

his own evil he is the better able to control it, and thus to establish more appropriate ethical attitudes. He writes: 'My own shadow side is a part and a representative of the shadow side of the whole human race . . . my reconciliation with him will involve at the same time my reconciliation with the dark brother of the whole human race. This means that I accept him, and in him, myself. I am therefore accepting in his person the whole component of the human race which—as my shadow—is my neighbour. Here the love of one's neighbour preached by Jesus of Nazareth becomes love of one's neighbour in the form of the (penitent) thief. . . . Psychologically, however, love and acceptance of the shadow is the essential basis for the actual achievement of an ethical attitude to the "Thou" who is outside me.'

In this 'Thou' Neumann includes an image of God. It seems unnecessary and academic to follow him into his discussion of 'the evil in God'. But one must consider his concept that the development of disobedience—'a God-opposing will'—which stems from the shadow, is a necessary step in the growth of a self-reliant and truly moral conscience. Such a proposition has great relevance to the ferment which exists today, not only in the churches, but also in world-wide outbreaks of antagonism to authority, and to legalistic systems of morality. This, indeed, stems from the dark

side of human nature. Nevertheless it has the justification that man is demanding some right of self-determination. Jung equates this with the *felix culpa* of Adam, which lay in eating a fruit that would give him knowledge of good and evil. Without this sin there would have been no creation, no salvation, and thus no growth of consciousness. Under the new ethic man's primary task is seen by Neumann to be that of knowing what the whole of the psyche is doing. He quotes the apocryphal insertion in St Luke's gospel, 'Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law'. If there is a lack in this very valuable book, it would seem to be that Neumann treats the deep unconscious too much as if its urges are mainly anti-ethical. Jung, and anyone working according to his findings, again and again will see that it can also be highly moral. Side by side with man's creatureliness, which too is created by God, is an innate awareness of the need for a God-head. The image of this differs in different cultures and different ages. But it is always and for ever present. Thus man is beginning to see, and must increasingly accept the fact that, as a human being, he shares, in both these respects, a basic structure of mind. In the light of this knowledge he enters into a universal brotherhood.

EVE LEWIS

ENOCH POWELL ON IMMIGRATION, by Bill Smithies and Peter Fiddick. *Sphere Books. Ltd*, London. 1969. 5s.

SOUL ON ICE, by Eldridge Cleaver, *Jonathan Cape*. 1969. 35s.

The Tory Party is probably unique among the world's political bodies in having retained its name and much of its nature since the seventeenth century. It still provides an alternative for the construction of a British government, whatever may be the party or coalition that it opposes.

From time to time the non-Tory alternative achieves success through a policy that catches the imagination or emotion of the electorate, Reform, Free Trade, the Welfare State; and these policies being implemented the non-Tory party loses its momentum and the Tories appear, almost without a programme, to offer respite to the country. Occasionally, however, the ancient party breeds, or tolerates the presence of, an intellectual within its ranks, a Disraeli, a Joseph Chamberlain, an Enoch Powell, who attempts to ally its public image with an articulate policy. Since the Spring of 1968 Mr Powell has attempted to do this by his

anti-immigrant speeches, an attempt the more spectacular since, when he delivered the first of them, he was a member of the Tory shadow cabinet and he, in any case, a man with a formidable academic record.

It is only incidental to this note to consider his future in the party, whether he will be a success like Disraeli or a failure like Chamberlain, and anyway the elements in this country to which he has become the mouthpiece range from the dockers to the distressed gentry. The question that exercises those who are deeply solicitous for social justice is whether he has so exacerbated colour-prejudice that racial disturbance has become inevitable or whether the present and future coloured population amongst us can become a respected and integral part of the nation. Particular incidents, too, can be forgotten, but it was disingenuous of Mr Powell, in his celebrated television confrontation with Mr Frost, to evade the con-

nexion between his speeches and the dockers who assembled outside the Houses of Parliament and called upon the High Commissioner of Kenya to go back to Jamaica.

Mr Powell's contention is that, unless there is massive repatriation of the immigrant population, their numbers by the turn of the century will be so great that the structure of the country's society will be endangered if not wrecked. He has uttered, or quoted with at least tacit approval, such phrases as that of coloured people having 'the whip-hand' over the white population, 'the Tiber foaming with much blood', and immigrants 'taking-over' at least parts of the country. He has forecast an end-of-the-century coloured population of 5-7 millions. He fears for the fate of 'England's green and pleasant land'.

Lenin used to say that a fool could ask in five minutes more questions than a wise man could answer in five weeks. The task of examining these evocative phrases and their factual basis is a tedious and undramatic one but two conscientious journalists, Bill Smithies and Peter Fiddick, have taken apart almost line by line Mr Powell's five main utterances on the immigrant problem in their pamphlet *Enoch Powell on Immigration*. This quiet analysis is unlikely as is a note in *New Blackfriars*, to be read by those who do have the 'whip-hand' in these matters. 'When it has done its work, the lie shall rot; great is the truth and shall prevail, when none cares whether it prevail or not.' But it is a noble undertaking all the same.

Let us take two points in this review. First, Mr Powell's contention that numbers are of the essence of the question. He has forecast a A.D. 2002 coloured population of 5-7 millions. On the most careful possible estimate the latter figure of 7 million would seem to be almost exactly twice the probable number. Secondly, Mr Powell quotes a constituent saying that, if he could, he would emigrate because of the 'whip-hand' which the black man will have over the white. Mr Powell might legitimately quote a constituent as evidence of an opinion among the electorate, but he does so in a way which indicates his sympathy with this statement. Does Mr Powell really believe that, unless his policy of massive repatriation is undertaken (except, of course, for the doctors who, for some reason unknown, are 'not immigrants'), the white population should themselves emigrate?

It is interesting to speculate about the destination of such would-be white emigrants.

It seems very likely that it would be a country in which the previous, and perhaps even the predominant, population was coloured. Are they going to New Zealand to have the whip-hand over the Maoris? To Australia with its Aborigines? To Canada with its American Indians? Or could they possibly be thinking of Rhodesia and South Africa?

It is the duty of politicians, as Mr Powell claims, to look ahead. He has confined himself to a forecast of the internal situation of this country at the turn of the century with a small but, in his estimate, formidable minority of coloured persons. What of the external situation in a world where, for every white person, there will be a dozen non-whites? Is it really in the interests of Mr Powell's constituents to make them detestable in the eyes of the indubitable holders of the whip-hand over their grandchildren? Is Mr Powell really thinking ahead to the situation of 2002 or to some more proximate, and domestic, eventuality?

There is no mention in Mr Powell's speeches of the wickedness of white treatment of others in the past and present, though this might have been fairly stated as some excuse, at least, for alleged and disputable examples of black maltreatment of whites. The past dominates the present, the past of the literal white whip-hand, and this is a world-wide factor, not one confined to the streets of Wolverhampton. We can choose to meet and ameliorate the situation created by the crimes of our forebears, or we can pursue a resolute policy of carrying out the assumptions of white superiority. In which latter case the future of the white races is not even disputable.

An interesting voice from the other side echoes in Eldridge Cleaver's *Soul on Ice*, equally eloquent and passionate, less academic but more reasonable. It is a collection of essays written when the author was in gaol for rape of a white woman, he being a U.S. negro. He acknowledges the rape as a revenge for the rape of his people by whites, and he is calmly clear about the stupidity as well as the heinousness of his offence. He is less than fair to some of his fellow-negroes, to James Baldwin, for instance, whom he accuses of selling-out to 'Whiteness', but he is positive and encouraging in discerning the reaction of young, educated white Americans to the whole system that has held the black U.S. citizen in thrall. It is a reaction, not only against the folly of racialism, but also against the hypocritical frigidity of American culture. 'The white youth of today', he says

'are coming to see, intuitively, that to escape the onus of the history their fathers made they must face and admit the moral truth concerning the works of their fathers.' They have picked up the technique of civil disobedience from the young coloured heroes who started the great rebellion in Montgomery. The same phenomenon is apparent in the British universities today. While in streets and schools, the less educated, to whom Mr Powell has given such encouragement, are inflicting filthy words and deeds upon their coloured fellow-citizens, in the higher world of education an absolute

rejection of racialism is apparent. If the Thames, rather than the Tiber, is to foam with blood, much of it will come from the veins of white people aligned with non-whites, and in both cases it will be from the élite of the nation. It would be foolish to deny the possibility. 'Everywhere', Mr Cleaver says, 'the whites are fighting to prolong their status, to retard the erosion of their position.' In doing so they are ensuring that the ultimate victory of humanity will have to be won at a bitter price.

PAUL FOSTER, O.F.

WHO ARE THE PROGRESSIVES NOW?, by Maurice Ash. *Routledge and Kegan Paul*. £2.

This book is a record of a colloquy held at Dartington Hall; a confrontation, rather, between two groups of educators both anxious to claim the title of 'Progressives' and to justify their claim. The book is divided into two parts. In Part I Maurice Ash gathers together the principal themes of the debate under five heads, illustrating them copiously with extracts from the discussions. In Part II he presents extracts from the formal papers by Hu and Lois Child, L. C. Schiller, D. W. Winnicott, Liam Hudson, Douglas Pidgeon, Michael Young, Kenneth Barnes and Royston Lambert. It is an excellent method of presentation. The first part systematizes the arguments of the debate without losing the feel and the excitement of the living clash of idea on idea and experience against experience. The second part, while being, on the whole, less interesting, provides a useful gloss on the first by rehearsing the main themes formally.

In Part I, one has the impression, as Liam Hudson remarks in his paper, that 'a surface of facts or objective data seems to swell on the tides of prejudice and belief'. Yet the contributions well up from such deep springs of experience and devotion as almost to make one believe that anything will work in education provided those who practise it believe passionately enough that it will. The discussion is for the most part straightforwardly as well as enthusiastically expressed, and does not lapse into that curious kind of *Educanto* in which so much of our educational discourse is conducted.

The adversaries in this conflict are on the one hand 'traditional' progressive educators mostly from schools like Dartington Hall and St Christopher's. They stand for traditional child-centred views, freedom, rich personal relationships, emphasis on the expressive and creative arts; they wish to assert the value

of the personality of the individual child against the dominance of the curriculum or of social conventions. Their discourse, says Maurice Ash, is a language-game revolving round the central concept of person. Ranged against them are the 'new progressives' committed to the state system, to comprehensive education, political realities and equality. They characterize the traditional progressives as 'protected, precious and unreal'. They allege that the state system has assimilated all the real values of progressivism, and added social realism, a concern for contemporary needs and socially useful skills which in *their* language-game are necessary for the development of personality. They characterize the ideal of leaving space for inner maturation—leave childhood to ripen in your children—as culturally naive. It is, they argue, a wholly relativistic concept. The traditional progressives retort as best they can to this attack from a party so obviously at present in the ascendant. In their view comprehensive education provides a 'societal paternalism' rather than real equality and their hope is that their personalism will enable children to grow up to animate society rather than be fitted into it.

Although one of the contributors remarks that the conflict between the individual and society is 'an argument of twenty years ago' it is clearly still very much alive in these debates. The traditional progressives want to set their children over against society, with an eye on service and social reform certainly, but otherwise leaving it out of account. The conflict is also one between the empiricist and the existentialist outlooks; between those concerned with learning theory and curriculum development and those whose priorities are emotional and motivational factors. An American reflection of the same controversy