

therefore need each other. And they need each other precisely because the shape and direction of our society are now willy-nilly in question. This is the basic issue now before us, the shape of social relations to come, what role we should expect and allow each other to play. And, of course, legislation is not enough in itself. It is only the tip of the iceberg, one effort among many of social reconstruction. It is equally obvious that not all can express a commitment to the implications of a multi-racial society in the same way. But minimally such a commitment means acceptance of the truth already discovered by Joseph Ashby of Tysoe in the fight for the farm labourers in the nineteenth century: 'Labourers, any set of people, must find their own way out of the difficulties. They must never trust another class to do justice without having to. But after all, wasn't that right enough? Resistance could be a debt you owed. (*Joseph Ashby of Tysoe, 1858-1919*, by M. K. Ashby, (C.U.P. 1961, at p. 73.) This is the spirit of Martin Luther King, of Black Power, of the Arusha declaration of Julius Nyerere, and increasingly of the masses of South America and the poor nations generally. Those of us who are not generous enough or who do not have the opportunity—or make it—to work actively and directly for racial reconciliation must at least be ready to recognize justice when it is claimed.

And the positive possibility beyond this is that it may only be a genuinely multi-racial Britain that will have the sympathy and vision necessary to co-operate substantially with the developing peoples of the world.

P.L.

---

*Erratum.* The article 'Metaphilosophy' by Mr Timothy Potts in the May issue of *New Blackfriars* contained three errors, which should be corrected as follows: p. 425, line 6: for 'the word' put 'a word'.

And two omissions are here indicated by italics: p. 426, after line 27: 'The position with regard to this example *is much more obscure than the mathematical one, because we still lack an analysis of causality which would allow us to exhibit its logical form*'.

P. 427, after line 38: 'we are not doing *natural science; nor yet natural history—since we can also invent fictitious natural history for our purposes*'.