

THE

5p



ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 79, No. 4

APRIL 1974

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: IDEALS IN OUR LIVES	3
JESUS AND PILATE	4
<i>by Prof. G. A. Wells</i>	
"THE FLOWER OF THE WORLD"— THE ROMAN REPUBLIC OF 1849	7
<i>by Nigel Sinnott</i>	
FOR THE RECORD	11
<i>by the General Secretary</i>	
CONWAY DISCUSSIONS:	
AUTHORITY IN SOCIETY	14
BUDDHISM	18
BOOK REVIEWS:	
MAN, MACHINES AND TOMORROW	19
<i>by Dr. A. Lovecy</i>	
THE ALEXANDER PRINCIPLE	20
<i>by George Dowman</i>	
YOUR VIEWPOINT	21
SOUTH PLACE NEWS	22
COMING AT CONWAY HALL	2, 23

Published by

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

Conway Hall Humanist Centre
Red Lion Square, London, WC1R 4RL

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS:

General Secretary: Peter Cadogan

Lettings Secretary/Hall Manager: Iris Mills

Hon. Registrar: Rose Bush

Hon. Treasurer: C. E. Barralet

Editor, "The Ethical Record": Eric Willoughby

Address: Conway Hall Humanist Centre

Red Lion Square, London WC1R 4RL. (Tel.: 01-242 8032)

Coming at Conway Hall

Tuesday, April 2

7.00 p.m.—**Discussion** introduced by **Dr. J. R. Ravetz**. Subject: **Irrational!**

Sunday, April 7

11.00 a.m.—**Sunday Meeting: DAVID ASHFORTH** on **Living in the Post-Secular Age**. Tenor solos: David Waters

3.00 p.m.—**Forum: Living Differently** with **Harry Stopes-Roe**

6.00 p.m.—**Bridge practice** in the Library

6.30 p.m.—**Concert:** Jupiter String Quartet, Margaret Bateson piano, John McCaw clarinet. Mozart Efl K498 Trio, Dvorak A Op 81 piano quintet, Weber Grand Quintet Bfl Op 34

Tuesday, April 9

7.00 p.m.—**Discussion** introduced by **David Flint**. Subject: **Computers, Communication and Change**

Sunday, April 14

Easter—no meetings

Continued on page 23

CURRENT SPES PUBLICATIONS

THE SECULAR RESPONSIBILITY

Marghanita Laski 10p.

THE ALTERNATIVE SOCIETY

James Hemming 10p.

THE BREAKDOWN OF GREAT BRITAIN

Leopold Kohr 10p.

MAN AND THE SHADOW

Laurens van der Post 10p.

WHAT ARE EUROPEANS?

G. K. Young, CB, CMG, MBE 10p.

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY FROM PAGAN AND JEWISH BACKGROUNDS

G. A. Wells 20p.

HUMANITY AND ANIMALITY

Edmund Leach 10p.

3p postage for one — 6p for two or more

THE ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 79, No. 4

APRIL 1974

The views expressed in this journal are not necessarily those of the Society

EDITORIAL

Ideals in our lives

EVERYBODY HAS IDEALS. For some, the ideals are simple enough, and for others they are matters of tremendous world rearrangement.

Some say the person who sticks to one ideal all his life is an unadventurous fool; some say the man who changes his ideals throughout his life, without seeing many come to fruition, is a person of unstable personality.

Yet most people agree that a man's ideals are good guides to his true nature at the particular time he holds them.

We all know of the student revolutionary who spends his three years at University by joining revolution-bent factions, decrying all authority, marching, protesting and (genuinely) wanting to set all the evils of the world aright. We all know of him. He is the man who, when not engaging in protest, is working away till the day he ends up with an Honours Degree, marries a company chairman's daughter and settles down quite nicely in a semi-detached in suburbia. His revolutionary days are an embarrassment of the past, yet they were genuine then. Now there are other ideals: good education for the children, a Jag perhaps, responsibility at the club, etc., etc.

Twenty years hence, when the children are in their own revolutionary stage, he will smile to himself and know that the stage will pass, as it has always done. New ideals and horizons always seem to emerge.

In many ways, South Place has always been like that. It has set itself ideals, which have changed over the years, and sometimes, as we look into our history, we may find some amusing pursuits which we have developed away from.

Today, some see aspects of our policies—and our ideals—as a little unusual. There is, for example, some discussion just now about our use of the word "religion".

In doing so, the common mistake should not be made. Ideals, though reliable indicators of character, nevertheless do not comprise that character. A particular ideal at a particular time cannot be held to be binding on the man, group, organisation or nation, for all time. We believe in our ideals, and we stick by them, till they change or we do. But we are not prisoner to them.

Jesus and Pilate

BY

PROF. G. A. WELLS

IF, AS I believe, Jesus is a myth, it is necessary to explain how he came to be regarded as having suffered under Pilate. My explanation is based on a division of early Christian thinking into four chronologically successive layers, beginning with the Pauline letters of ca. AD 60, which preach "Christ crucified", with no indication of where or when his death occurred. (I shall not, today, be considering—as I did in my last lecture here—the even earlier layers of tradition which can be inferred from Paul's letters. Nor can I try to explain what basis Paul had for his indifference to the where and when of Jesus' life, but I must take the fact as datum). The second layer consists of the post-Pauline epistles of the late first century—Hebrews, James 1, 2 and 3, John 1, Peter and (outside the canon) 1 Clement. None of these documents mentions Pilate, any more than does Paul. But some of them differ from the Pauline letters by assigning Jesus' life not to a vague, unspecified past but to "the last times", i.e. to a past that—still unspecified—is nevertheless comparatively recent. The transition from Paul to this second stage of Christian thinking is intelligible enough. If Jesus is (as Paul supposed) the god of the last times, in the sense that he is soon to return to earth in order to bring the world to an end, then surely his first coming—as well as his second—is to be allocated to "the last times". This may originally have meant no more than that his coming to earth inaugurated the final epoch (however long) of man's history—the epoch which would culminate in his return as judge. But it soon came to be understood as meaning that he had lived on earth in the recent past.

Third Degree

The third layer of Christian thinking about Jesus consists of the epistles of Ignatius (ca. AD 110) and the Pastoral epistles of the NT (1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus)—three letters which purport to be from Paul, but which are widely agreed to be works of an unknown Paulinist who wrote in his name early in the second century in order to refute certain gnostic views. This third layer makes Pilate responsible for Jesus' death. The fourth layer is represented by the passion narratives of the gospels, which transfer the responsibility from Pilate to the Jews. In my view even Mark, the earliest of these gospels, could have been written as late as AD 90-100. Some overlap in date between the four layers of early Christian thinking is to be expected; for on the one hand a given tradition often arises somewhat earlier than the oldest of the extant documents in which it is recorded; and on the other it does not disappear as soon as a later tradition, which in due course is to supplant it, has arisen. But although the strata are not to be kept rigidly and completely apart, they can be clearly distinguished. The view that "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever" (Hebrews 13:8) is the reverse of the truth; he is an idea gradually constructed and modified over a considerable period of time.

Roughly contemporaneous with layers three and four of the Christian tradition is the statement of Tacitus (ca. AD 120) that Christians are adherents of a "dire superstition" and "derive their name and origin from Christ who, in the reign of Tiberius had suffered death by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilate". Tacitus does not seem to have based this statement on any Roman records, but took it from what Christians were then alleging; for (1) he gives Pilate an incorrect title. Pilate was prefect,

not procurator, of Judaea; the latter term was the one current in Tacitus' day, and its application to Pilate is therefore an anachronism; and (2) he does not name the executed man. He says nothing of Jesus but uses the title "Christ" (Messiah) as if it were a proper name. Both these facts would be hard to explain if he had derived his information from archives.

Change of Idea

My problem today is to explain how layer 2 (Jesus lived in the recent past) was developed into layer 3 (he was a contemporary of Pilate). One relevant factor is the rival Christologies of early Christian communities. A number of hymns included in the Pauline letters represent Christ as a supernatural personage who descended to earth, lived there in humility and obscurity, and then reascended to heaven. Somehow, however, Christians came in time to think of Jesus as a prominent teacher and a worker of prodigious miracles, whose life was the reverse of obscure. And so we find that the hymns included in some epistles of the late first or early second century represent his life as a manifestation, not a concealment of his divine glory. Now once Christians had come to believe not only that he had been on earth recently, but also that he had lived in eminence instead of obscurity, a tradition bringing him into conflict with a recent ruler of the country could naturally arise.

Another factor leading to this same result was the struggle against heresy. Ignatius urged the faithful (ca. AD 110) "not to yield to the bait of false doctrine, but to believe most steadfastly in the birth, passion and the resurrection, which took place during the governorship of Pontius Pilate". That he needed to emphasize in this way when these events took place suggests that not all Christians were agreed on the matter—particularly as he specified the *time when* as an integral part of the correct doctrine which, he admits, is in competition with other doctrine. The heretics he opposed were Docetists (i.e. "seemers") who regarded flesh as sinful and denied that Jesus had "come in the flesh". They thought that his flesh was only apparent, that he lived on earth with but a phantom body. This Docetist heresy arose late in the first century, when the idea that Jesus had been on earth recently was beginning to take root. And so the obvious way to establish that he had come in the flesh would be to specify details of his recent birth from a human mother, and of recent activities which had involved his flesh in real suffering. (The Docetists held that, having only a phantom body, he could not have suffered real pain). Ignatius considered salvation dependent on sacramental eating of the saviour's flesh, and so had the strongest possible motive for resisting the Docetists; and he accordingly insisted that "Jesus Christ, David's scion and Mary's was really born of a virgin and baptized by John, really persecuted by Pilate and nailed to the cross in the flesh".

The Pastoral epistles are roughly contemporaneous with the writings of Ignatius, and the Pastoral I Timothy declares that Jesus "made the good confession before"—or "in the time of" (the Greek is ambiguous)—"Pontius Pilate". Some theologians regard this formula as taken by the author from an early baptismal creed. At baptism a Christian would recite such a tenet which had the purpose of making clear that the Jesus of his faith was not a timeless myth, like Osiris, but firmly tied to a historical situation. The author of the Pastorals does not write as an original theologian, and so may well be quoting an already-existing creed. His greatest objection to the teachers he condemns is that they were original, and he tries to make a consistent whole of points of doctrine that he has collected from disparate sources. Hence he is not likely to have himself originated the guess which linked Jesus with Pilate, but will have taken it over from earlier tradition. There is no reason why such a guess should

have been seriously challenged provided it was made as late as the latter part of the first century: for (1) by then, few who had been alive in Pilate's time (ca. AD 30) were still alive, to come forward and contradict it; and (2) a linkage between Jesus and Pilate did not infringe any existing article of faith, but was merely a historical proposition which did no more than fill out the already established doctrine of "Christ crucified". Furthermore (3) these early Christians, knowing nothing of the need or nature of criticism of sources, would unhesitatingly accept as fact any inference that fitted into the general scheme of their convictions.

Nevertheless, we must still ask what would cause a Christian of the late first or early second century, who had already come to believe that Jesus had lived on earth conspicuously and also fairly recently, to assign his life to Pilate's Palestine, rather than to some other recent period. Now the belief that Christ had died by crucifixion was firmly established as early as Paul—before the death had been given a date or even a period. It would therefore be natural for Christians of ca. AD 100, who were familiar with crucifixion as a Roman punishment, to think that he had been killed by the Romans. Such Christians would have known that "Christ" or Messiah was a royal title, and that anyone who made pretensions to it would immediately be charged with sedition, whether he understood the title in a political sense or not. There had been rebellion enough since the Romans had taken over Judaea in AD 6 to justify nervousness on their part, and hundreds of patriots had been crucified. Admittedly, Paul, who does not give Jesus a Roman crucifixion, was also familiar with this Roman punishment. But his Jesus had lived a life of complete obscurity, and that not necessarily recently. Hence Paul did not have the motives of Christians of AD 100 for supposing that Jesus had been confronted with Pilate, nor even that his crucifixion had occurred during the Roman rule. (There had been crucifixions of holy men in Palestine before the Romans, in the first and second centuries BC).

Not Evident

Now Christians of the late first century must have been struck by the fact that very few of their contemporaries could offer plausible first-hand reminiscences of Jesus, based on personal acquaintance with him. (None of the Christian literature known to have been circulating before AD 90 includes material of this kind, nor even claims to have been written by persons who had been Jesus' companions). They would therefore infer that he could not have died as recently as the Jewish War (AD 66-70) but at some earlier date during the Roman rule. From this premiss Pilate would certainly come to mind as the likely culprit; for he was particularly detested by the Jews, and is indeed the only one of the prefects who governed Judaea between AD 6 and 41 who attracted sufficient attention to be discussed by the two principal Jewish writers of the first century, Philo and Josephus. Philo describes him as "naturally inflexible and stubbornly relentless" and accuses him of "acts of corruption, insults, rapine, outrages on the people, arrogance, repeated murders of innocent victims, and constant and most galling savagery". This testimony shows that he was quite capable of murdering the innocent, and so the supposition that Jesus was his victim would not necessarily imply that Jesus was thought of as a political rebel against Rome. Nor would a Christian who stamped Pilate as Jesus' murderer need to fear that such an allegation would incur Roman displeasure. Both Philo and Josephus criticize Pilate harshly, but were perfectly loyal to Rome, where Pilate does not seem to have been highly esteemed. (He was sent to Rome in AD 36 to answer to the Emperor for a massacre, and nothing is known of his subsequent fate).

By the time the gospels were written Christians were hated by Jews, and so it was natural for the evangelists to assume that this hatred ex-

isted not only in their own day, but also in earlier times, and was responsible for Jesus' death. And so Mark represents Pilate as doing his best to have Jesus acquitted, but as nevertheless forced into ordering his execution by the malice of the Jewish leaders. Later evangelists do even more to implicate the Jews and absolve the Romans. In Matthew "all" the people demand Jesus' execution—the "all" is a significant addition to the corresponding text in Mark. And in a verse which is entirely Matthew's own, and without parallel in any other gospel, "all the people" answer Pilate's plea for clemency with: "His blood be on us and on our children"—a text which served for centuries as a basis for ferocious persecution, to which the recent Vatican Council has belatedly tried to put an end by ruling that no Jews alive today are among the "children" responsible for Jesus' death. If Matthew elevates Pilate by depressing the Jews, Luke prefers the method of exonerating Pilate more directly, and deliberately fails to indicate that Roman soldiers carried out the execution. In the fourth gospel, the latest of them all, we find the episode treated as one might expect from this evangelist: Jesus, the accused, is represented as treating the governor to a short-course in Johannine theology.

Many think that a theory of Christian origins without a historical Jesus is absurd because it necessarily implies that erroneous beliefs became widespread under conditions which ought quickly to have discredited them; that elaborate gospel stories about Jesus and Pilate would at once have been seen to be false if Jesus and never existed. The answer to this objection lies in the dates of the documents. Jesus was not linked with Pilate by writers contemporary with Pilate, but only by those of about 70 years later, when few who had lived through his administration were still alive to come forward and contradict them. And the linkage was based on inference, not on fraud. Those who lack understanding of the process whereby myths are formed are apt to argue that, either a tradition is true, or else it must have been maliciously invented by cynics who knew the facts to have been otherwise. I have, against this, tried to understand the linkage with Pilate as an intelligible inference from the data available at the time when it was made.

(Summary of a lecture given on January 13)

"The Flower of the World" the Roman Republic of 1849

BY

NIGEL SINNOTT

ON THE DEATH of Giuseppe Mazzini in 1872, Dr. Moncure D. Conway: "It is difficult for American and English people of the present day to weigh justly the revolutionist of Italy. Our revolutions have passed. . . . The English people—rejoicing in charters of liberty whose every line is written in blood—may now complacently rebuke those who are passing through that old phase for following their example. But our Saxon testimony stands—'Resistance to tyrants is service to God'—and stand it will till the last throne of tyranny shall fall."

Mazzini, by his writings, and through his organization of *Giovine Italia* (Young Italy) and *Giovine Europa* (Young Europe), was one of the main

architects of that "Third Rome", the Rome of the People, whose heroic but forlorn struggle for survival against enormous odds inspired the poets of two continents, and, phoenix-like, brought about the eventual unification of Italy.

The events in Rome of 1849 were really some of the last acts of the great historical drama throughout Europe the year before: 1848, "The Year of Revolutions", when the old régimes, which had been re-established by the victors of Waterloo in 1815, were nearly swept away. There were popular risings in Poland, Hungary and France, an attempted one in Ireland, in Vienna, Prague and Sicily. In northern Italy, the provinces of Lombardy and Venetia rebelled against the rule of the Emperor of Austria, and were aided for a while by the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia. To their assistance also went several thousand men from the army of the Roman States, without waiting for permission from their ruler, the Pope.

Pius IX had appeared as a "new broom"—some even imagined (wrongly) that he was a liberal—when in 1846 he succeeded Pope Gregory XVI, who had governed the Roman States by a system of censorship, spies, arbitrary arrest and bully-boys (the San Fedists); Gregory had even banned the introduction of telegraphs and railways. The new Pope, as yet still very popular, watched the war in the north with anxiety—Austria was, after all, a loyally Catholic power; and when it was clear that she was winning, Pius IX delivered an Allocution of 29 April, saying that he would not go to war with the Emperor, despite entreaties to do so, "since we, however unworthy, exercise on earth the functions of Him who is the author of peace and lover of charity. . . ."

Cannons to Left and Right

Pio Nono's progressive image was finished; the radicals, liberals and republicans felt betrayed; and in September, to appease and contain the rising dissatisfaction throughout the Roman States, the Pope appointed as his chief minister Count Pellegrino Rossi, an efficient, right-wing diplomat who was disliked by the Jesuits at one extreme, and by the left-wing democrats of the Trastevere quarter at the other.

On 15 November, Rossi was assassinated. An unruly mob besieged the Quirinal palace, demanding constitutional reforms and a popular government; eventually the Pope acceded to most of their wishes, but then, on 25 November, fled the city and sought the "filial protection" of Ferdinando II, the ultra-reactionary King of Naples. From his exile in Gaeta, just over the border, Pius IX declared the government dismissed, the Consultative Assembly revoked, appointed a Council of Regency, and demanded the submission of his subjects. Rome ignored him, and its provisional government announced that a general election would be held, on the basis of universal suffrage. This "monstrous act of unconcealed treason and naked rebellion" took place in January 1849—despite the sanction of the Greater Excommunication—and was, of course, a republican landslide.

Meanwhile, liberals and nationalists had come flocking to the Roman States. Giuseppe Garibaldi, the red-shirted *guerrigliere* who had made a name for himself fighting in South America and northern Italy, offered his services to the Romans. Then Giuseppe Verdi, the patriot musician, came to the city, and on 27 January his new opera, *The Battle of Legnano* (the revolt of the Lombard League against the Emperor Barbarossa), had its première at the Teatro Argentino. Pius IX, from Gaeta, could only match this propaganda exercise by promulgating the dogma of the Immaculate Conception on 2 February.

On 5 February the new Constituent Assembly, which included Garibaldi, met for the first time; and on the night of 8/9 February 1849 they voted on, and proclaimed, the Roman Republic. Mazzini was naturalised, and invited to join the government. The offices of the Inquisition were turned

into workers' tenements, some of the vast episcopal estates were confiscated, but the poorest of the parish clergy received pay rises. The exiled disciple of peace and lover of charity now called upon the Catholic powers of Europe to exterminate this "forest of roaring beasts".

Surprise Attack

The Romans expected to be attacked first by the Neapolitans and the Austrians, but because of a rebellion in Sicily, and the short-lived re-opening of hostilities between Austria and Piedmont, the first serious threat came from another, and unexpected quarter: Republican France, whose new President, Louis Napoleon, had plans to revive his uncle's empire. To do this, he needed to ingratiate himself with the clerical and rightist parties in France. He was also jealous of Austria. To restore the Pope, and "law and order", was his chance.

On 25 April a French expeditionary force under General Oudinot landed at Civitavecchia, and reached the outskirts of Rome on the 30th. The Romans had had time to recall Garibaldi's Legion from patrolling the Neapolitan frontier, and had also been reinforced by Poles, Hungarians and some gentlemanly constitutional monarchists—Count Manara's Lombard Bersaglieri. Some Spaniards arrived to fight for the Pope.

The French attempted to enter the city, but were driven from the walls by grapeshot and small-arms fire. They then attacked two villas on a strategic hill overlooking the western walls at the foot of the Janiculum. These buildings and their gardens were defended by Garibaldi's men, and bands of artists and students. After much hand-to-hand fighting the French regulars, to their astonishment, were beaten off. General Oudinot called for a truce.

Friendly Persuasion

When news of the French defeat reached Louis Napoleon, he resolved to send reinforcements and siege artillery to his troops, and also the brilliant engineer, General Vaillant. To conceal these intentions he arranged for the future builder of the Suez Canal, Ferdinand de Lesseps, to go to Mazzini and negotiate a treaty of friendship with the Roman Republic. De Lesseps acted in good faith, and while the negotiations were going on, the Roman armies were able to contain the Neapolitan advance from the south at the battle of Palaestrina, and then drive King Ferdinando "off the premises" at Velletri. Garibaldi was the leading light in these victories, though in the case of the second, he flagrantly disobeyed his commanding officer.

When General Vaillant and the reinforcements arrived, General Oudinot revoked de Lessep's treaty and the French re-opened hostilities. In the early hours of 3 June they again attacked the two villas near the Janiculum, just outside the Porta di San Pancrazio, and took them. For the rest of the day, Garibaldi, Manara and others organised desperate—almost suicidal—bayonet charges against the nearest of the villas, the Corsini, but even if on occasions they took it, they were only beaten back by massive French counter attacks before they could consolidate. They tried using the artillery, directed by the artist Gabriel Laviron (yes, he was a Frenchman!), but this failed to dislodge the French for long enough. After 3 June, many of the famous names of the *Risorgimento* lay wounded—or dead, rotting between the lines.

With the Villa Corsini secured, the French were able to mount their siege artillery by it, and General Vaillant's engineers dug zig-zag trenches towards the breaches that the guns remorselessly opened up in the walls of Rome. The French stormed these breaches on 21 June, establishing themselves on the walls in two places. But still the Romans did not surrender: they fell back on an ancient, inner line of wall, and held this, despite heavy bombardment, until the early hours of 30 June, when the French stormed the

secondary defences. Bitter hand-to-hand fighting continued until noon, when a truce was arranged for collecting the dead, and Garibaldi was asked to report to the Assembly on the military situation.

It became clear that further resistance, other than a street-by-street civilian bloodbath, was hopeless. After much discussion the Assembly agreed to remain in session in Rome, the French should be permitted to enter on 3 July, but Garibaldi could first take out of the city any who would follow him and continue the war in the countryside. On the evening of 2 July he left with 4,000 men and his pregnant, ill wife, Anita. "I offer neither pay, nor quarters, nor provisions", he said. "I offer hunger, thirst, cold, forced marches, battles and death." He was not far wrong.

The Retreat

Although Garibaldi's column managed easily to escape pursuit by the French, their march soon became an undisguised retreat. With heavy losses through desertion, their main column harrassed by the Austrians, and their stragglers and wounded hunted by bands of peasants, priests and friars, they only just made the sanctuary of the tiny Republic of San Marino. From here, Garibaldi and a smaller band, of about 200, attempted to break out towards Venice, where Daniele Manin's republic was still holding out. However, many of the Garibaldians fell foul of the Austrian army and navy, to be tortured and shot. (A few of the luckier ones were imprisoned.) Garibaldi's wife died in the marshes near Ravenna; her husband was eventually smuggled by the republican "underground" across Tuscany to the west coast, a ship and exile. In Rome itself, the French restored the Pope on 15 July.

So ended the struggle of "the degenerate remnant of the Roman People", as *The Times* called them. But the poets, especially those in Britain and America, had other ideas. To Arthur Clough, the Rome where he himself had been in 1849 was the "republican Zion"; Mrs. Hamilton King in her *Ugo Bassi*, described the Italian ideal of the republicans as "Like a golden lily after the night's rain/Bursting its sheath in the sunrise, all uprisen. . . ." Swinburne wrote florid tributes to Aurelio Saffi and Mazzini (both Triumvirs of the Roman Republic), and dedicated his *Songs before Sunrise* to the latter. His *Watch in the Night* and *A Song in Time of Order* tell of Garibaldi's retreat and the aftermath. Ernest Myers's *Defence of Rome*, and Clough's *Amours de Voyage*, both tell the story of the siege. In the United States, Whittier passionately espoused the cause of the fallen republic with his *To Pius IX*, *The Dream of Pio Nono*, *From Perugia, Italy*, and a biting rebuke to the conquerors, *The Peace of Europe*, which was matched by Walt Whitman's *Europe*. In Tuscany, the Brownings watched the events of 1848 and '49: they inspired Elizabeth Barratt Browning's *Casa Guidi Windows*, and her husband, Robert, wrote *The Patriot*, *The Italian in England* and *Holy Cross Day*. When, in 1851, Louis Napoleon, who had done his work so well, overthrew the French Republic, Walter Savage Landor wrote in his *Epigram* on the French: "Behold at last the vengeance come/For the brave men ye slew at Rome."

The "brave men" who died for the Roman Republic did not inspire just the poets: they provided a martyrology and a Garibaldian legend that would one day make a nation, despite the long historical power of the Catholic Church. Italy, the mere "geographical expression" of Metternich had now, in the words of Meredith, "tasted her own blood, and herself knew that she lived". As Professor G. M. Trevelyan put it: "Because men remembered and told with pride and anguish the story of the uncalculating devotion of those young lives in this hopeless struggle, there grew up, as the years went by, an unconquerable purpose in the whole nation to have their capital: there rose that wild cry of the heart—*o Roma, o Morte!* . . ." (Rome or Death!)

Yet the Rome of 1849 symbolised more than just the dream of a free Italy "from the Alps to the sea". It was defended not only by Romans and other Italians, but by Poles, Hungarians, English, Dutch, Belgians, Swiss, Latin Americans, a Finn, a Negro and even a Frenchman. As the Patrimony of St. Peter was the world capital of Catholicism, so the Roman Republic became the symbol of "small nations, struggling to be free" and the shrine of those who believed (and still believe) that liberty, imagination and the honest search for truth were more important than the transmogrified Truth with a capital "T" which provided all the answers for all time, and to question which was heresy and a treasonous contagion to be crushed with an iron hand. It was indeed the "republican Zion" of the poets' dreams; and if our modern police states have "ways of dealing" with poets a century and a quarter later, they still have not found a way to stop free men from dreaming.

"For I know surely that though we be dead,
Though all this generation pass away,
Out of this soil the flower shall spring at last,
Of the starry whiteness, and the crimson heart,
And the green leaves spreading—Yea, the Flower of the World,
Poets have dreamed of—but upon our graves."

(Mrs. Hamilton King, *Ugo Bassi*)

(Summary of a lecture given on February 3)

For the Record

BY

THE GENERAL SECRETARY

LAST YEAR, in the USA, Dr. Szasz, the gadfly of psychiatry, was voted the Humanist of the Year. At the meeting at which the presentation was made he offered some very interesting observations that are published in the January/February 1974 issue of the American *The Humanist*.

He said: "I confess that I am not sure what humanism now is, except in the sense that being a humanist is nice—much as being, say, a male chauvinist pig is not nice. Humanism implies an idea that no one in his right mind, if I may put it that way, can be *against*. . . . No one, to my knowledge, has ever advocated an ethic of inhumanism or has ever called himself an 'inhumanist'."

He then looked at classical, Renaissance and modern humanism in turn and found that the modern form, in its contemporary shapelessness, lacked something that was the key to the others. "Both classical and Renaissance humanists displayed deep concern not only for human freedom and dignity but also for the disciplined and honest use of language. This essential, perhaps even organic, unity between man and his language has been severed in the modern age—many contemporary humanists displaying unconcern for language and many contemporary students of language displaying unconcern for humanism."

He makes some fascinating remarks: "It is idle, or worse, to persist in characterising people according to whether and how they reason, when all that we can observe is whether or how they use language."

His conclusion: "I believe there is a pressing need among contemporary humanists for a fresh emphasis on language: for although rationality, reasoning and thinking occupy important positions in the modern humanist credo, language, writing and speaking are conspicuous by their absence from it."

I think that if Dr. Szasz was speaking to South Place he would be talking to the converted, but he has done a service to us, nevertheless, in spelling it out so clearly and well. Speakers and contributors who give us dogmas and clichés get pretty short shrift but it could be that we still have a few beams left in our own eyes. It certainly does seem to me that a new insistence on good, clear, simple, vigorous English is a critical offering to the commonwealth that organised ethicism and humanism might make. (It is also good to see the capital "H" taken out of Humanism—we prove ourselves by our deeds not by our labels.)

The Chair Revolution at Conway Hall

It's happened—it has *actually* happened! We have re-seated the Large Hall and the last of the creaks and groans of the old chairs has departed. The essential credit goes to Mr. George Hutchinson the Secretary of the Concerts Committee. He surveyed the market and found something that was not there on our last survey over three years ago—a chair designed in America and made in Denmark. Colin Greaves and I went with him to Conrans to see it. We had to be satisfied that it would meet the main single requirement concerning its mobility and storage when not in use. Most stacking chairs are not good enough in this respect but this one *was* and 282 are now installed at considerable expense, but much less than we feared had we to have to have a chair designed specially for us. The General Committee and the Finance Committee sat (literally!) on the problem at length and with great care and finally we decided to go ahead—just in time to beat the next price rise. We hope you like the chairs. They are all steel, most of them a brown colour, but some are in red make for contrast and variety.

April Programme

David Ashforth, Chaplain of Imperial College, is the author of a most interesting paper, published by his College, dealing with the chaos inherent in pluralism. If anything goes—what counts? He will be the lecturer on Sunday, April 7. When Jonathan Miller was with us at a Forum a couple of years ago he drew my attention, over tea, to a new seminal work in moral philosophy, "*A Theory of Justice*" by John Rawls, the Professor of Jurisprudence at Harvard. It is indeed a fascinating book and it has special implications for us at *South Place*—I shall deal with some of these on the 21st. On the 28th Tom Evans will make his assessment of T. S. Eliot—a bold and interesting enterprise!

The debate on what we think of humanism and our own *South Place* version of it will be taken a stage further on the 7th when Harry Stopes-Roe will open a Forum on *Living Differently*. Jason Clay is the new Secretary of *Survivor International*, an organisation associated with the Royal Anthropological Society that is concerned about the fate of aboriginal peoples faced with the advance and onslaught of "progress". He will show and comment on the film "*The Last of the Cuiva*". I understand that it is pretty strong stuff.

The theme for Tuesdays in April is "The Breakdown of Society" and it gives us a broad brief. Dr. Ravetz (2nd) will look, I think sympathetically, at the revival of the irrational and this is especially interesting as he is regarded as a principal authority in this country on the history and philosophy of science.

David Flint (9th), one of our own members, will consider the new stage

of the industrial revolution that we now live in—brought about by computers and automation—and what it might mean for the future. Wynford Hicks (16th) recently the Editor of *Inside Story* will suggest a new look at the social divisions of our society and the way they are breaking up. He is not someone who is mentally straitjacketed by current doctrines.

F. T. North (23rd) whose sympathies lie with Social Credit will consider the increasingly critical problems now associated with money and credit. Finally (30th) we shall ask questions, with the help of Nicolas Walter, about the forms of freedom we might devise to meet the deficiencies, even the collapse, of old forms of social organisation.

AROUND THE SOCIETY

□ Robert Goodsman, one of our young members, has just been in to say "Goodbye". He is selling his flat and car, giving up his job and taking off to he-knows-not-where. It won't be in Europe anyway. In the past the young had wars to fight or great causes to espouse. Whither now? It is a good question for us.

□ A couple of years ago we had an excellent working party on a Saturday that did a very good job on the woodwork on the stage. We also had a splendid lunch in the Library and made a rather fine day of it. There are other things to do and another working party has been suggested. Will likely volunteers give me their names? There are other on-going things, too, like the provision of flowers and keeping the brasses bright and ship-shape. The Hall is looking pretty good at the moment—just the time to make it even better!

□ James Faure Walker was married at *South Place* last summer and is much interested in the artistic possibilities of the Hall. The General Committee a long time ago authorised me to encourage and promote exhibitions of works of art in the Hall, provided it didn't bring bills in, so I went over the ground with Jim and he has undertaken to find your artists in search of hanging space. The first group comes from Coventry. They came in to paint the whole corridor from end to end and their exhibition goes up on Monday, April 1. *There will be a party for the opening day at 7.00 p.m.* and all members and friends interested in the visual arts will be welcome—with the usual penalty, i.e. bring something to add to the festive fare. The press will be invited. The visual arts have never been a strong point at *South Place*—so much the better for our opportunities.

□ During the past year three members of the General Committee—Michael Lines, David Western and Jo Camp—have found it impossible, in view of their other commitments, to function effectively and have therefore resigned. This means that there are ten vacancies on the General Committee to fill at the AGM instead of the usual seven. The last three will be for one year only; the others are elected for three years.

□ Refreshments on Sunday mornings and at Forums are well in hand thanks to the zeal of Ray Lovecy and those who have been good enough to put their names down on the rosters that she organises. We still, though, need some extra help on Tuesdays. Will regular attenders (men as well as women!) give this a thought?

□ The Annual Dinner was just right—food, speeches, atmosphere—the three hours went in a flash and the Library really makes a marvellous dining room. With Margaret's departure we had either to engage profes-

sional caterers (and send the price through the roof) or look around to see if we had the necessary talent on some group basis. We found it and beat the System! The big discovery was Evelyn Brown who took on the main course. Tomoko Sato made a vast and hugely successful fresh fruit salad (almost the whole company went round again on that one) and Anon made the soup. Tina served the sherry and Angela Connolly and Evelyn dished the whole thing up from the buffet table. They were tremendously industrious. We left the washing up till the next day when Bill and Evelyn undertook to see it done. Chris Macy, in his speech, told us that a new publishing venture was in the pipeline—something in the tradition of the Thinkers Library, and that sounds *very* interesting. Mr. Home, Mrs. Booker and the MC (himself, himself) moved the Thanks and the Toasts.

□ A word to any aspiring writers among us—if you want to write then write something every day—Bernard Shaw's advice and very good too. It is so much better, though, if you can write to some purpose and see it in print. We have one new reporter of meetings for the *Record*, Keith Porteous Wood, but we need one or two more so that the load can be shared. Volunteers?

□ Iris Mills is looking for a flat or house in which to share accommodation with three friends. News of any likely leads would be welcome.

□ The gardens in Red Lion Square have been re-designed and laid out anew. It is a good place for a break before or between meetings when the sun is being kind to us.

PETER CADOGAN

CONWAY DISCUSSIONS

Authority in Society

AUTHORITARIANS are those who are for ever laying down the law on what is good for others. The bureaucrat is always asking on whose authority or on what authority we have dared to do something. Worst of all are those who pose as authorities—who lack the modesty and restraint we associate with, say, our discussions here in Conway Hall.

Historically, authority is contrasted with freedom and generally thought to be an inferior concept.

Yet this should not have been, since authority and freedom are both aspects of the European process of law. When law breaks down or is ignored, arbitrariness which is neither freedom nor authority, breaks in. Privilege is lost. This has always been something to guard against and as we saw, the United States Declaration of Independence was soon enough followed by the United States Constitution with its safeguards against those vested with authority. The French Republics have been the most authoritarian states in Europe.

So authority and freedom have been invoked by either side; those who wanted to overthrow tyranny called for freedom till they had done so and then sought to invest their actions with a new legitimacy. It has been less a clash of authority and freedom than a process of abuse of privilege by every faction seeking power.

In the clashes over privilege between rulers and subjects of different race and language, between legitimacy and democracy, particularly in Central Europe, authority acquired a bad image. Those who embodied it were alien, papal, used force to maintain their privileges (as did the others to win theirs), kept mistresses (as did the democratic leaders, though till they took office they could not do this from public funds) and rulers were generally identity-denying.

But throughout this European process there is one aspect—one to which I always keep returning in our SPES sessions—that of trying to invest concepts such as authority and freedom and the institutions derived from them with the glamour of being autonomous higher creations—even supreme ones. The fallacy has been to assume that there *must* be some overall authority to which ultimate reference can be made when all other authorities have been consulted and have failed to provide an answer. We see this particularly today in connection with the conduct of economic affairs.

This seems in Europe to have been the result of the marriage over centuries of Church and State. The Germanic rulers seized eagerly on the Church's capacity to confer legitimacy as much as they demanded the services of clerics as chancellors. A king could no longer be just the cunning one. We still see some outrageous examples of this in our time—Orders in Council which blandly set aside, for example, the express intentions of bequests.

Church Influence

This monolithic notion of authority might not have developed had the Mediaeval Church not pervaded every sector of society—the arts, literature, even the metaphors in our languages; our whole system of schools and colleges. Much of this has been pure gain and enrichment. This is the real heritage of Western Christianity and I am grateful that I am one of its heirs.

The whole emphasis of our modern times is to intensify the European illusion of the external authority of ideas. The rise of Party central offices, of leaders elected at one or two removes from the electorate itself, the growth of Whitehall mandarinism, the remote complexities of modern affairs—these have all supported the notion of authority moving on a higher plane. So to the illusion of a “higher purpose” is added the fallacy that there are “higher solutions” to which human predicaments are irrelevant. The rubbish about Britain “setting the world an example of moral leadership” in some field or other is one such case. The survival of the United Nations—to take another example—is held to take precedence over that of any of the nations constituting it, while in economic affairs attempts by authority to impose ideal constructions of “social justice”, whatever that may mean, on the random diversity of human toil and its random consequences, have been little short of disastrous.

So how do we disperse the hangover of monolithic and universal authority? For it is all-pervasive and it is exploited to human detriment for motives of power and expediency. Power alone is not authority. Power, I define as using other men as instruments in a design.

It would be nice to think that we could await the break-up of present authorities which have ceased to serve, pick up the bits, and rebuild afresh—rebuild a framework of law rather than pile up new laws which are mere irritations and as often as not unenforceable. Authority is breaking up or down—whichever way we prefer it.

Government came into being because men needed honest weights and measures and true coinage. Can one say that the conduct of economic affairs by governments in recent years amounts to much more than a deliberate falsification of weights and measures of value? The penalty for this now is relegation to the House of Lords.

After the end of the Carolingian era, kingship underwent severe set-backs

but revived vigorously under Capets, Plantagenets, and Hohenstaufens. There was a need for kingship to sustain the feuds of vassals, the rights of yeomen and freemen, to guarantee the charters of guilds and merchants. Complete arbitrariness and unchecked violence meant that subjects turned thankfully to anyone who could act against the perpetrators of violence, and readily grant him authority. As the Anglican Communion puts it, under him we may be godly and quietly governed. This has been largely the basis on which the nation and national authority has been created in Europe and it is up to us here to show what can be a better process: and it has had its shortcomings.

Power has always been an essential part of the process. And in the disintegration of legitimate authority today we are paying the price of the nineteenth century liberal's rejection of power as a mere corruption. The consequence is that someone who does understand how to involve other men in his design picks up power. Or else we have the meaningless chanting of slogans like Black Power, Student Power, Workers' Power, by raggle-taggle groups who would least of all be capable of exercising it and who merely point to the anarchy of violence.

In addition, we are entering a phase of intensified individual inversion, even of adult autism, of difficulty in conducting mature communication. But this may be an important turning point. Because periods of indulgence in self-imagery, in inversion, in inward struggle have often been preludes to an outward burst which after due struggle brings new manifestations of power and authority.

I am continually surprised at the misinterpretation of what happened in Europe in the twenties and thirties—although the generation which went through it all is still largely with us and at least outwardly still largely *compos mentis*. The rise of Fascism and Naziism had nothing to do with race, with anti-Semitism, with anti-what-have-you but simply because Fascists and Nazis claimed that they would get things done where others had failed. They could thus give Italians, Germans, Spaniards and others the illusion that they were escaping from situations which had become intolerable. And the rout would again be led by those who had locked themselves into an intellectual muddle about the legitimacy of authority and the practical issues of power.

Need for Authority

Anarchy is not enough. Too much could be lost. The break could be too lasting. An authority of some sort must be asserted at some point. If our present parliamentarians cannot restore its legitimacy, the task will be carried out by someone exploiting lowest common denominators as motives of action. This will not be some fastidious nature invoking higher principles—it is because I keep saying this that I am rather unpopular with some members of SPES.

In our daily lives we accept a multiplicity of authorities. We have different standards. I never find this inconsistent. The human race has evolved to cope with diversity. The ancient Greeks recognized this with their diversity of gods for every occasion, for every virtue and vice. I am not advocating a return to the Greeks, though we use their divine metaphors in our daily life.

We accept authority in practice when it gives us such a sense of assurance: we resent it when it does not, when it is arbitrary. But can we have a plurality of powers in a contemporary society which is mainly characterised by a sense of insecurity? For in spite of the liberal belief that men are supposed to progress by a process of emancipation from old thralls—superstition and religion, tradition, conventions, necessity, and ignorance—we seem to be facing a revival of all manner of strange cults. The process seems to have led to personal vacuity and instead of feeling emancipated a

great many members of society appear to be searching for a new certainty principle.

But I believe that the answer is *not* to be found in more centralization or authority, in a bigger monolith. It must be through a dispersal or reduction of central authority that we shall restore effectiveness and validity to the notion of authority itself. When anarchy threatens it is not that the anarchists themselves are necessarily wrong. The fault is as much likely to be with those in nominal authority. A law or decree is always a poor substitute for the individual sense of responsibility and if individuals are lacking in that, the failure may be that of those who claim the responsibility for making our laws.

Rulers and Their Rules

We have to look for a new ordering principle which is also a selective one. If we are reconsidering the framework of legitimacy should this not rather mean laws which call rulers to account and not laws which harass subjects? The greater the degree of accountability of the rulers, the more likely are the political system and the society over which they preside, to encourage moral action or stimulate ethical considerations among those carrying the greatest responsibilities.

Such an authority may suffer from human weakness and selfishness. But it will also profit from human strength and generosity. And it can be more than impartial: it will be purposeful if the active members of society feel that their own purposes—their own creative endeavours—are identified with those in authority. For the word *auctoritas* originally meant creation. If I am also doubtful about the course capitalism has taken over the past two or three decades it is because by turning men into passive consumers, it is destroying their capacity to create. Therefore paradoxically enough, there is a need for an authority to restrain it.

Therefore let us be clear that authority cannot be universal. We need only look to the wider world to see that this can never be so.

Authorities which seek to impose ideas require another sort of justification while an authority which seeks to give a sense of well-being is of a different order again. Wherever possible, we must throw responsibility back on the individual.

I am of course of the Right, that is to say, I am one of those who believe that men co-operate best on the basis of the common assumptions of a shared history, not on the implied authoritarianism of perfectionist dogma. The authority which beckons at the end of my road started from the diverse concepts of Europe's history. They in turn have a unity only *within* that history, whether they are freedom, justice, authority and legitimacy. The authority is in the continuity and not in the universality.

As the crude instinctive elements of religion have receded, our present day objects of reverence, our embodiments of compassion, are the creation of secular artists of the Middle Ages and Renaissance and link us to similar creations of the Classical World. The works of Greece, the slumbering forms of Michelangelo, the awakening or brooding moods of Rodin speak to us of the past humanity of our past gods where priest and theologian tell us nothing.

I am not worried about the signs of disintegration about me: I am only sorry that I may not live to see the process of re-integration.

Authority can help men to create. The fateful tendency to universalise is perhaps an inevitable element in the search for a supreme authority, an empire which will be one of knowledge, of widest comprehension, for which the others were but poor substitutes. There the European may find final assurance.

(G. K. Young provided this summary of his talk on November 6, 1973)

Buddhism

MR. BARROW BURT is an Australian Buddhist monk, derobed for the time being, but working for his Order in the context of English education. He gave us an excellent outline account of the history and ideas of Buddhism.

Gautama was the son of a local laird on the borders of Nepal 2,600 years ago. The clan of which he was a member was like a Celtic tribe. The boy was brought up in the skills of riding, archery and swordmanship and married at the age of 16. He went to study with two great Brahmin teachers and then spent six ascetic years of fasting and yoga followed by meditation. His search for nirvana, i.e. transforming and transcending wisdom, was successful. He achieved the state of the Buddha which means the fully-enlightened one. He then decided to go back to his earlier settlement with five companions.

Bhudda's three-fold path concerns firstly, ethics, secondly, meditation and thirdly, wisdom. They lead to Nirvana. Ethics is the art of living with our neighbours, while meditation is the art of living with ourselves.

There are four precepts of ethics. Precepts are not commandments, but invocations to endeavour. The important thing is to try and carry them out appreciating that mistakes will be made. The four precepts are, not to kill living beings, not to take what is not offered, not to wallow in debauchery, not to take words and use them to hurt others, not to use alcohol and drugs as artificial supports.

An enormous range of speculation is possible on the basis of the original thinking. It spread all over India, Ceylon, Burma, China, Korea and Japan. It was adopted in each country in a different way in accordance with that country's own endemic culture. The result is a great diversity and change over 2,600 years.

Buddhism has many faces and in some parts of the world it even postulates a Supreme Being, but that was not part of the original faith.

Mr. Burt then instanced the eight-fold path of critical injunctions. They are: right view and right intention in the light of the truth told by the Buddha, right speech, right action, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration. All things are in a constant state of flux and all life has inherent in it the seeds of suffering. There is no such permanent thing as soul, no thing of which we can say "that's me". We have illusions and delusions that lead to wanting and greed. We cause suffering to ourselves.

When Buddhism got to China the people could not translate Sanskrit into their own language. They wrote characters for Sanskrit's phonetic sounds and these sounds then acquired divergent Chinese characteristics, thus Chinese forms of Taoism and Confucianism were introduced into Buddhism in a swing away from the basic teachings. The subsequent translation into Japanese led to more complications. The word Zen was carried from Sanskrit through Chinese into Japanese by sound transference. The biggest Buddhist divergence happened in Tibet where it absorbed the old Tibetan religion. The erotic images are not really sexual, but rather symbolic indications of our own nature.

From the West we can get a clearer picture of what Buddhism means because of our access to all its sources, but the trouble is that young people can take from it what they want to meet their own needs, and the result can be very alien to the original intention especially when it gets mixed up with drugs.

The general Buddhist conclusion is that the only way to change society is from within the individual. Looking inwardly first is not a selfish activity; there has to be a proper balance with compassion and kindness.

The Buddhist view is that every man should spend some time as a monk in order to study and understand his religion. The tradition is that a boy

becomes a monk in order to get an education just as he might have done in medieval Europe. In practice, however, in the East, there is as much nominal Buddhism as there is nominal Christianity in the West.

In reply to a question Mr. Burt pointed out that the little fat man with whom we associate the Buddha is in fact nothing of the sort. He is the Chinese god of happiness. The concern of meditation is to observe and reflect and so to see experience for what it is—an expression and reflection of the highest human capabilities. **P.C.**

(Report of a talk given on Tuesday, December 18)

BOOK REVIEW

Man, Machines and Tomorrow by M. W. Thring. Routledge & Kegan Paul, £2.25.

FOR those who dread the swelling flood of technology, hope is still buoyed up on rafts and dinghies set afloat by increasing numbers of highly qualified and reputable practitioners. Professor Thring is certainly on the side of the angels, as we know from his stimulating lecture to our Society last July. His "Hippocratic Oath", put forward in *New Scientist* (January 1971), is the proclamation of his personal faith, his conviction that *science needs a morality* to enable humanity to survive—as humanity.

"I vow to strive to apply my professional skills only to projects which, after conscientious examination, I believe to contribute to the goal of co-existence of all human beings in peace, human dignity, and self-fulfilment...."

"I vow to struggle, through my work, to minimise danger, noise, strain or invasion of privacy of the individual, pollution of earth, air and water, destruction of natural beauty, mineral resources and wild life."

Too idealistic, alas, for most of us, with a living to earn in the world as it stands. It is all too evident that conscience discovers *problems*, not solutions. Only by using *judgment* can action be fitted to circumstances; and then we often find it doesn't fit exactly to the "tolerances" which conscience would prefer. Absolutes are seen to have had their day. In practice, you will put up with a distressing noise if it warns you of danger; again, you must expect some invasion of privacy if you insist that your rats or weeds are to thrive as "wild life". So the rules have to be broken, and at some stage each of us finds the shoe pinches.

In truth, the author fully accepts the real constraints of actuality. Granted that the ideal will never be attained, its true function still is to be attractive. "We can try. We can do our best to avert the dangers. We can do our best to bring about swiftly a time of peace and prosperity and freedom from nagging anxiety. Invention can be the power force that drives mankind forward . . . until we are big enough and bold enough to choose and control our own fate."

Very high marks are therefore due to Meredith Thring for aims and outlook. As regards means and insight, however, *Man, Machines and Tomorrow* leaves me disappointed. This title and the opening words, "There is an inventor in all of us", encourage an expectation of actual progress and tangible products to persuade us that humanising forces can succeed against mechanising forces to determine what engineers contribute to the world, tomorrow.

In the first four chapters a brief and breathless account is given, passably correct but oddly assorted, of the rise of technology and its debit/credit of social consequences. The subsequent six chapters on "creative society" in its various aspects are imaginative and courageous. It seems a pity that the descriptions (and pictures) of the professor's devices suffer by contrast with the speculative and "no-holds-barred" style of theoretical discussion which forms the context in which they are presented.

DR. A. L. LOVECY

The Alexander Principle. Victor Gollanz, £3.00.

SOME years ago my wife, who was herself a pupil of F. Matthias Alexander, wrote an article for *The Monthly Record* on the work of Alexander who had come to England from Tasmania in 1905. Here he formed and later developed a medical theory which has become known as the Alexander technique.

Not being a trained doctor he met with bitter opposition from the medical profession in England but now his technique is widely accepted by medical, educational and psychiatric workers who are realising that what Alexander taught has added a vital new theory capable of increasing their knowledge of how to deal with certain types of illness. As an Alexander pupil Bernard Shaw was a typical example of the efficacy of the treatment as indeed is Sir Adrian Boult, another of his pupils. Both these men, in their advanced years, revealed by their good health and upright postures what Alexander had done for them.

A few years ago at a rehearsal of the London Philharmonic Choir I tackled Sir Adrian on what Alexander had done for him. He agreed on the benefit he obtained from the technique but thought that the workers now continuing with the treatment were not going far enough in developing it. Now Dr. Wilfred Barlow has written a book *The Alexander Principle* published by Victor Gollanz Ltd. at £3.00 which covers every aspect of the subject in meticulous detail.

Dr. Barlow, who studied under Alexander, now teaches the Principle to future teachers at an institute which is recognised by the Inner London Education Authority. In brief, the main guidance imparted to the pupil may be summarised: "that a great deal of modern man's illness can be traced to the wrong way he uses and carries his body; muscles are tensed when they should not be; backs are 'humped', vertebrae contracted together, the neck is sunk down into the chest; stomachs are allowed to slip forward out of the pelvic girdle; legs are constantly crossed and toes turned in, tensing and straining all the muscles from the hips."

To these faults in everyday behaviour Dr. Barlow attributes "arthritis, pains in the back, slipped discs, rheumatism, fibrositis, hypertension and an enormous variety of nervous diseases which are considerably aggravated by the muscular tension we produce in ourselves by the way we use our bodies".

It will be apparent to the reader how Alexander started something which can free mankind from many of his ailments by pointing out how we misuse our bodies.

A chapter, "learning the principle", takes the form of a series of questions by a pupil or prospective pupil and giving the answers by the teacher. For instance, the teacher is asked about the work the pupil is expected to do in order to achieve a balanced regulation of his body? The reply he receives that he needs to alter his old habits is apt to raise almost insoluble problems to many which they must face with courage and understanding. There is further help in the following chapter, "applying the principle", which records some practical applications.

Mr. Fred Watts, who published F.M.'s own books, was an enthusiastic Alexander supporter. He gave me copies, in the vain hope they could have helped my first wife in her fight against cancer; Mr. Watts was a sincere Humanist.

There are 28 plates and 33 drawings helpful to the reader.

GEORGE DOWMAN

Your Viewpoint

As one of your non-religious correspondents, I can assure Ray Lovecy (letter, March) that I do not have an "abhorrence" of the word "religious"; my concern is rather that it should be treated with respect, and that its use should not lead us into confusion!

Mrs. Lovecy's reference to "pseudo christianity" leaves me wondering as to "whom" she regards as the "really religious" Christians! Aside from any "tolerant" or "up-to-date" law, what does Mrs. Lovecy think of the "religious" claims of "Christian Humanists"? Should they be regarded as thrice "pseudo"—that is, as Christians, Humanists, and Religious? Moreover, if one should not be regarded as "really" religious without a "real" religion, where is the one, true Humanism?

Incidentally, British non-religious humanists (albeit 'pseudo' ones) can hardly be "recognised" as "religious"!

CHARLES BYASS

Farnham Common, Bucks.

Mind, Matter and Man

Although I did not hear Francis Clark-Lowe's talk on "Mind the New Religion" I would like to express my thoughts that this title evokes.

I certainly feel that there is a mind (god?) upgrowing through matter; that is indivisible from matter.

I feel that matter evolving is striving always to create the "Mind that knows itself and knows itself in all that is".

I feel that indeed man has not begun to know all his capacities. His mind is capable of knowing not just all matter, but all that exists in his mind too.

He can turn to look at himself and study the countries of his own mind. In fact, he may find that within it is the ready-laid-down knowledge about all existence.

It is as though it is but man's task to uncover (not discover) this. It is as though, in the mind of man, is a copy of the pattern/the Mind (God?) that made all existence: man's mind itself, in other words, is a copy of the mind of god.

And the two minds must meet before mind-embodied can enter the eternal region.

Before the homely materialist rocks on his feet[!], I shall try and explain myself.

Within man is this mind (god), and within all that is, is the same living centre or mind.

Man, with his marvellous powers of communication, can enable the meeting of the "god within" and the "god without".

The fusion of these two "mind spheres" can (for I have seen it happen), transfigure a man, and make him "not of the flesh".

Even the "homely materialist" has the magic light of this "other world" in his eye!

ANN WHITWELL

London, SW12

South Place News

New members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members: Mr. K. P. Wood, N11; Mr. J. C. Wynford Lewis, Pennard, Wales; Mrs P. B. Myers, W5; Mr. D. Davis, E9; Miss J. Hansmann, W10; Mr. J. N. Franklin, Canada; Miss J. Heade, E18; Miss U. Amakwe, N4; Mr. S. Durrani, SE26 and Mrs. N. Simons, NW2.

Obituary

We regret to report the deaths of Mr. H. Fiddian and Mrs Ilse Barasch.

Harry Fiddian was, at 83 years, one of our oldest members. He was one of the breed of South Place members with a Unitarian background, and he attended the original South Place chapel. A letter describing how, as a young man he met Moncure Conway at the chapel, was published in the November/December issue of the *Ethical Record*.

Ilse Barasch was a regular Conway Hall attender for many years. She built up a wide circle of friends, and she will be missed at Conway Hall functions.

Bridge Drive

This will be held at 6.30 p.m. on Thursday, April 18. Light refreshments will be served, and new members and friends may attend.

Easter All-Day Ramble

Saturday, April 13. Meet at Euston Station to catch 10.36 train to Berkhamsted (cheap day return 71p). Walk to Ashridge Park and Aldbury Common. Bring packed lunch. Distance approximately ten miles. Leader, Mr. P. J. Booker. Tel: 743-3988.

Sunday Social

Sunday, April 21, at 3 p.m., Mr. L. Fischer will show slides of his travels in Israel and Czechoslovakia. Tea will be served at 4.30 p.m., cost 10p.

Clements Memorial Prize

The 1973 Clements Memorial Prize has been won jointly by two candidates. Geoffrey Poole, who composed a trio for violin, cello and piano, and Patric Standford, who composed a string quartet, have each been awarded £50 by the judges Stephen Dodgson, Elizabeth Maconehy and John McCabe.

Country Dancing

A Country Dancing session will be held jointly with the Progressive League on Saturday, April 20, from 3 to 6 p.m. Everyone is welcome, and the first half-hour will be devoted to basic instruction.

Kindred Organisations

The first in a series of public meetings on the theme Threats to Freedom is being held by the **National Secular Society** on Tuesday, April 2. The meeting, on Threats to Sexual Freedom, is being held at the Caxton Hall, London SW1, at 7.45 p.m. The speakers will be Renée Short, M.P., Dilys Cossey, Antony Grey and Barbara Smoker. There will be a further meeting in the series, on Wednesday, April 24. Full programme from the General Secretary, 698 Holloway Road, London N19.

Humanist Holidays is taking bookings for a summer week in Hunstanton, beginning August 17. Full details from Mrs. M. Mephram, 29 Fairview Road, Sutton, Surrey. Tel: 01-642 8796.

Continued from page 2

Tuesday, April 16

7.00 p.m.—**Discussion** introduced by **Wynford Hicks**. Subject: **A New Analysis of Classes?**

Thursday, April 18

6.30 p.m.—**Bridge Drive**. Light refreshments

Saturday, April 20

3–6.00 p.m.—**Country Dancing** in the Library, jointly with Progressive League

Sunday, April 21

11.00 a.m.—**Sunday Meeting: PETER CADOGAN** on **Non-Violence, Civil Disobedience and John Rawls**. Contralto solos: Irene Clements.

6.00 p.m.—**Bridge practice**

6.30 p.m.—**Concert: Haffner** String Quartet. Mozart Dmi K421, Bfl K458, F. K590

Tuesday, April 23

7.00 p.m.—**Discussion** introduced by **F. T. North**. Subject: **The Break-down of Money**

Sunday, April 28

11.00 a.m.—**Sunday Meeting: T. F. EVANS** on **The Value of T. S. Eliot**. Soprano solos: Ruth Field

3.00 p.m.—**Forum: Isolation or Integration** with **Jason Clay** with film *The Last of the Cuiva*

6.00 p.m.—**Bridge practice**

6.30 p.m.—**Concert** in aid of Musician's Benevolent Fund. Gabrieli String Quartet. Hummel G Op 30 No 2, Shostakovich No 8 Op 110, Dvorak, Efl Op 105

Tuesday, April 30

7.00 p.m.—**Discussion** introduced by **Nicolas Walter**. Subject: **Forms of Freedom**

THE HUMANIST COUNSELLING SERVICE

Concern Themselves with
Your Personal Problems . . .

. . . Whatever they are

Write or phone in Confidence

13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London W8 5PG

Telephone: 01-937 2341

South Place Ethical Society

FOUNDED in 1793, the Society is a progressive movement which today advocates an ethical humanism, the study and dissemination of ethical principles based on humanism, and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment free from all theological dogma.

We invite to membership all those who reject supernatural creeds and find themselves in sympathy with our views.

At Conway Hall there are opportunities for participation in many kinds of cultural activities, including discussions, lectures, concerts, dances, rambles and socials. A comprehensive reference and lending library is available, and all Members and Associates receive the Society's journal, *The Ethical Record*, free. The Sunday Evening Chamber Music Concerts founded in 1887 have achieved international renown.

Services available to members include Naming Ceremony of Welcome to Children, the Solemnisation of Marriage, and Memorial and Funeral Services.

The Story of South Place, by S. K. Ratcliffe, is a history of the Society and its interesting development within liberal thought.

Minimum subscriptions are: Members, 75p p.a.; Life Members, £15.75p (Life membership is available only to members of at least one year's standing). It is of help to the Society's officers if members pay their subscriptions by Bankers' Order, and it is of further financial benefit to the Society if Deeds of Covenant are entered into. Members are urged to pay more than the minimum subscription whenever possible, as the present amount is not sufficient to cover the cost of this journal.

A suitable form of bequest for those wishing to benefit the Society by their wills is to be found in the Annual Report.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

TO THE HON. REGISTRAR, SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY,
CONWAY HALL HUMANIST CENTRE, RED LION SQUARE, LONDON, WC1R 4RL

Being in sympathy with the aims of South Place Ethical Society, I desire to become a Member and I enclose as my annual subscription the sum of £..... (minimum 75p) entitling me (according to the Rules of the Society) to membership for one year from the date of enrolment.

NAME
(BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE)

ADDRESS
.....

OCCUPATION (disclosure optional)

HOW DID YOU HEAR OF THE SOCIETY?

DATE SIGNATURE

The Ethical Record is posted free to members. The annual charge to subscribers is 75p. Matter for publication should reach the Editor, Eric Willoughby, 46 Springfield Road, London E17 8DD, by the 5th of the preceding month.