, to build up a broad people's alliance in defence of peace, for national independence and for social advance. Arising out of this struggle will come the aim of winning political power, of transforming "capitalist democracy into a real People's Democracy, transforming Parliament, the product of Britain's historic struggle for democracy, into the democratic instrument of the vast majority of her people." Such a People's Government, we say, would:

> Break the power of the millionaire monopolists and other big capitalists by socialist nationalisation of large-scale industry, the banks, big distributive monopolies, insurance companies and the land of the large land-owners, and introduce a government monopoly of foreign trade.
>
> Introduce a planned economy based on socialist principles aimed at fundamental social change.
>
> Transform the existing unequal imperialist Empire into a strong, free, equal association of peoples by granting national independence to the colonies.
>
> Make Britain strong, free and independent with a foreign policy of peace.

Break the political hold of the capitalist class by democratic electoral reform, democratic ownership of the press, the people's control of the B.B.C., and the democratic transformation of the Civil Service, Foreign Office, Armed Forces and Police, the Law Courts and the administration of justice.

Why do we want political power, what is it for? I would recall the Chartist slogan of 1840:

"Political power our means,
Social happiness our end."

We want political power in order to give our incomparable working class, which has already achieved much, the chance to show what it can do with its energy and skill. We want power to tear down the slums, rebuild our cities, bring every idle acre into cultivation. We want power to give people a full, happy and peaceful life.

We want power to give our scientists, teachers and intellectuals the full opportunity to use their gifts and qualifications for society, unrestricted by preparation for war or preservation of profit.

We want power to give our youth the chance of peaceful creation instead of the role of conscripts in filthy colonial wars.

In the recently published biography of Lord Salisbury he is recorded as having said at the end of his life that he had been Prime Minister more times than he cared to remember. There spoke the authentic voice of the ruling class, confident and conscious of the aim and purpose of political power for his class. But he represents a bygone age. Churchill tries to speak like him, but the days of capitalism are numbered.

Now our day and time is approaching. But we shall have to struggle for it, for the capitalist class will use every weapon to cling to its positions.

The working class and its allies have all the means to achieve their historical mission. The supreme crime of the right-wing Labour leaders is that they breed defeatism, seek to hold back the people, seek to undermine the confidence of the working class in its ability and strength. Communism does the opposite. It preaches confidence and again confidence, confidence in the power and the ability of the common people.

And if you want the reason for this confidence, I say: look round the world. The people are on the march. Boldly they are advancing under the flag of Communism to take their fate into their own strong hands.

Communism is the hope of humanity. Communism is rallying all that is best in humanity. Communism is the future for humanity. Speed the day of its realisation in Britain!

Folk-Song for Our Time?

A. L. LLOYD

God knows it is easy to misjudge the trend of public taste, but for some time it has seemed that a revival of interest in folk music is upon us, a revival more powerful and more significant than that experienced early in the century. Of late, thousands of ordinary people, youngsters particularly, have been turning to folk-song in search of the satisfaction of some apparently deep artistic want. The enormous popular success of such near-traditional singers as Josh White and Burl Ives would have been as unthinkable, five years ago, as would the broadcasting of the *Ballads and Blues* series by the B.B.C. And if the new movement is already developing its cult, this is but the mildly irritating product of a genuine, if raw, enthusiasm.

If the signs are read aright, the new revival is more powerful than the former one because it is more firmly rooted in the mass of the people. The revival of fifty years ago was mainly among middle-class folk, scholars, educators, parsons, givers of garden parties. Let no one disparage what was achieved then. Nonsense was talked and silliness done, but a few serious characters accomplished tremendous things, and with the further development of musical folk-lore as a science, the stature of Cecil Sharp, for one, has increased, not diminished. But the present revival of interest is a different affair, for it seems to have arisen more or less spontaneously among young people in youth clubs, rhythm clubs, trade union branches, night-school classes, in fact precisely among those people who are the true heirs to that lower-class musical heritage we call—for want of a better name—folk music. The purpose of this article is to try to suggest what folk music may have to offer to such people, and what they may have to offer to folk music. The problem is one of some importance, for it is intimately linked not only with the defence of our cultural independence, but also with the future of the popular creation of music in Britain.

Folk music possesses two fundamental characteristics which distinguish it from other kinds of music—its manner of performance and its function in society. By *performance,* I imply such features as oral transmission, the perpetual variation of the material, the various aspects of vocal or instrumental technique (Scottish pentatonism, Bulgarian rhythms, the Andalusian crying voice, etc.). By *function,* I mean the reason why a song gets sung, what it means to the singer, what the singer hopes to achieve by its performance (the propitiation of evil powers, solace for a baby's death, strengthening men's determination during a strike).

Till now, bourgeois folk-lorists have concentrated most of their atten-

tion on the formal aspects of folk music, and have given little thought to its function. That may be one reason why, after years of cogitation and conference, they have still failed to define what folk music is, have still not contrived to reach agreement on just what it is they are studying. What is the meaning of the word "folk", for instance? Does it mean the entire nation, within or beyond the political frontiers, as the German romantics believed? (So that to them, any widely-accepted song is a folk-song. *Die Lorelei*, words by Heine, melody by Silcher, is a folk-song. And *Abide With Me*?) Does it mean a single class—say, the working class? Or does it mean, as Bartók and others thought, a fraction of the people—say, the peasant class—whose material conditions of existence isolate it from the rest? The more the folk-lorists discover, the more sociology comes to bear on criticism and the vaguer the notion of folk music becomes. Small wonder that the folk-music scholar takes refuge in some quiet room where he can study tune-shapes and dissect melodies like so many frogs. But here again, confusion follows him. Folk music doesn't as a rule come into being conveniently fixed in ink on paper like art music. It is passed on by word of mouth and subject to constant change as it goes from singer to singer, because one doesn't like the run of the song and so he alters it to suit his fancy, while another can't remember exactly how it went so he fills in the gaps for himself. The material, then, is always likely to be in a state of flux and permutation, and the folk-lorist with a fixed and formal mind is sometimes baffled by the fact that even if he limits his investigations to one song, he may find it existing in countless forms reflecting quite different musical, psychological and social nuances.

The Marxist folk-lorists of the U.S.S.R. and of the new democracies have an enormous advantage in that not only are they dealing with a folk-tradition in full flower, but their philosophical approach provides them with a method of grasping the material however subject it may be to fluctuation and change, and gives them a theoretical groundwork for interpreting the social character of folk music. "Society influences music and at the same time music influences society" is their thesis, and the process is seen in its clearest and most exciting forms in folk music, precisely because it isn't the solitary talented individual who speaks through the folk-song, but the humble anonymous collective crowd with the power to move mountains and bring down the stars.

It must be remembered that the great musicians, the art composers, European or Oriental, affect the lives of only a tiny fraction of the world's population. The Congo pygmy woman yodelling to keep bad luck away from the little elephant hunters, the Rumanian shepherd playing cajoling music on his flute to entice a lost sheep out of the rocks; the Negro convict gang hoeing in the long rows of a cotton-field and distracting their minds with a song of Long-Gone John the escape artist, these, and hundreds of millions like them, are quite

uninfluenced by the cultured works of the great men. For them, music is little concerned with aesthetic pleasure. Rather, it is a desperate necessity. Things cannot happen right, life is not supportable, without the proper music, or, it may be, the proper dance. Such songs and dances may have many layers of meaning, and the magical world they create is a direct extension of the real world; and such is their power that even when through some social change, their significance is lost to the intellect, it may still be felt by generations of singers and dancers. Thus, the young *calusari* dancer who leaps and prances at the Bucharest Festival no longer believes that his dance has power to make the crops grow and the cattle breed (though his elder brother may have believed it only ten years ago). Nevertheless neither he nor his spectators are insensitive to the magical encouragement of the dance, even if they associate it with phosphates and tractors rather than with semen and water-buffaloes.

Over most of the world, this kind of functional music may form a prominent part of the folk-singer's repertoire, but it was hardly the thing that attracted the early collectors, who followed Herder's romantic view that "All people who are still uncultured are singers. Nature created man free, joyous, singing. Art and society have made him pent-up, sullen, dumb." Those holding this opinion believed that folk-song must be something simple, naive, as spontaneous as the song of a bird on a bough. Innocence and charm was what they looked for.

After all, it must be remembered that most of the early collectors were only doing the job as an amiable pastime. Many of them were curates keen to fraternise with their flock, or maiden ladies with a passion for bicycling. The music they liked best, the songs they collected and published with the greatest will, were often precisely the least representative items of the folk-singer's repertoire. The music the folk-lorists like best is not necessarily that which most interests the bearers of the tradition. In one area of Eastern Europe folk-singers came to have a horror of folk-lorists because the scholars pestered the peasants to sing rare old funeral chants of a kind which the singers had abandoned years before. In the case of the conventional folk-music collections, it was generally the most harmless part of the country repertoire, and the part which corresponded closest to the style of art music, which appeared most readily in print. Work songs, plough cries, shepherd calls, lullabies, material which was closest bound to the folk-singer's life, most frequently used, and most characteristic in expression, were pushed into the background by the great majority of the early folk-lorists. In this respect, Britain was better served than many West European countries. Because of our peculiar social history, our tradition is far richer in "diversionary" songs than in functional songs; nevertheless relatively early investigators such as Miss Lucy Broadwood showed a keen interest in street cries, for example, which doubtless seemed rather

ridiculous to the compilers of the lavender-and-mothball collections of *Quaint Songs of Olden Times* or *Ditties My Grandmother Sang*. Also despised and neglected were songs of more or less anonymous origin and oral dissemination, reflecting social conditions in the towns and industries. To the conventional folk-lorist, a song had to be rustic to be good. If it was old and rustic, that was better. But best of all was the old rustic song suitable for singing in evening dress from a concert platform. As a result, to this day those of us who only know folk music from the popular collections have a distorted idea of what the material sounds like. To people who have made the acquaintance of the Negro spiritual through the concert versions, the Library of Congress recordings of authentic spiritual singing come as a tremendous shock.

It was on the basis of the printed collections that German scholars, some forty or fifty years ago, came to the conclusion that there was no such thing as folk music. John Meier endowed this bold conclusion with a working title: *Rezeptionstheorie*. According to this theory, all art is created at the top of the social edifice. The common people are incapable of creating anything. They merely receive the art that filters down to them from above and preserve it long after the ruling class have finished with it. Of course, the art song doesn't remain identical, once it is taken to the bosom of the common man. The people, having no idea of, nor respect for, the integrity of the work, re-make it without scruple. Through the technical incapacity of the singers, through their defective memory and their tendency to confuse one song with another, the material becomes eroded out of all recognition until finally the once-fashionable material is *zersungen*—sung to pieces. Thus, the songs of the troubadours and minnesingers became the folk-songs of the sixteenth century, the songs of eighteenth century poets became popular songs in the nineteenth. For this process Hans Naumann coined the phrase *gesunkenes Kulturgut* (sunken cultural values), which has been a catchword ever since for those folk-lorists who cannot believe that the Oklahoma farmer, the Hungarian servant-girl, or the Durham miner are capable of making up songs for themselves. The anti-democratic nature of this theory delighted the Nazis, and today has a special appeal to fascist folk-lorists in Spain, for instance, who appear to take it as their duty "to save folk music from the folk".

The theory dies hard, though its fallacious character is not hard to demonstrate. Oral tradition is capable of absorbing widely disparate material, and certainly in most European traditions, particularly in Western Europe, the folk-singer's repertoire is likely to contain many songs which ultimately derive from cultured sources. But it is likely to contain many more which don't have any connection with art music. As a witty French critic remarked: "If all folk-song derives from art sources, where does the pentatonism come from? Debussy?"

It was around 1910 that Meier and his followers triumphantly

announced that they were on the way to tracking some 1,700 printed German folk-songs to their cultured source. At the same time, Bartók was rattling in a horse-drawn vehicle over the rough roads of Hungary and Rumania, into country where the gap between the classes, between haves and have-nots, literates and illiterates, was absolute in a way unknown in Western Europe, save perhaps in parts of Spain. Particularly in Rumania, Bartók realised he had stumbled on a wealth of music quite different from that created for the privileged classes—music not played and sung exclusively for entertainment, music in which art is not the only master nor beauty the only end, music created and performed to still the terrors, soothe the longings, fill the needs of men. Music with a direct social function. True, Bartók chose to disregard all other aspects of folk-song than the strictly musical ones, and his scientific analysis of the thousands of songs he collected has yielded important results. But he pushed the method too far. The measurements of a beauty queen don't tell you what kind of a girl she is. The folk-lorist needs to remind himself that a folk-song is but the outward form of a complex of ideas in the minds of the men and women who make it and sing it. It arises through certain social circumstances, certain wants, desires and ideas, and its form is also determined by the ideas and techniques of its maker, as well as by environment and possibly the natural materials at hand for instrument-making, etc. The formalistic approach of the tune-dissector leaves too many factors untouched, it is inadequate even for musical purposes.

It is often said that the great difference between folk music and art music is in their dissimilar techniques or dissemination—folk music spreading from mouth to mouth or hand to hand, with all the variation implicit in such a process, while art music is transmitted in printed form, with the composer's intentions fixed in black and white. But it may well be that a far more important difference lies in the everyday adaptability of folk-song, the fact that it is cut to suit the desires, the needs, the victories and defeats of the hour—the raising of a barn, the flogging of a prisoner, the installation of a new patent cage in the mine. Book-literature, composed music, cannot compete with folk-song in that everyday functional respect. Yet folk-song is no less durable than high art in its emotional effect. An atom scientist may be moved to tears on hearing a girl sing *The Cuckoo is a Pretty Bird*.

Of course, by no means all folk-songs have a direct function. Only in primitive societies does it happen that the singer's repertoire is made up almost entirely of utilitarian songs. In traditions such as ours, folk-song has become increasingly an object of diversion and entertainment. Even so, many lyrical songs have come into being with the practical purpose of easing the singer's heart and stilling the mind. An Indian in the Argentine Andes expresses clearly why he sings:

Yo no canto pa cantar,
Ni pa tener buena voz.
Yo canto para que vayan
Las penas del corazon.

No sé que tiene mis penas
Que no me quieren dejar.
Ayer me separo de ellas
Y hoy me vuelven a encontrar.

(I don't sing for singing's sake, nor because I've a good voice. I sing so that my troubles may leave my heart. I don't know what's wrong with my troubles that they don't want to leave me. Yesterday I separate myself from them, and today they come back to meet me.)

In British tradition, there is an abundance of songs whose purpose is to give expression to heartbreak, and so console the singer. Those with only a slight acquaintance with folk-songs are familiar with such verses as:

I wish my baby it was born
And smiling on its father's knee,
And I was dead and in my grave,
And the green grass growing over me,

or:

I sit upon the high green land where quiet the waters lie.
I think I see my true love sail atween the sea and sky,
With one babe at my bosom and another at my knee,
I sorrow for my sodger lad in Low Germany.

Less familiar, but often even more striking as illustrations of folk-music function, are those songs dealing explicitly with the class struggle, the "songs of protest" as they are called. Protest songs form a category which is very common in the repertoire of folk-singers in many parts of the world, though here again, the printed collections are often poor guides. For this, there may be a twofold reason: on the one hand, the collector may suppress such songs as disrespectful, on the other hand—and this is even more likely—the singer may withhold such songs for fear of giving offence to his genteel guest. Such songs may be defiant:

You take mah labour, an' steal mah time,
Give me ol' dish pan an' a lousy dime,
'Case I'm a nigger, dat's why.

White man, white man, sit in de shade,
Here in de hot sun, sweat wid de spade,
'Case I'm a nigger, dat's why.

Worm get turnin', cat hug a lion,
Mah hell get risin', don' care about dyin',
'Case I'm a nigger, dat's why.

They may be heartfelt exhortations, as the song written by the coal-miner's wife who watched the strikers' children walking barefoot in the rain to the soup kitchen, and said: "After they had passed by I just set down by the table and began to wonder what to try to do next. Then I began to sing out my blues to express my feeling. This song come straight from the heart and not just from the point of a pen." Her song ends:

Oh, don't go under that mountain
With the slate a-hangin' over your head,
And work for just coalite and carbide,
And your children a-cryin' for bread.

Oh listen, friends and workers,
Please take a friend's advice,
Don't load no more, don't pull no more,
Till you get a living price.

Or they may be satirical, as the biting dialogue-song *The Coalowner and the Pitman's Wife,* which was orally circulating among Durham colliers for more than a century before it finally appeared in print in 1952. Whatever the character of these protest songs, research in areas where relations between collector and singer are uninhibited suggests that such songs abound to an undreamed-of extent.

The question of relation between the folk-lorist and the bearer of folk-song is a particularly important one, connected as it is with such vital problems as the investigation of the creation of folk-song. Putting aside the romantic theory that all folk-songs have their genesis in some mysterious collective activity, putting aside also the so-called realistic theory that all folk-songs are inherited from upper class cultured sources, there still remains the problem: Who starts off a new folk-song and how? Many folk-lorists believe in the total absence of any author for a folk-song, and make anonymity an essential condition, as if a folk-song would cease to be a folk-song if, one day, the name of its humble author were to come to light. Now, in the main, our folk-lorists have had little luck in their interrogation of folk-singers regarding the authorship of songs of apparently recent make-up in their repertoire. Perhaps there

has been too little trust between investigator and informant. Perhaps too, the folk-lorist has been taking too narrow a view of what constitutes a folk-song.

A most remarkable example of self-imposed limitation is afforded by those folk-lorists—the majority of Western folk-lorists, in fact—who regard rural manifestations as the only ones worthy of their attention, who would deny the term "folk-song" to any product of the cities, whether orally transmitted or not, and who prefer to disregard any historical evidence of song-traffic between the urban and rural lower classes. Now, in fact, the working classes in the towns and cities probably played an enormous part in shaping the folk-song not only of countries such as Britain, but also of those East European countries where some folk-lorists would have us believe the peasantry have been living in a closed rural civilisation, utterly cut off from town culture, high or low. I believe that would be a most rewarding field of study, the influence of town workers on our folk-song heritage. Particularly since, if our folk-song has any future, that future lies with the town workers.

It cannot be overlooked that at least part of the newly revived interest in folk music has a strong political bias. There are many who believe that music may be a force to assist the progress of the human race; and since folk music is created directly out of the common experience and aspirations of working people, it follows that folk-song is likely to be a powerful aid not only in mirroring man's condition, but also in encouraging him on his forward march. Also, folk-song is the most truly and deeply national aspect of our musical culture, and at a time when that culture is in grave danger of losing its independence, it is well that we avail ourselves of what we can in the way of fortification. A prominent folk-lorist recently remarked: "I am told that certain trade unions have become interested in promoting folk music lately. Is it an accident that these are precisely the most militant unions?" He could be assured that this was no accident.

Capitalism has made a sad mess of our folk-song tradition, but the outlook for a revival not merely of interest in folk music, but of the actual creation of new forms of it does not seem so dark as it did in, for instance, Cecil Sharp's time. Our native musical idioms are among the most powerful as well as most beautiful in Europe, and there seems to be a wide audience, young, hungry for culture, anxious to listen to folk-song, and what is more important, to take it into their own repertoire, to make it part of their own cultural baggage.

Can those circumstances lead to a revival of folk music creation? It remains to be seen. But it is worth bearing in mind that if the old folk-song repertoire largely passed out of wide popular use during the nineteenth century, the process of oral transmission remained, though altered by new social conditions. After all, relatively few people learn their music from print; and radio and gramophone must be regarded

as extensions, and very powerful extensions, of the means of oral diffusion. The young man in the suburban back room who tries over on his trumpet a tune learned from the radio, and who scorns to play it as he heard it, but determines to improvise, to vary, to impose his own fancy on the melody, may not be playing folk music, but he is perpetuating a technique which the folk musician—whether Galician bagpiper or Uzbek drummer—would recognise and sympathise with. His heart is in the right place, the problem is for him to supply himself with musical material that is worth exercising his fantasy on.

At the 1952 Conference of the International Folk Music Council, the eminent American musicologist Charles Seeger had interesting things to say about the revival of traditional music in an industrialised society:

> "If . . . the common ultimate goal is maximum continuity between the best known of the past and the best conceivable for the future, what we have to deal with here is an equation between what people will accept from their ancestors, and what they will create for themselves and their children. No matter what the reviver thinks of the present state of affairs, therefore, he must accept it as his given quantity and use it as the base that it inevitably is for whatever accretion it may accept. This base will in all probability be a conglomeration of opera arias, salon music, popular songs of various vintages, some folk and near-folk materials . . . and—not to be forgotten—the commercial exploitation of the whole lot. Indigestible? By no means. Oral tradition can digest anything, give it but enough time."

Those who feel that the springs of folk creation have dried up, as far as the industrial worker is concerned, may take heart from what happened in America in the 1930s. There, the great stimulus towards the creation of new folk-song began when militant trade unionism swept through the textile mills and coalfields of the South, among industrial workers still living within a traditional folk culture. Folk bards arose such as the North Carolina cotton spinner Ella May Wiggins, Aunt Molly Jackson the Kentucky miner's wife, and most remarkable of all, the Oklahoma migratory worker Woody Guthrie, whom one folk-lorist has described as "the best folk-ballad composer whose identity has ever been known." Guthrie poses a special problem for the academic folk-lorist. Musically, he was brought up within the folk tradition. His manner of performance and style of creation are traditional. Is one to take it that he was a folk-singer while he was among the migratory workers, and ceased to be so when he moved into the city? Is he a folk-balladeer while he makes up songs in his head, and does he cease to be one when he reaches for his typewriter?

Such people, and a host of others, known and anonymous, enriched the fund of American folk-song with hundreds, perhaps thousands of

pieces, some deep in the oldest traditional style, others having much of the ring of the juke-box or the talking film, but devoted to describing the condition and aspirations of the modern folk community, the industrial community, and capable of becoming synthesised into an eloquent traditional shape, just as in the past our tradition has absorbed and been enriched by all kinds of disparate musical influences. The new folk-song movement that came into being under the impulse of trade union enthusiasm during the early days of the C.I.O. did not confine itself to the singing South. Its leadership quickly passed into the hands of city-dwellers. The movement led to a vast resurgence of oral singing whose wave has, at least momentarily, receded under McCarthyism, but whose effect is being felt most vigorously in Britain. The example is a salutary one, for it showed that, in order to move the urban masses, one does not have to rely, as the Wobblies did, on the parody of the Salvation Army hymn and the parlour ballad. The Brooklyn garment worker and the man punching out car fenders in Dearborn showed himself capable of taking old traditional songs to his heart, even pentatonic ones, and of producing his own songs in the form of a modern adaptation of the traditional pattern. Of course, much that was so produced was raw and fugitive. But a number of these songs had stamina enough to stick in the imagination of singers, to pass into currency, to start the life of change and adaptation that is proper to the true folk-song. Now, we hardly know what we have in the way of British industrial folk-song. The field remains almost unexplored, though a superficial investigation of songs of the coal-mining industry has produced sufficient results to indicate that the coalfields, at least, are richer in folk-song than was commonly supposed. But what concerns us here is not only the folk-song of the past, but the folk-song of our time, valid for the everyday lives of town-workers, such as began to emerge in the United States shortly before the war. In Britain, the ground for a similar resurgence is prepared. It may be that the impulse to germinate is not far off.

Lives of Labour Leaders

Lord Pakenham, *Born to Believe,* an autobiography. (254 pp. Jonathan Cape. 18s.)

Hugh Dalton, *Call Back Yesterday.* Memoirs 1887-1931. (330 pp. Frederick Muller Ltd. 21s.)

George Isaacs, Printer, Trade-Union Leader, Cabinet Minister, by G. G. Eastwood. (233 pp. Odhams Press Ltd. 16s.)

Harold Laski (1893-1950), A Biographical Memoir, by Kingsley Martin. (287 pp. Victor Gollancz Ltd. 21s.)

In the last century it used to be reckoned that no Ministry was complete without the inclusion of some of the great Whig families—a tradition that was still faintly visible in the Ramsay MacDonald administrations. In more recent times the newspapers have delighted to record the score of Eton versus Harrow or other such schools in each new Cabinet. This did not disappear with Mr. Attlee's Ministries. It is interesting that of the three biographies of Labour ex-Ministers published in the last twelve-month, two of them are Etonians. To the old saying that "the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton" some trade unionists may now be tempted to add a less respectful adage about the electoral battles of the Labour Party.

These two Etonians tell their own story, from the time the silver spoon was popped in their mouths up to and after the moment when they fell on their knees before their monarch to take into their hands the seals of office. The first, Frank Pakenham, a younger son of the Earl of Longford, after Eton and Oxford, became associated with the Conservative central office, the City and the *Daily Mail.* At length, largely under the influence of his wife, he became a member of the Labour Party in his thirty-first year : and, on his own steam, became a Roman Catholic in his thirty-fifth year. At the age of forty he was defeated as Labour candidate for Oxford and was promptly raised to the peerage and given a post in Mr. Attlee's Ministry. The story of his cosseted career is recounted in autobiographical detail that is made the more tedious by an increasingly unctuous manner of writing. This appears to have grown upon him as he made his rapid transition from his pre-war leftist vapourings to the Ministry's extreme right wing : for it is told that his sanctimoniousness was such as to grate even upon Ernest Bevin's nerves.

Pakenham, possessor of a tender conscience (worn rather conspicuously upon his sleeve) is frequently full of contrition. Hence his book might not inaptly be summed up in Belloc's line :

And gracious, how Lord Lundy cried!

Dalton's cheerful bouncing memoirs of the first part of his highly successful career make more robust reading. Son of the tutor of King George V, Dalton's early life in the entourage of the royal court provides some amusing stories, and early deprived him of the awe with which so many of the Labour Cabinet members seem to regard the monarchy. Of Eton he says "bored till my last year"—a sentiment the reader may well share. Then follows the story of what he did and whom he met in Cambridge, what he did and whom he met in London when reading for the bar, and what he did and whom he met in the war of 1914-18 when he became captain of artillery on the Italian front.

Then his political career begins, mingled with the London School of Economics and books on public finance, until his success at Bishop Auckland is followed by his being under-secretary for foreign affairs under Arthur Henderson, up to the defection of MacDonald in 1931. It is full of anecdotes and gives a certain amount of information about events in parliament and the MacDonald Ministers.

This account of a highly successful career does not purport to set forth a political outlook and it is only here and there that there is more than the standpoint of a convinced Hendersonian and an opponent of MacDonald. In all this there is no feeling—as there could be with figures of an earlier generation—that the author was first and foremost a representative of the working class.

Even in the matter of MacDonald this emerges. Dalton tells the story that within a few weeks of the formation of the first Labour Government in 1924, he was one of a luncheon group to whom MacDonald deplored strikes, justified "some reductions" in wages, was in favour of using troops as strikebreakers and said there might have to be "a national Government"—"nearly a coalition but not quite" (page 148). Dalton comments "As for the 'national government', we had been warned—seven years' warning." But if Dalton had been a true representative of the working class, he would not have kept this warning dark : he would have denounced MacDonald, opposed him openly. That would have been the path of a true Socialist. The pit Dalton and others fell into in 1931 had been digged by their own failure to act up to the duties of a people's representative. On this he himself, in a burst of frankness, made the fitting comment when he said in 1931: "We should have been less loyal to the leaders, and more loyal to principles."

We turn to the life of George Isaacs. This book, by a professed admirer, tells us of the boyhood of his hero, brought up in poverty in

a London slum ; of his early years until, at the age of twenty-six, he became secretary of the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants ; and of how he successfully built the union. Thereafter it traces all the stages of his career in the world of trade unionism, in local government and in Parliament. Isaacs, not different in this from most printers' officials, was increasingly right-wing throughout his career. We learn of his friendly association with employers, and in particular with the late Lord Northcliffe, with whom he was "on intimate terms for many years".

Further : "There were some both in his own union and outside who criticised Isaacs for his association with Northcliffe . . . there were those of Isaacs' critics who went so far as to say that he was actually in the pay of Lord Northcliffe." This libellous statement was denied on the front page of the Natsopa journal in June, 1921. The row inside the union in the early 'twenties is briefly referred to, but without much detail. We learn, too, that : "It was on the Council of the Industrial Welfare Society, that Isaacs first met King George VI (then Duke of York)" who "particularly liked a joke" and one day Isaacs told him one. We learn of his religiosity (Methodist—like so many other of the older generation of trade union leaders). There are many quotations from Isaacs' own account of this or that, for example : "When Isaacs was with Queen Elizabeth (now the Queen Mother) on a tour of Lancashire cotton mills" he recounted that : "When we arrived at Manchester Town Hall, rather tired at the end of our tour, the Queen soon busied herself at one of the tables, pouring out tea and handing cups to those seated with her." I suppose it tasted better than mother makes it. In short, as a right-wing trade union leader, Isaacs has had a full and varied career.

As a Cabinet Minister (he was Minister of Labour from 1945 to 1951) Isaacs was responsible for the use of troops in the extensive strike-breaking carried through by the Labour Government, especially in connection with the London dock strikes in October 1945 and June 1948. In the strike of June 1949, in support of the Canadian Seamen's Union and against handling "black" work, the Emergency Powers Act was again brought into operation and troops were used. Isaacs wrote a foreword to a White Paper on the strike, in which he said :

> "When the trade union leaders in Great Britain, mindful of the interests of their members, opposed the strikes and tried to bring out the true facts, they were in turn assailed and abused by the Communists in Britain who were supporting the strikes."

When, however, Mellish and another right-wing Labour M.P. made allegations about a "red plot", they were completely unable to substantiate the charge. Was Isaacs disappointed ? There is no record, but in May 1950 he appointed a Committee of Inquiry to examine the problem of unofficial strikes in the London docks. The Committee, amongst other

things, recommended the dismissal "of those who persistently incite to join in unofficial action". In all this Isaacs appears to have behaved just as his predecessor, Ernest Bevin, would have wished him to do.

In none of these three career stories is there anything but fragmentary statements of a full political outlook. The book on Harold Laski, who died in March 1950, is of a very different character. It is full of political principles, is indeed an immense mosaic of glittering political principles which the subject of the memoir was proliferating all his life, almost as though a colony of mosaic coral-insects had been at work. The book is done by a skilled practitioner in political journalism, who mingles readable narrative (not always entirely accurate in trade union history) with evocative sketches of his subject, while quotations from this or that of Laski's voluminous correspondence seem aptly to confirm the lines of the sketch. Yet the eclectic and the rhetorician in Laski makes it difficult to pin him down, as so many of his colleagues found. I remember the impression I had of him in his eighteenth year, on his honeymoon in Scotland, as some jangle of live wires that bounced like an india-rubber ball. He was, it seems, never very different from that. Kingsley Martin, closely associated for so long with Laski, is well-qualified to write this biographical memoir—in a sense perhaps too well qualified in that he must find it difficult to resist playing Plato to his Socrates. But in the main it is a detailed and affectionate picture of the life and opinions of his friend. Sometimes the insistent claim that Laski moved to a Marxist standpoint is negated by a single revealing sentence, for example: "As for China, it has developed in the way that Harold feared, and hoped that wisdom might forestall."

For, of course, Laski was always anti-Communist and never a Marxist, however much he may have differed from some other opponents in having an acquaintance with Marx's writings. One of the extraordinary examples of obtuseness was his writing on Communism for the Home University Library. When the sponsors of that series, designed in this political section to give a member of each party an opportunity of writing on their party's standpoint, dared not ask a member of the Communist Party to write, Laski proved willing to do it, and was apparently unaware that he had made himself a tool to cover up intolerance. The only tenable excuse would be that he would have been equally ready to undertake to express the outlook of Conservatism, on the ground that he understood and could state that outlook better than the Cecil who actually wrote.

The book also narrates how on one occasion in the London School of Economics Laski "mounted the rostrum, drew from his pocket a twopenny pamphlet by R. Palme Dutt and proceeded for the whole lecture period to deliver an excoriating analysis of its assumptions and its arguments." (Would he have done the same with a Tory pamphlet—in an official lecture?) There is however no narration here of how Laski

four successive times agreed to meet Dutt in debate and four times found discretion the better part of valour.

After the 1931 betrayal of the Labour Party, Laski moved to the left in his writings and speeches, in which he more and more used and indeed frequently coined leftist phrases, some of them derived from his extensive reading in the books of Marx. He gained increasing popularity in the Labour Party, and at its 1937 Annual Conference was elected together with D. N. Pritt to the Executive Committee. There was a big difference between the two men. Pritt fought, Laski compromised. Pritt, after two-and-a-half years, was expelled: and went on with the fight. Laski remained a member of the Labour Executive for nearly twelve years, a prisoner of the right wing, while his earlier influence rapidly fell away. Kingsley Martin tells us that he often spoke of resigning from the Executive so as to be free to denounce Bevin's policy, which was his party's policy, but that

> "Year by year he postponed the decision, thereby alienating friends who felt that he was losing a crucial opportunity of leadership. . . . In private conversation and on public platforms he promised more than he could perform; in the Executive he could do no more than put forward his proposals and, finding himself hopelessly outnumbered, propose a compromise which would be accepted more or less in the form he suggested and which was then binding upon him. . . . But year after year he allowed himself to be reluctantly responsible as a member of the Executive for a policy which he denounced in private and which, because of his Party loyalty, he just managed to avoid denouncing in public."

Kingsley Martin candidly adds the comment:

> "Whenever he resigned, critics would have asked why, if he felt like that, he had not resigned long before when his disagreement was already clear; why he had so recently agreed to some other equally distasteful aspect of the policy he now rejected; why had he misled his followers by saying that his colleagues were broadly in agreement with him when all he meant was that he desperately hoped they were, or that he might still be able to reform them. Many such considerations weighed with Harold."

No longer could Laski pronounce the left-wing orations, no longer could he be even a revolutionary phrase-monger. In truth, Othello's occupation was gone.

R. P. A.

Recent Books

WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

Harry Pollitt, Selected Articles and Speeches, Vol. I. 1919-1936. Lawrence and Wishart, paper covers 6s., library edition 10s. 6d.

This is a publication of immense significance for the whole working class and progressive movement today, and throws a flood of light on the development of the movement. It contains the record of a consistent fight for working class unity and of the consistent application of creative Marxist theory to the problems of British Labour.

The editors have well carried out their task of selection from the very copious material available, and useful explanatory notes are provided. This first volume of a series to be completed in four volumes covers the period from the end of the First World War to the beginning of 1936. The contents include material on the struggle for unity of the Labour movement in the post-war period up to the general strike, on the development of the Minority Movement, and on building the Communist Party and the united front.

EDUCATION

Your Children's Future, by Max Morris. Lawrence and Wishart, 5s.

Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School, by Brian Simon. Lawrence and Wishart, paper covers 6s. library edition, 8s. 6d.

Better Schools Now! by Peggy Jay. Turnstile Press, 3s. 6d.

The last month has seen the publication of three important books on Britain's schools. All three authors agree in condemning the present system and in advocating a series of immediate reforms. But Mr. Morris and Mr. Simon, whose books supplement each other, go a good deal further than Mrs. Jay in bringing out the essentially class-biased character of the school system and in insisting that the most drastic and far-reaching changes are necessary. The concluding chapters of *Your Children's Future* outline the socialist plan for education which could be operated by a People's Government in Britain.

Both Mr. Morris and Mr. Simon emphasise the need for the Comprehensive School as the answer to the present division into three schools, whereas Mrs. Jay approaches this question in a far more tentative manner. At the same time she is inclined to allow that "some good" may be found in reliance on intelligence testing in the schools, whereas Mr. Simon's book contains a truly devastating criticism of the whole theory and practice of intelligence testing.

These books together provide a wealth of information and constructive proposals. And they demonstrate what a broad basis of agreement exists for an effective campaign to change the school system in this country.

PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY

Dialectical Materialism, an Introductory Course, Vol. II. Historical Materialism, by Maurice Cornforth. Lawrence and Wishart, 10s. 6d.

The Origins of Christianity, by Archibald Robertson. Lawrence and Wishart, 21s.

The Present as History, by Paul M. Sweezy. Monthly Review Press, New York, $5.

The second volume of the series on dialectical materialism by Maurice Cornforth is concerned with historical materialism. Like the first volume, it is very comprehensive and lucid, and numerous references are given to the Marxist classics.

Archibald Robertson makes a lively and stimulating contribution to Marxist discussion with his *Origins of Christianity.* Particularly interesting and valuable are his chapters on the development of Judaism, on the "myth theory" of Christ and on the role of Saint Paul in the development of Christianity. This book fills a long-vacant place in British Marxist literature.

The Present as History is a collection of essays and reviews on capitalism and

socialism, concluding with an address on "Peace and Prosperity" delivered in New York in February of this year. Its publication in America today bears witness to the strength and purpose of the American people's fight for democracy and peace.

SCIENCE

Science and Industry in the Nineteenth Century, by J. D. Bernal, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 12s. 6d.

A History of the Sciences, by S. F. Mason. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 28s.

Routledge are to be congratulated on publishing two works on the history of science and the social relations of science, both demonstrating the power of Marxist analysis.

Professor Bernal's *Science and Industry in the Nineteenth Century* studies the motive forces of scientific development and the relationship between science and technology by the close examination of several concrete examples from nineteenth century science. This book makes a contribution of the first importance to the understanding of the social functions of science and of the nature of scientific progress—to the scientific understanding of science itself.

Whereas Bernal studies in an intensive way a few examples from a single period, S. F. Mason's book makes a survey of the entire history of science. He has carried out this vast undertaking with remarkable success, and has produced the best and most comprehensive popular history of science yet published.

SOCIALIST REALISM

The Water Tower, by André Stil. Lawrence and Wishart, 10s. 6d.

Rising Tide, by Jack Lindsay. The Bodley Head, 12s. 6d.

André Stil's *The Water Tower* (*Au Château d'eau*) is the first part of his trilogy of French working class life, *le Premier Choc,* which has been acclaimed as an outstanding example of the method of socialist realism in literature and won for him the award of a Stalin prize. It deals with the struggle of French port workers against American occupation. Stil tells his story through a series of episodes, beginning with the intolerable privation and poverty of the French workers, and then showing how they are fighting back. His book gives an unforgettable and inspiring picture of the individuality of the French workers, of working class struggle and the leadership of the French Communist Party.

Jack Lindsay's new novel, *Rising Tide,* also deals with the lives and struggles of the dockers, the scene being set in London. This, together with its predecessor, *Betrayed Spring,* marks a new advance in Jack Lindsay's work, and stands out for its realism and humanism.

MEMOIRS

Solo Trumpet, by T. A. Jackson. Lawrence and Wishart, 12s. 6d.

I Fought in Korea, by Julian Tunstall. Lawrence and Wishart, 8s. 6d.

What Nobody Told the Foreman, by Max Cohen, Spalding and Levy, 8s. 6d.

These three books are very different one from the other, but have it in common that they are based on personal experiences. In *Solo Trumpet,* veteran socialist T. A. Jackson tells in lively style the story of his life as a freethinker and socialist agitator up to the end of World War One. Jackson recreates the atmosphere of an earlier stage of the working class movement, and in his pages can be read how not only he himself but the whole movement advanced from the old-style sectarian "Marxism" of the Social Democratic Federation to Communism.

If this book is by a veteran, then *I Fought in Korea* is by a raw recruit. Julian Tunstall, now a student at Cambridge, was one of the first conscripts to be sent to Korea, where he took part in the advance to the Yalu River and then in the hasty retreat. He writes well and with feeling, and has much to relate about the conduct of the American forces.

What Nobody Told the Foreman is a book about the wood-working trades, dealing in dry and humorous fashion with the struggles of a working carpenter. This is the first title of the new book club, People's Books, members of which can purchase it and subsequent club titles for five shillings.

March Publications

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SYSTEM

JOHN GOLLAN

200 pages 7s. 6d.

★

TWO PLAYS ABOUT MALAYA

MONA BRAND and LESLIE RICHARDSON

144 pages 12s. 6d.

★

GOOD TO BE ALIVE

The Story of Jack Brent

STANLEY HARRISON

96 pages 5s.

★

Available

COME ALL YE BOLD MINERS

Ballads and Songs of the Coalfields

A. L. LLOYD

Cheap ed. 7s. 6d. Library ed. 12s. 6d.

LAWRENCE and WISHART

Science and Society

Established 1936

Vol. XV11, No. 4 Fall, 1953

INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY AND THE ARMS ECONOMY *Lewis H. Robb*

SECOND THOUGHTS ON EPICURUS *Benjamin Farrington*

ECONOMIC PROGRESS AND ECONOMIC SURPLUS *Paul A. Baran*

THE TRANSITION FROM FEUDALISM TO CAPITALISM *R. H. Hilton*

THE LIMITS OF RATIONAL PSYCHOTHERAPY *Barbara and Joseph Wilson*

BOOK REVIEWS

Quarterly 75c. single copy
17s. 6d. per year (post free)

Science & Society, Inc.

30 EAST 20th. STREET
NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

Engl'sh Representative:

COLLET'S LTD., 40 Great Russell St.
London, W.C.1

KEEP THAT LITERATURE IN CIRCULATION!

We always want books, pamphlets and periodicals relating to all social-economic movements; Russia and China; I.L.P., C.P. and Comintern Congress Reports; runs of Communist and International Press Correspondence; and general Marxist and Socialist literature

Any quantity. Any language.

THE HAMMERSMITH BOOKSHOP
3 Beadon Road, London, W.6
RIV 6807

Printed in Great Britain by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Beechwood Rise, Watford, Herts.