

THE



ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 79, No. 9

OCTOBER 1974

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	3
NON-VIOLENCE, CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND JOHN RAWLS	4
<i>by Peter Cadogan</i>	
THE CRISIS OF CATHOLICISM	7
<i>by Hector Hawton</i>	
FOR THE RECORD	10
<i>by the General Secretary</i>	
CONWAY DISCUSSIONS:	
FORMS OF FREEDOM	13
NOSTALGIA, A REAL ILLUSION	14
BOOK REVIEW:	
ECONOMICS AND THE PUBLIC PURPOSE	16
YOUR VIEWPOINT	18
SOUTH PLACE NEWS	21
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

Sunday, October 6

- 11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting:** T. F. EVANS on **Shaw's Religion**. Contralto solos: Irene Clements
6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice** in the Library
6.30 pm—**Concert:** Haffner String Quartet. Mendelssohn Emi Op 44 No 2, Rawsthorne Theme and Variations, Schubert Ami Op 29, D804

Tuesday, October 8

- 7.00 pm—**Discussion** introduced by Stan and Margaret Chisman.
Subject: **Success and Failure in Human Problem Solving**

Sunday, October 13

- 11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting:** DR COLIN HAMER on **Ethical Feeling**. Soprano solos: Jean Aird
3.00 pm—**Forum: International Humanism**. Report on the Amsterdam IHEU conference by Peter Cadogan
6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice**
6.30 pm—**Concert:** Bartholdy Trio. Beethoven Intro and Variations in G, Op 121a, Schubert Bfl Op 99 D898, Dvorak Dumky Op 90

Tuesday, October 15

- 7.00 pm—**Discussion** introduced by Graham Tayer. Subject: **Systematic Thinking**

Thursday, October 17

- 6.30 pm—**Bridge Drive** in the Library

Saturday, October 19

- 3.00–6.00 pm—**Country Dancing** in the Library

Sunday, October 20

- 11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting:** DR JAMES HEMMING on **The Work Ethic**. Bass-baritone solos: Peter Rice
3.00 pm—**Sunday Social**
6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice**
6.30 pm—**Concert:** Ian Partridge, Jennifer Partridge. Schubert Schöne Müllerin Op 25 D795

(Continued on page 23)

THE ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 79, No. 9

OCTOBER 1974

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

EDITORIAL

Public and Private Enterprise

WE LIVE in an age of paradoxes. While the government plans to nationalise large sections of British industry, the National Health Service falters under too heavy a burden, and while those who have trusted private enterprise under the name of Court Line bleat to the government asking for compensation, the country as a whole is looking to the oil industry to pull Britain out of its economic doldrums.

Also, some polarisation seems to be taking place in those services designed to protect society itself, which can logically only be run fairly by that society. About half a dozen "private armies" are currently under way, at least two being spearheaded by retired senior military officers. More alarming is the suggestion which has come from a group of MPs that a private police force should be formed, to help out when things go wrong. Putting aside knotty considerations of whether MPs should make collective radical suggestions which are not party policy and on which they were not elected, it would surely have been more sensible of those MPs to have called for strengthening of the "specials" part of the police force, if they really want some police reinforcement.

Looking at national enterprises logically, it would be foolish to have several private enterprise railways serving all the cities of Britain. The naturally occurring materials in the ground belong to all of us, yet some are controlled by the State, but most are exploited by private enterprise.

There is something in most of us which suspects State control of anything, but there is the dilemma. We have to take the least of evils in many walks of life, and if it is a choice between a State army or a private one, a public police force or an independent one, the choice of the majority is likely to favour State control.

The argument that State controlled bodies are undemocratic because they are elected by no-one cannot be faulted, but if the State is run by a democratically-elected government there is at least some degree of public control.

The choice between public and private enterprise in vital national services is likely to be a major factor in the forthcoming election. It is important that the correct choice is made.

Non-Violence, Civil Disobedience and John Rawls

BY

PETER CADOGAN

IF YOU make a reading of the past, present and future inspired by the values of freedom and justice and define progress in terms of their particular extensions then you are able to make principled statements about social change and social relations that owe nothing to political dogmas. There is, however, an act of faith involved—for to believe in freedom and justice is such an act, and at no time has it been more called for than today when the anything-goes attitude of pluralistic materialism threatens to compound political chaos with spiritual nihilism.

Nothing of consequence can happen in England now until given individuals, known and respected by others, dig in their heels and stand against the tide of consumer values and the mere preservation of the *status quo*. In my view this involves principled non-violent direct action up to and including civil disobedience where necessary.

An interesting thing about the expressions non-violence and direct action is that they signify both means and ends. Both ideas are abhorred by politicians. Clearly if direct democracy could be made to work the representative principle would be redundant and the politicians out of a job. If non-violence was established what price the Armed Forces and the other means of coercion that constitute the heart of the nation-state?

Our Society was founded by Elhanan Winchester in 1793 round the proposition that God is love; no theology, no particular rituals, no exclusive sacraments—just a simple, emotive, spiritual proposition. Down the years we may have changed our way of expressing it but the essence of the message remains the same: that at the heart of all ethical teaching and practice compassion, friendship, concern, forgiveness and charity are the irreducible elements of the human experience. This is the religious foundation of justice.

It is, of course, an incredibly difficult thing to live up to. The power of the rival gospel of I'm-alright-Jack is never to be underestimated. The probability is that we fail more often than we succeed; but we all succeed occasionally and it is those moments of success that make life worth living.

The Source of Conflict

But our values are in everlasting conflict with our social order, in particular with our fantastically complicated and powerful class system. For nearly a thousand years, since the Norman Conquest, the different classes have been superimposed interactively upon one another, the lords, the knights, the squires, the merchants, the clergy, the scholars, the lawyers, the peasants, the yeomen, the mastercraftsmen, the journeymen, the apprentices, the soldiers, the manufacturers, the wage-workers, the professionals, the bureaucrats and the latest arrivals—the systems-managers. All those social layers or their residues and consequences are with us still today. They assume inequality, privilege, scarcity and deep educational and cultural differences. What price then compassion and justice?

The same social structure produces, and is in turn produced by, a political constitution that meets the requirements of an elite no matter how much it is modified to meet the demands of public opinion. Yet it is true that hundreds of years of struggle have secured new gains for justice none of which can ever be taken for granted. Every generation has to fight its battle

for freedom over again, as much to confirm its birthright as to advance its cause.

In fact we have been too successful for our own good. From the sixteenth century to 1914 this country has a fantastic record of achievement. It produced an arrogance and a sense of self-satisfaction that is the contemporary English sickness, and that sickness gets worse rather than better.

It was in the 1950s that, at last, fundamental questions about our society began to be discussed and to displace the shallow established argument about "capitalism" and "socialism". Among those questions: What happens if we proceed from affluence to the abolition of scarcity when our whole social structure is based on scarcity? What is the point of the Armed Forces when weapons of mass destruction make war impossible between the industrialised countries? What happens to the role of Parliament when a Civil Service, multiplied in size ten times over, assumes the essential functions of government? What happens when money ceases to be used primarily as a means of exchange and becomes an instrument of Government policy? What happens when a country that had a great Empire loses that Empire? And finally, given all these problems, how does one restate and practice individual responsibility in a society increasingly dominated by over-mighty institutions and enterprises public and private?

How the New Debate Began

True to the English empirical tradition the great debate did not begin over ideas, it began over a practice, the practice of testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere with all the hazards of consequent fall-out. First there was an awareness of a problem, then a feeling that something must be done, then the discovery of what to do (Aldermaston Marches and the great sit-downs at military bases and city centres) and then, and only then, an enquiry into what it all meant—the discovery of ideas.

Practically the result was immense. Before 1958 "peace" was a dirty word because for some eight years the organised peace movement had been a Communist front. By 1963 the case had gone across so well that it no longer needed to be put and when the following year Sir Alec Douglas-Home was foolish enough to go to the country on the Bomb he made the biggest mistake of his life and suffered the consequences.

What had happened on those five years was the effective birth or rebirth of non-violent direct action. Direct action is the social and political manifestation of the do-it-yourself principle. It contrasts very clearly with the indirect action of parliamentary politics—party programmes, elections, conferences, lobbies, petitions, leaflets, resolutions, deputations, meetings, letters to MPs and the press. But what if you have been through all that and *still* justice has not been done? This was the situation of the Chartists, the early trade unionists, the suffragettes, the opponents of World War I. Accepting the continuing legitimacy of the constitution and being committed to non-violence the only answer is to break the rules, laws and conventions *that are being used to express and protect an injustice*.

It is a strange thing about human beings that talking and writing, no matter how wise and correct, will frequently get us nowhere no matter how numerous or important we may be. But a simple imaginative action by an individual or a small group in which the agents put themselves personally at risk can transform the whole picture and restart the wheels of change and progress.

Non-violence can mean different things. Interpreted absolutely it can mean unqualified rejection of all kinds of military and civil violence at all times. The outlook of the religious pacifist approximates to that view. It can also mean principled, but not unqualified, rejection of violence. Ghandi, for example, taught that the submission to tyranny in some circumstances

could be a greater evil than using violence to defeat that tyranny. Thus there can be such things as just wars; many of us today take the view that the second World War was, on balance, just while the first one was not. Thirdly non-violence can be purely tactical because the other chap is bigger than you are!

There are many variants of these three meanings. To every individual non-violence means something slightly different. For many years I was deeply engaged in its theory and practice and came to the conclusion that violence is bred in the bone of civilisation since, ultimately, the Army is the State. From this it follows that building a non-violent society means not less than transcending civilisation itself in favour of a new and higher order of human relations. To understand and practice non-violence today is to establish new norms and to lay the basis of the new society of the future.

We have been civilised, i.e. we have lived in towns, for some 10,000 years and for all of that time we have never known peace. All we have known is temporary interim non-war. Peace remains to this day something beyond our wildest dreams. Where then do we start? What working meaning can we give to non-violence now?

By 1962 I found an answer that satisfied me and still does. At that time I wrote a rather notorious article entitled "The Theory of Non-Violent Pushing" in order to state the case. In the ranks of organised direct action since 1958 we had interpreted non-violence in a very simple well-defined way. On a demonstration, faced by police or troops who barred our way, we would sit down and refuse to move. When the police came to move us we would offer no resistance, go limp and be carried away to a police bus and the nearest lock-up. The police got to understand our attitude and tactics and our relations with them were good. The results were highly photogenic, the publicity was immense and some of our message got across.

This lasted for about five years, until 1962. We were all the time demonstrating against nuclear weapons but there was no nuclear war being fought or even threatened. The balance of terror dates from the success of the first sputnik and that was in 1958. Our enemy was largely abstract, it was only a possibility. But when it ceased to be a mere possibility and became a real and immediate threat *then* what price going limp?

The Change

That moment came in the autumn of 1962. The Russian ships loaded with rockets were approaching Cuba. The forces of the USA were standing ready to invade the island and pre-empt the conflict. On both sides the fingers were on the nuclear triggers. A Committee of 100 demonstration first blocked Whitehall to register its feeling with the PM and then swept up Regent Street to the slogan "East and West, Hands Off Cuba" en route to the Embassies of the US, the USSR and Cuba. The police sent a bus ahead of us and a thin cordon spread across Regent Street to stop us. *It never occurred to us to stop and sit down*, the situation had changed. There was a real and terrible war in prospect. We offered the policemen no violence, we were many and they were few. There wasn't a moment's hesitation, we brushed them firmly aside and went straight through. It was the first of many non-violent pushes.

There is all the difference in the world between being forceful and being violent. Rugby is extremely forceful but it is not violent—or if it is the referee blows the whistle. If two people or two groups of people are in conflict (whether the issue be a game or "for real") then provided they keep their tempers, obey certain rules and retain their sense of humour there can be a great deal of tolerance of force and no violence. This is not just conjecture—the proof is in the pudding.

The conclusion is this—non-violence is not primarily a physical thing, it happens in the mind or more exactly between two minds. *Non-violence is*

the condition of person-to-person communication; violence is the breach of that condition.

This is not only morally important and theoretically clear it is also fundamental politically and constitutionally. If our Government or any other government was to threaten to become tyrannical the key to its success or failure in that endeavour would be the loyalty of the Armed Forces and police. If the troops and police change sides that government is doomed. This is why the American government withdrew from military intervention in Vietnam. Mutiny, desertion and fragging were rife. If the troops had not been withdrawn they would have withdrawn themselves—the process was already well advanced when the politicians saw the light.

It is one thing for a radical campaigner to discover and work out these things, or for a soldier to do it when he is asked to give his life for no good reason but somehow it is even more rewarding to find one of the world's greatest scholars doing it in a major academic work. John Rawls is Professor of Philosophy at Harvard and his recent book *A Theory of Justice* is a philosophical milestone. It is not easy reading but his conclusions on civil disobedience in relation to war in a near-just society have classic clarity:

"If a soldier is engaged in certain illicit acts of war, he may refuse if he reasonably and conscientiously believes that the principles applying to the conduct of the war are plainly violated. He can maintain that, all things considered, his natural duty not to be made the agent of a grave injustice and evil to another outweighs his duty to obey.

"A person may conscientiously refuse to comply with his duty to enter the armed forces during a particular war on the grounds that the aims of the conflict are unjust.

"Indeed, the conduct and aims of states in waging wars, especially large and powerful ones, are in some circumstances so likely to be unjust that one is forced to conclude that in the foreseeable future one must abjure military service altogether.

"The possibility of a just war is conceded but not under present circumstances."

(Summary of a lecture given on April 21)

The Crisis of Catholicism

BY

HECTOR HAWTON

WHEN CHARLES DAVIS left the Roman Catholic Church in 1966 he said that it was visibly breaking up. This verdict of one of the theological experts who took part in Vatican Council II deserves to be taken seriously. A similar view was expressed by Dr. Malachi Martin, an ex-Jesuit and former Professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. He wrote: "Well before the year 2000, there will no longer be a religious institution recognizable as the Roman Catholic Church" (*Three Popes and a Cardinal*, Hart-Davis, MacGibbon, 1973, p. vii).

What has happened to justify such prognostications? Quite simply, there is a revolt by a substantial number of the Catholic laity, supported by a significant minority of the clergy. In the last seven years 25,000 priests have left the priesthood. More serious in the long term, the number entering the

priesthood or religious orders has steeply declined. The rate of conversions in this country has also fallen by about 30 per cent.

The root cause of this malaise is the crisis of authority. The Roman Church, like the Communist Party, has always owed much of its success to a coherent system of doctrine maintained by strict discipline. Disputes on faith and morals were settled by the Pope. When he spoke *ex cathedra*—that is, from the Chair of Peter—his pronouncements were said to be infallible and irreformable. Such formal rulings are, of course, rare. In 1850 Pius IX defined the Immaculate Conception (not to be confused with the Virgin Birth). This was followed, 20 years later, by a definition of Infallibility. No further *ex cathedra* pronouncement was made until 1950 when Pius XII defined the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (i.e. her bodily ascension into heaven).

What happened in the intervals when the Pope no longer used "the hot line to the Holy Ghost"? He continued to give guidance through encyclicals, circular letters sent to all churches. These communications represented the teaching authority or *magisterium* of the Pope. Their policies were implemented by an efficient bureaucracy, the Roman Curia. Although, strictly speaking, encyclicals are not infallible, it is considered "temerarious" to act against them. This was made clear by Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani Generis*: "If Popes expressly pronounce in encyclical letters on matters previously debated, it is obvious to all that the question—according to the mind and intention of those Popes—can no longer be regarded as open to free discussion." And this was reinforced in article XXV of Vatican Council II which enjoined that "religious submission of will and mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic authority of the Roman Pontiff even when he is not speaking *ex-cathedra*".

Reform Unleashed

Such was the system devised by the Council of Trent which undoubtedly kept the Church intact for 400 years! It effectively came to an end on the death of Pius XII and the election of John XXIII in 1958. John reconvened the Vatican Council which had been prorogued in 1870 when Italian troops invaded Rome. He wanted to let the winds of change blow through the Church. He called this up-dating *aggiornamento*. He can hardly have bargained for winds of hurricane strength that shook the ancient edifice to its foundations. Like the sorcerer's apprentice he had released forces he could not control.

John died during the Council and it was left to his successor, Paul VI, to try to slow down the pace of reform. But there could be no doubt that the era of monolithic uniformity initiated by the Counter Reformation had come to an end. The power of the episcopate was strengthened and that of the Curia weakened. The Progress was gained a number of points but the most explosive issue, birth control, was kept from the agenda by the well-known device of appointing a Commission. Its report, however, was withheld, but the contents were leaked and were found to be out of line with the Pope. In 1968 Paul published the encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. The effect was shattering. Despite the findings of the Papal Commission Paul ruled that artificial contraception of any kind and for whatever reason was absolutely forbidden. The only permissible form of family planning was the so-called rhythm method.

He must have foreseen the storm this would provoke but to reject the solemn findings of previous Popes and the traditional attitude of the Church, certainly since St. Augustine, would have undermined what was left of Papal authority. Not much was left. In Holland and Belgium the prohibition was ignored with the connivance of many priests. Sales of the Pill increased by 98 per cent in Spain, 87 per cent in Portugal and Austria. The size of Catholic and Protestant families of the same income group in

the United States is the same. The Family Planning Association in this country found that 9 per cent of the women attending its clinics were Catholics—that is roughly the same proportion as Catholics in the population. The authorities tried vainly to stem the tide. The Archbishop of Southwark and the Bishop of Nottingham suspended “disobedient priests”, and Norman St. John Stevas, the well-known lay apologist, founded a Freedom for Conscience Appeal Fund to help them.

The Vatican sent a secret letter to all Nuncios urging them to use their influence to oppose Government sponsored aid for birth-control programmes. The Pope spoke in person at the United Nations. “You must strive”, he said, “to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind, and not rather favour an artificial control of birth, which would be irrational, in order to diminish the number of guests at the banquet of life”.

The Pope next visited Colombia where the population explosion is particularly menacing. All to no avail. The hierarchy in Colombia gave their approval to all forms of birth control except abortion and sterilization. On such an official level defiance is almost unprecedented.

Another example of the impotence of the Vatican is the case of Father Hans Küng, the famous—some would now say infamous—rebel of Tübingen. Father Küng has published an erudite study of Papal claims which rejects the dogma of Infallibility. He was more fortunate than von Döllinger, the eminent theologian who refused to submit to the ex cathedra pronouncement in 1870 and was excommunicated. Father Küng was summoned to Rome but he refused to go except on his own unacceptable terms. Nothing has happened to him. His book was not placed on the Index because there is no Index. He has nothing to fear from the Holy Office, the once dreaded Inquisition, because it has shed its more objectionable functions and changed its name. Since Vatican II the Pope has conducted a kind of holding operation. The stream of priests who request laicization are treated gently. The extraordinary novelties introduced into many Dutch Churches meet nothing worse than pained disapproval. The most recent rebuff to the authority of the Church is the Italian referendum firmly supporting the introduction of divorce.

The Church of Rome as it existed from the Middle Ages is undergoing a change that is probably irreversible. The main difference between Catholicism and Protestantism is the right of private judgement. This is now being conceded, albeit reluctantly. The Pope can no longer use the traditional sanctions to keep his house in order. In the pithy phrase of Dr. Martin, the Pope is unpoped.

(Summary of a lecture given on June '23)

56th Conway Memorial Lecture

Ernest Gellner

Professor of Philosophy, London University

OPTIONS OF BELIEF

7.30 p.m. Thursday 5th November

For the Record

BY

THE GENERAL SECRETARY

LET'S be "different", just to start the new season! I took Ernst Cassirer's *Myth and Language* with me to Amsterdam. Not exactly light reading, but great stuff. He goes right back to the beginning. To the first men *everything* was mysterious, everything had in-dwelling power and every noun was more than the label of a thing, it was also the symbol of the unknown element in that thing. Thus myth and language are identical in origin and from that common source the phenomenon of religion proceeds. Thus my *Reflections of Reading Cassirer's "Myth and Language"*:

The Christians took a whole vocab
From happy pagan and from Ancient Greek,
Must we now on grounds of pride
Be accessory to our own defeat?

If in the beginning was the word
Inseparable from human deed,
Our deeds are doomed by self-default
Without the very words they need.

Thus "spirit" is in-dwelling power
From atom up to human kind,
And "worship" is the deep respect
For these that in our hearts we find.

So "ritual" is the form we forge
To put our feelings in,
So that our fellows recognise
Certain moments crystallised
That otherwise might just-have-been.

And "grace" is not from outer space,
It springs from wells within
When we take time with our plumb lines
To sound where deeps begin.

"Communion"—a plain Latin word
Traduced by superstition
For bread and wine from corn and wine
Already have a form "divine"
Without a God's permission.

Then wholly "holy" are those times
Those places and their circumstance
That you or I will share with none
(Or occasionally with only one)
For "sacred" is their confluence.

And "mystery" is a word to serve
When mind has bound what is observed
And yet still finds beyond that fence
Beyond-the-brink experience.

Then marriage vows and funeral rights,
Baptisms, initiations,
All have their climactic place
As the cycles of the human race
Begin and end their seasons.

Boldness is as boldness does.
Christianity departs,
Yet it has a human residue
That's fit for human hearts.

So from what's left, let's take a grip
Upon the words it stole
And put them back to proper use
Sans "revelations" role.

But "revelation", there's a word
In the list for reclamation
Intuition's synonym
For truth's obscure gestation.

There is no end to this long tale
Of abandoned inhibition,
We'll always find there's words defined
That need redefinition.

So go to it all you humanists,
Who doubt religion's way,
Turn it back to whence it stemmed
And turn it on today!

Replies invited, for or against, in verse of course. . . .

October—Halt and be Recognised

I suppose that most of us (over a certain age!) were brought up Shavians. Even so it is liable to come as a shock to some of those "most" that Shaw regarded himself as a deeply exclusive man. I have recently acquired a whole book devoted exclusively to Shaw's religion. Tom Evans could hardly have found a more interesting subject to open the season with on October 6. Going through some of our archives recently I discovered a letter from Shaw in response to Delisle Burns' appeal for funds to build Conway Hall. Burns wrote to a vast number of VIPs and most of them replied politely and sent nothing. Shaw sent £10—a useful sum in 1928.

Colin Hamer was all set to emigrate and did in fact depart. This led to the cancellation of his summer lecture on ethical feeling. Something happened and he came back, so the lecture is on again. The date is October 13.

The whole notion of the work ethic is under fierce attack from some quarters at the moment. I can see we are going to have a very good session when James Hemming takes this subject on, on October 20.

My subject on the 27th will be *The Long Exile of the Idea of Justice*. Brian Inglis has written a book about this. Bentham exiled justice in the name of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, and we are still suffering from the results. . . . I'm trailing my coat! I hope you'll get the picture on the day.

For Tuesday Discussions the theme is *How to Solve Problems*. Stan and Margaret Chisman suggested this idea and they open with the first meeting on the 8th. Then Graham Tayer, responsible for a whole series of BBC programmes on this subject, will be with us on the 15th. On the 22nd we

are extremely fortunate to get Dr. Grey Walter, an authority of world repute on the functioning of the brain, to come in specially from Bristol to talk to us. He will use film and slides to illustrate his case and the BHA Film Unit will do the projecting for us. Finally a newcomer, Annette Rich, from South Africa, will tell some of her extraordinary story. How do you face problems to which there are no answers?

At the first Forum (on the 13th) I shall report back from the Amsterdam conference of the International Humanist and Ethical Union. It was a remarkable occasion. I was able to pick up new ideas, have some interesting stories to tell and made any number of new contacts for the Society. At the second Forum, on the 27th, Victor Rose, who painted that vast canvas on the human saga that hangs outside the Library door, will talk about man as a pattern-making animal and illustrate his case with the help of the epidiасcope.

AROUND THE SOCIETY

□ The NSS has just published a new pamphlet *Our Pagan Christmas* by R. J. Condon. Technically the publication date is not quite yet so comment must be withheld. After our rather fierce argument last year, and our very successful pagan party on Christmas Eve, this sounds like topical stuff for *South Place*. It will be available from our bookstall or direct from the NSS, 698 Holloway Road, London N19 at 20p plus 4p postage.

□ Christopher Macy is leaving the New Humanist to become Editor of *Psychology Today*, the British version of a well established American monthly. Next year Constance Dowman will be retiring from the RPA (where she is General Secretary) after 42 years' service. The RPA has decided to have one Managing Director (as Hector Hawton used to be) instead of two principal officers, as has been the case since Hector's retirement. Ideally the RPA want to find someone with the expertise to handle both the editorial and the financial/admin. side of the RPA but applicants will certainly need to be well qualified in *one* of those fields, and of course committed Humanists. An attractive salary will be paid and letters of application should be addressed to the Chairman of the RPA at 88 Islington High Street, London N1.

□ The IHEU Conference in Amsterdam elected Harold Blackham *Humanist of the Year*, out of all the world's Humanists. He was present to accept the honour with a short, witty and self-deprecating speech. The IHEU is very much his brain-child—he and his Dutch opposite number started it all rolling.

□ Members are asking me about the Red Lion Square Inquiry conducted by Lord Justice Scarman. The police chief Mr. Gerrard gave evidence for two and a half days, I was the second witness and was cross-examined for over two hours on the 26 pages of evidence that I had provided. Six barristers cross-question every witness. The whole process will take weeks and I can't imagine the voluminousness of the whole proceedings if they are to be published as such. The key document will be the final report written by Mr. Scarman himself. The manner of the conduct of the Inquiry is a classic example of fairness in action.

□ Following some unsought publicity our funeral ceremony is liable to be in increasing demand. We don't, of course, set out to provide a public service but nor do we want to disappoint people in dire need. Will members of the Society who would be prepared to conduct services please let me know? People have, of course, to be able to act during the day and at about three days notice. We will provide likely volunteers with the necessary

material (two documents) and take whatever other steps the situation calls for.

□ Some horrible summer-holiday-type gremlins got into last month's printing. May I correct just three of their depredations? In my report to the AGM Moncure Conway came as Noncure(!), on p.21 in the first paragraph the word "who" should be deleted and on p.11 "the freedom of assembly was firmly (not 'grimly') upheld". Our General Committee may be many things but "grim" is hardly one of them. And one omission, my fault this time, the General Secretary was left out of the Executive Committee list.

□ Margaret Chisman has sent me a short report of the Humanist Summer Course at Debden House on "Quality of Life: Values in Society". Professor Thring, David Guest, Rose Hacker, Ivor Russell, Christopher Macy and Margaret herself were the speakers and it all went very well. Next year's tutor-organiser will be Linnea Timson, August 18/24. The location Debden again and the theme: "The Humanist and the Healthy Society".

□ The next two-day conference organised by *The Ecologist* will be on Thursday and Friday November 28/29 at Conway Hall. Theme: Ecology and Religion. I shall be taking the Chair for the opening session. Details on request.

PETER CADOGAN

CONWAY DISCUSSIONS

Forms of Freedom

NICOLAS WALTER introduced the discussion by asking two questions. Assuming that we were going to do things differently in this country, that we were to pass through something that might fairly be called a revolution, how would we like our society run? What kind of society do we want and how would it be organised? He quoted from a recent book by Murray Bookchin who wrote, "Freedom has its forms. However personalised, individuated or dad-aesque may be the attack upon prevailing institutions, a liberatory revolution always poses the question of what social forms will replace existing ones."

Early European revolutions, including that of America (since it was a European export) took the form of parliaments elected to rule in the people's name. This was the aspiration of liberal revolutions and we see the same kind of thing happening in Portugal today.

Secondly, however, there are revolutions that argue that parliaments are shams because they are covers for establishments; but, unfortunately, the alternative has always turned out to be yet another kind of class dictatorship, allegedly coming from below, witness Russia, China and Cuba.

The question is then raised as to whether there may be another kind of revolution based in a non-authoritarian way on workers' councils. The idea here is that, instead of a political party seizing governmental power, authority is taken locally by councils of the people, who work or live in a given place. The resultant theory and practice is that of a new kind of direct administration.

The early Soviets of 1905 and 1907 in Russia and experiments in Germany, Italy and Hungary in 1918/19 were attempts of this order. Everywhere, however, they were defeated, either by their enemies or their friends. In much the same way the Bolsheviks smashed the Kronstaat Soviets by force and subsequent experiments in Spain, Poland and Hungary were put down.

Mr Walter again quoted Murray Bookchin who pointed out that the idea of a workers' council limited the notion of government to the place of work. But workers are people! They are members of the community concerned with other things besides industry, and government cannot be delimited to what transpires on the industrial base only. This means that a system of councils is called for in which individual interests and aspirations in their wholeness can be met.

This is not a new idea because it was advocated by William Morris in "News from Nowhere" and can be taken right back to the Anglo Saxon Moot, or assembly of the whole people in a given area, designed to take political decisions. This idea also goes back to ancient Athens in which all citizens took an equal and alternating share in public responsibilities.

He pointed out that with the French Revolution the important thing was not the National Assembly, but the local Sections of Paris and it was those that the Jacobins suppressed. It was likewise in the Paris Commune in 1870. The Commune, i.e. the Assembly, got all the publicity, but in fact what really mattered was the network of clubs and local societies that ran the neighbourhoods.

He also pointed out that there has been undue emphasis on the importance of the town and industry at the expense of people in the countryside; whereas the practical experience in China and Russia has been that it was the peasantry not the industrial proletariat that understood the deeper meaning of revolutionary change. This was because, in the nature of their work (governed by the seasons and working with their hands with their own families) they have a closeness to reality denied to those whose working life is governed by the alienating influences of the clock and the wages system.

Kropotkin and others talked about "free association", but they had no well-defined scheme in mind. Too many theorists have stopped at the syndicalist position, discussing only what happens in factory or pit, whereas the unit of the future may well be the community, i.e. a village or urban parish.

If we are to think realistically about the future we have to concern ourselves with mundane matters and if we don't find the answers to the problems they raise, then our wider vision might come to nothing.

P.C.

(Report of a talk on Tuesday April 30)

Nostalgia, A Real Illusion

ONE MAN'S nostalgia is another man's agnosticism and Dr Jerry Ravetz opened his address by instancing some of the different meanings of the word.

In Leeds, the city in which he works and a place much beset by intensive renewal, there are those who simply say "Leave our city alone". There is, however, a Yorkshire song that says "Things ain't what they used to be. And they never bloody were!" Again in York there is a remarkable museum displaying a full-scale cobbled street, flanked by shops and houses. It is very nostalgic, only there are no smells and no bugs.

We cannot recreate the past for what we recreate is always an illusion, but the illusion can be real for us, and in being real, constitute a political force. A sense of the past provides us with a feeling of continuity and security and this is of consequence, even though it may be spurious.

Our nostalgia for the old days is always a distortion. We don't remember the past, we remember our memories, which is not the same thing and even those memories were in the first place highly conditioned by our situation at the time. What stays with us is again modified and our judgment is

constantly changing. We do, however, reconstruct the past and this both influences present behaviour and how we see the future.

Is this a good or a bad thing? Should we dwell on illusions? We are all nostalgic for something and if we try to dismiss it we are liable to be truncated. Nostalgia can be constructive or destructive, depending upon circumstances. Rather than passing judgment upon the phenomenon, it might be better to deepen our understanding of how it happens.

There are no doubt some forms of scholarship influenced by nostalgia and this is especially true of historical studies. Men can discover and persuade themselves that in the past things were *really* happening and the historian may find reality for himself in his own artificial reconstructions. In the extreme case, as in mediaeval science, there were many proposals that contain no truth at all and were utterly off the point. St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologica* outlined a synthesis of faith and reason, bodily and godly, that turned out to be without foundation. He brought together Christian and Greek traditions out of devotion to both and without regard to experimental observation.

Reading into History

The same kind of thing applies to contemporary left-wing historians. Edward Thompson imposed his own interpretation upon the events of the early 1800s, reading into them a character contemporaries did not discern for themselves. Auguste Comte, nostalgic about the 18th century Enlightenment, tried to erect a system that re-stated the Enlightenment in the context of 19th century growth and development alien to his original subject.

It is a commonplace of today that we look back very sympathetically on the smaller communities of England in previous centuries, but we tend to forget that frequently the human relations in those communities were brutal.

Can one have nostalgia for the future? This is a difficult accomplishment, but a few people, like William Morris, have found it feasible. Generally, however, thinking about the future yields toughness, planning and cold rationality and a discounting of the emotions; and this is reflected in much architectural practice concerned with slum rebuilding. Tower blocks became a commercial rip-off, and architects draftsmen for vandals. If we changed our sensibilities, then circumstances can change, but this means altering our whole conception of what is the good life. Our knowledge of the past is a man-made construction and it may be our social duty to engineer it. Historians are doing this all the time, should we not do it too?

Dr Ravetz instanced George Orwell's *1984* in which the white-collar classes are consciously engaged and deliberately manufacturing the past. Everything gets manipulated and ultimately rendered meaningless until eventually the people at the top turn out to be mad. And so it would be with us if we were to decide about the past and compel others to believe it. We are, therefore, on difficult ground. To deny the past and simply to exploit it is to promote the rule of madness. A certain nostalgia can be used to justify Fascism.

Put philosophically, we wrestle with the problems of the memories of memories. Dr Ravetz asked the question "What evidence is there that I am the same person I was once as a small boy?" The difficulties concerned with nostalgia are no greater than with other forms of knowledge. Nostalgia gives comfort, but it is also evanescent and dependent upon memories. It is not a sin and not much of a weakness. It is the human condition. One might live in the here and now, neither heeding the past, nor anticipating the future, but this would be a dead way of life. If we find someone who is tender about nothing, he can be very vicious, no matter how immaculate his intellect.

Tenderness, it seems, is linked to nostalgia.

P.C.

(Report of a talk on May 21)

BOOK REVIEW



Economics and the Public Purpose by J. K. Galbraith, André Deutsch, £3.25
"THE best economic system is the one that supplies the most of what people most want."

No apology need be offered for bringing this book to the notice of SPES members in these anxious times, when economic instability seems so plainly the result of power exercised without respect for ethics. This of course is not the only fault. Nor is there any real consensus as to *who* is abusing power so shamefully; tell me of one, and I'll tell you of another!

Hence it is a virtue of Galbraith's book that he never lays stress on ethical claims; he puts his trust in the reader to know. The public purpose, after all, is very large bound up with social justice—which is a name for economics conjoined to ethics. As an economist, his job is to learn about economic facts, to consider economic theories, and make up his mind whether the facts make the theories look foolish or fair enough, as the case may be. When a theory does look foolish, it is sensible to see a better one. As he aptly remarks at the end of chapter eleven, no theory should lead to totally implausible conclusions. A sobering thought, sadly unfamiliar to utopians!

Out-dated

So to the remarkable fact (and nobody who reads this book can remain in doubt about it) that our central economic theory still enshrines a stereotype from which reality departed long ago. Out of the old market economy known to Adam Smith, where prices are settled by toiling producers and prudent consumers, a more sophisticated system has evolved. Industrialisation and the advance of technology created a demand for substantial investments in plant. The market response was to assemble capital by the creation of joint stock companies.

Today, the result is dramatic. In America, "the two largest industrial corporations, General Motors and Exxon, have revenues far exceeding those of California and New York. With Ford and General Electric they (exceed) . . . those of all farm, fishing and forestry enterprises". Putting it mildly, "there exists an extremely asymmetrical industrial structure, with the bulk of economic activity controlled by an elite of a few hundred enormous corporations and the remainder divided among four hundred *thousand* small and medium-sized businesses".

Money Games

Monopoly? Well—nearly full Marx. However, "Marx saw much of the tendency of capitalist development, but he did not have the supernatural power of seeing in his time all that would eventually transpire. Much has happened since. . . ." So it would be a mistake "to substitute one insufficient view of economic society for another. Honesty and perhaps courage are associated with acceptance of *what exists*." And that is what is thoroughly and clearly set out in the first half of this book; wholly serious, it is also entertaining, with the author's characteristic irony—brief, shrewd, never acrimonious. Galbraith does have courage and not only is he honest, he is honourable—a more unusual quality.

Far from condemning the huge productive enterprises as monopolists, he accepts them for the benefits they bring by "economy of scale". Given even a rudimentary knowledge of watch manufacture, let alone such industries as electric light bulbs, plastic mouldings and electronic components, e.g. transistors, it is easy to see that such things must be either very

abundant and cheap, or else quite rare and costly. How would scarcity serve public purpose?

Big Brother Business

Of course, the giant enterprise has the power to prescribe the terms on which it obtains raw materials and other requisites. Minor rivals cannot make so good a bargain, nor can they compete with its selling prices. So prices are set by the big corporation to give a chosen margin. Wage settlements are therefore passed on directly to the consumer, and there is some suspicion that the unions meet with less resistance because of this.

Clearly the effect of these near-monopolies on the economy is very far-reaching, nevertheless it bears little resemblance to the expectations of textbook theory. For these asset-laden giants, *growth* is the primary objective; profits are ploughed back, shares rise and the shareholders slide into a passive role. The executive management or "technostructure", rather than the nominal directorate, becomes dominant; and traditional incentives give way to the needs and opportunities of bureaucratisation.

In contrast to this, over very wide areas of the economy no such oligopoly is feasible, particularly where cost of labour is a much bigger proportion than capital assets. This is true, for instance, in much of the retail distributive trade, in repair services and maintenance work, and personal services in law, health and adornment. Geographical spread is also a contributory factor in these cases, as it is in farming, fishing and many light industries. All this operates on the market basis.

The coexistence within the economy of these two quite dissimilar systems, one characterised by stability and strong "planning", the other a "market" system, competitive and more vulnerable, gives rise to interactions far more complex than the models of economic theory. Hence this book would still be a masterly achievement if the author had done no more than to provide in plain language his lucid analysis of these typical systems, their interplay with each other, with capital supply, and with the interventions of government for management of demand and other purposes.

Them and U.S.

However, that is truly the preparatory groundwork, as the foreword makes clear. "It is then that the book gets on to the questions of what to do. By these I set much store". About a hundred pages are given to discussing a constructive policy for reform in the US, and most of this is applicable elsewhere. The mixed economy is a more intriguing mixture than orthodoxy cares to admit. Even by Americans the salt tang of socialism has long been accepted, under less alarming names, and Galbraith may well succeed in adding more relish. "The new socialism is not ideological; it is compelled by circumstance, (namely) the retarded development of the *market* system, (where) certain of the retarded industries are of peculiar importance not alone for comfort, well-being, tranquillity and happiness but also for continued existence. They provide shelter, health services, and local transportation of people."

The urge to go on quoting must be resisted. For all who really care about the sheer economic confusion around us, all who prefer clarity and reason to the vulgarity of party rhetoric and vilification, all who are willing to chew and not merely to swallow, for all these there is no substitute for reading the book itself. *It does matter.* "Left to themselves, economic forces do not work out for the best except perhaps for the powerful."

DR. A. L. LOVECY

Your Viewpoint



Ireland

Since our mainly ageing middle-class membership, (or should it be Leadership) is not remarkable for its ability to orientate and activate itself, prefer-rign rather to ponder the glories that are passed I was not surprised to hear it was not anxious to consider the Irish problem.

The question is: is SPES for members only or should it help others to make up their minds? I recognise that some things put on are vital, relevant, of real impact, albeit sometimes marred by the contributions to dissension by our resident bores. But since to the average mind the media are educationally useless, merely resulting (perhaps intentionally?) in a continuing state of utter confusion, I believe Conway Hall can and should play a real part here.

In the Bogside in 48 hours between 25 and 30 houses are raided by the Army. It is unlikely that they enter in the urbane manner of a policeman entering our homes, especially if their mates have been shot down beside them. One can imagine what these visits mean in terms of inconvenience, anguish, bitterness and hatred.

Due to a natural fertility and the Catholic Church there are a lot of Irish in Britain. Perhaps they do not love us as they should. It is distressing if they are not grateful to be allowed to live here and do our dirty work, but that's life!

It is well-known that the Irish are less amenable to discipline and organisation than the Anglo-Saxons. For this reason I believe that much guerilla activity is free-lance. For this reason it could go on for years. State power and the mulish 'firmness' of politicians have so far achieved what? In NW3 we have had four little carrier-bag bombs. I do not know if the injured have recovered. Are not car bombs rather easy to plant here?

The function of a politician is to bend to pressure. Unfortunately, Business Establishment pressure tends to cancel out People Pressure, which makes for a stance of mental paralysis on "firmness". Perhaps we should step-up people pressure. A "Troops-Out" movement already exists, but lacks muscle and drive. Only the Irish can settle the Irish Question. We may be too late now, but publication of this letter might activate a brain or two.

KEN HARDING

Those Numbers

Like most of us I enjoy a bit of banter well enough, but even allowing for the silly season I think the dispute about "our numbers" by Messrs. Sheldon and Cadogan was space wasted (approx. 30 and 40 lines respectively). If our intake does average ten a month and we grant twelve months' grace *after* expiry of the year's subscription, we can have about 240 "birds of passage" included in our total 800 or so. Well, I leave it to members to think what they will about *that*!

Why disclaim being open to all-comers? Neither our rules nor our practice supports the notion of *exclusiveness*, and it is not in itself attractive, or typical of humanist thinking. So people join, and some find their sympathy with our declared objects is strengthened (as mine has been) on a more realistic appreciation of what the vague words may signify.

If others find their sympathy diminishing on closer acquaintance, then it is at least possible that *we* are at fault. How can we be sure that they are in the Society on a misreading of its identity? That they, and not we, should think again?

Smallness there will be, and ugly at that, if all who feel doubts are

ushered to the door. When this happens to people like Max and May Sheldon who, in a quiet way, have given very valuable practical help to this Society, I find the problem much too disturbing to be dismissed with no incisive thought.

Certainly our religious foundation is not to be taken lightly, and that is what the legal fuss is about. The worn-out notion that reason and religion are irreconcilable does linger on, and still has support from persons of repute. Against this, very little has yet been done to enable our own members to understand the problem, and the line of argument the Committee has adopted to meet it.

DR. A. L. LOVECY

London E4

The General Secretary replies: Membership is the heart of our Society, there is nothing "silly" about discussing it. The fact is that currently we both gain and lose about ten members a month. Lapses are the biggest source of loss but there are also deaths and resignations (usually for personal reasons). Every voluntary organisation faces the problem of "birds of passage", we have to live with it as we try to do something about it. A fair number of people do seem to join us on what turns out to be a passing impulse (and 75p is not a deterrent!) and our openness is such that we accept them and a year later face the consequences.

Our aims and objects specify what we are about and we don't expect people like the Jehovah's Witnesses to join us! One evangelist *did* join us a few years ago and one could sense our meetings groaning when she tried to take us back to revelation. She then told me, in private, that she had joined the Society to convert us! No one suggested she had to go but she was reminded about the aims and objects of the Society and eventually, to our relief, she lapsed of her own accord. She still comes back occasionally and is made welcome. That story is a fair indication of our attitude and tolerance.

Free Speech

Having re-read Professor Hyman Levy's letter (September) several times, I'm still not sure about whom and/or what he is attacking and/or defending. Presumably, Professor Levy would prefer to combat Racism in (to use his terms) a "verbal battle" rather than a "real battle".

As a supporter of freedom of speech (that is, freedom within the law), I'm unpleasantly surprised that SPES does not allow on its platform the points of view of "evangelical religion and party politics". (Can it be that there was some sort of mix-up in the printing of The General Secretary's reply?) Incidentally, there is surely no law in this country against the criticism of laws.

CHARLES BYASS

Farnham Common, Bucks.

☉ What are Prof Levy and Peter Cadogan really arguing about? I ask the question for neither of them actually defines the real issue at all. Yet it is a very simple issue. It is whether Conway Hall ought to be let to the National Front or similar organisations commonly regarded as fascist or racist in their views.

What are the views which the National Front propagates in Conway Hall? If we accept that they are the same views as they put forward elsewhere, it may be pertinent to quote from a leaflet recently issued by

them to try and recruit school students to their ranks:

"Are you tired of having to endure Social Studies or History lessons where the teacher continually tries to run down Britain, while at the same time Black kids have "Black Studies" to give them more self-respect and Black pride?

Are you tired of lessons where the teacher has to go at a snail's pace to allow immigrant kids who don't speak English a chance to keep up?"

(Copies of this leaflet were recently circulated to members of the SPES General Committee.)

Peter Cadogan defends letting Conway Hall to this organisation because "We are committed to the rightness of the freedom of speech and assembly" which he describes as "the ethical position deeper than politics".

I seriously question this view. The question of whether or not we let Conway Hall to a particular body does not, I suggest, depend only on whether we accept freedom of speech and assembly. When you let a hall to an organisation, you are surely doing more than just recognising its right to free speech. You are, in fact, actively helping them to express their particular views. You are co-operating with them to enable them to do so and this is not gainsaid by the fact that you may charge them for it: this only converts the arrangement to a wholly or partially commercial one.

The question at issue, therefore, is not whether we recognise the right of the National Front to freedom of speech and assembly but whether SPES should actively assist them and co-operate with them. None of us advocates that the National Front should be forcibly suppressed by law. It is also perfectly clear that the NF is quite able to secure freedom of speech without any help from us. They put up candidates for Parliament and local councils. They hold frequent meetings all over the country. Only a tiny proportion of their meetings is held in Conway Hall. To argue that a refusal on our part to let Conway Hall for their meetings would deprive them of freedom of speech is plainly nonsense. To argue that we must let Conway Hall to them can only mean to argue that SPES ought actively to co-operate with them in their propaganda.

There is no escape from the dilemma. I, for one, cannot accept co-operation with the National Front on the basis of eloquent but quite phoney arguments based on freedom of speech. I invite those of your readers who agree with me to drop me a line to let me know.

J. STEWART COOK

37 Frances Road, Windsor, Berks

④ It was sad to read the letter from Professor Hyman Levy, for whose rationality I have hitherto had the highest regard. His technique of using a "weasel" word such as racism was well developed by the late unlamented Joseph Goebbels and Julius Streicher. Under its impact we are supposed to shut up. But could the weasel word not also have been "religion" which sent so many to the rack or stake, or "democracy" which sent them to the guillotine?

Professor Hyman Levy may not be aware that the Nazi movement was forbidden at different times by various German governments, notably those of Bavaria, Hesse and Prussia. They were banned from holding public meetings, conducting marches, or wearing uniforms. It made no difference. On the contrary it brought them into the public eye as persecuted minorities.

The only time I myself have heard a National Front speaker was in Conway Hall, when a certain Martin Webster insisted on coming on to the platform during a meeting of a perfectly respectable society of which I am a member. After seeing and hearing him I decided I would never

have any dealings with his organisation. Does this not justify the decision of our General Secretary and our General Committee?

I realise that my views on race may not agree with those of many members of SPES. But I have lived and worked amongst the peoples of Africa, the Middle East and Asia, and the factor of race is one which we must face up to in honest, open and even combative discussion. It has to long been dodged. "Social limitations" on freedom of speech finish up, as in pre-war Japan, with police powers to suppress "dangerous thoughts".

G. K. YOUNG

London, W14

South Place News

New Members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members: Mr R. Kenyon, SW17; Mr J. Slater, Oldham, Lancs; Mrs R. Colman, NW8; Mrs E. Monks, W2; Mrs M. Fischer, Surrey; Mrs Y. Awbery, WC1; Mr N. S. Cane, Kent; Mr M. Segal, WC1; Mrs I. Burall, NW3; Mr C. Greaves, EC1; Mr E. Esat, NW3; Miss L. Shaw, Wores; Mr K. Lucas, SE23; Miss E. Glen, SE23; Mrs D. Hutchison, N10 and Mr O. Xaviers, E17.

Obituary

We regret to report the death of Mr Richard Fox.

Tributes to George Dowman

Louise Booker writes: George Dowman was an outstanding member of South Place, and gave unstinted service for 53 years. He served on the General Committee, was Editor of the *Record*, and later Acting Treasurer. He arranged the music for the Society's meetings. His Musical Afternoons with Friends at Sunday Socials were very much enjoyed.

He had many abilities and qualities, singing, composing music, writing articles and poetry, and having wit and humour, but above all he was a very humane person, courteous and helpful, and extremely kind and thoughtful, a warm personality who will be long remembered.

Rose Bush writes: I would like to pay my personal tribute to George Dowman, whose friendship I have enjoyed over many years. His sympathetic nature made him always concerned for the welfare of others and his memory of friends and acquaintances and their doings was quite fabulous. We shall miss him as a distinguished member and upholder of our Society and much more so as a kindly and friendly personality.

Eric Willoughby writes: George was one of the first people to talk to me in the early days of my SPES membership, and his warmth of personality and wry sense of humour showed itself immediately. As a former Editor of this journal he gave me a few helpful hints, but above all, his forbearance in the face of illness and the march of time was exemplary for us all. For me, at any rate, the very atmosphere of Conway Hall has suffered a sad loss.

Dr A. Lovecy writes: Beyond the circle of his close friends, George was always a familiar figure at our Sunday meetings. The natural word to use is always, for that was the impression he made on me as a sceptical newcomer. His unobtrusive diligence, musically and committee-wise, seemed almost to personify the benign and enduring tradition of the old Society. In those days we often met with two or three others for a drink before lunch. Perhaps we were groping our way to a sociability which has now become our coffee custom. No such thoughts at the time; we were just enjoying a lively gossip and George Dowman's funny stories, an inexhaustible repertoire.

George Hutchinson writes: George Dowman added much to the artistic side of South Place. He sang at many of the Sunday morning meetings, and had a liking for songs by Walthew—another musician much associated with the Society. George also had a lot to do with the selection of singers and players for the Sunday morning meetings, a responsibility he carried out with great taste. The evening concerts saw him often, and at one time he was a member of the concerts sub-committee.

For any ordinary person, this would have been sufficient, but as other tributes show, the musical activities were but a small part of the total contribution George made in service to our Society.

Sunday Social

Sunday, October 20, 3 p.m. Guest will be Mr Peter Megoran, assistant curator, William Morris Gallery. Talk, with slides, on William Morris, followed by tea.

Country Dancing

Saturday, October 19, 3 to 6 p.m. Jointly with Progressive League, in the Library. Everyone, including beginners, welcome.

Bridge Drive

Thursday, October 17, 6.30 p.m. in the Library. Members and friends welcome, light refreshments served. Regular Bridge practice Sundays, 6 p.m.

Kindred Organisations

The **Humanist Holidays** event in Brighton, October 18-20, costs £7 for the whole weekend, not per day as stated in the September *Record*.

The **National Secular Society** is sponsoring a meeting with the title Religious Education—The New Indoctrination? on November 1, in Conway Hall. The meeting on November 1 at 7.45 p.m. will have Brigid Brophy, Harry Stopes-Roe, David Pollock, Michael Lloyd-Jones and Barbara Smoker as the speakers. The NSS is also publishing a booklet for the festive season. Called *Our Pagan Christmas*, the booklet, written by Richard Condon costs 20p plus 4p postage. Orders to 698 Holloway Road, London N19.

The **Humanist Housing Association** is completing conversion of a house at Sunhill Place, Pembury, Tunbridge Wells into ten flats. The single-bedroom flats, for elderly individuals or couples, will be available early next year on the basis of a life tenancy in return for an interest-free investment in loan stock. Only service charge and rates will be payable, and communal services including laundry will be provided. Anyone interested in occupying a flat should contact the Secretary, Rose Bush Court, Parkhill Road, NW3.

The Annual General Meeting at the **Voluntary Euthanasia Society** is

being held on October 26 at 2.30 p.m. in the Tudor Room, Caxton Hall, London. Speaker, Dr D. H. Clark. Discussion will include formation of a Constitution. Members and sympathisers welcome. Full details from General Secretary, tel: 01-937 7770.

An international conference on Computers and the Humanities is to be held in April at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, by the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing. Papers and performances, concerning the arts and humanities or computer-related research, should be submitted for inclusion by January 15, 1975. Performances are likely to include computer-generated music, graphics, etc. Full details from Prof Robert Dilligan, ICCH/2 Founders Hall 407, University of Southern California, LA, CA 90007, USA.

(Continued from page 2)

Tuesday, October 22

7.00 pm—Discussion introduced by Dr W. Grey Walter. Subject: Expectancy and Guessing in Human Brains

Sunday, October 27

11.00 am—Sunday Meeting: PETER CADOGAN on *The Long Exile of the Idea of Justice*. Cello solos: Emma Ferrand

3.00 pm—Forum: Man, the Pattern-Making Animal with Victor Rose.

6.00 pm—Bridge Practice

6.30 pm—Concert: Edinburgh String Quartet. Mendelssohn Efl Op 12, Seiber No 3 Quartetto Lirico, Schubert G Op 161 D887

Tuesday, October 29

7.00 pm—Discussion introduced by Annette Rich. Subject: Culture Clash and Decision

* * * *

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

THE USES OF PAIN Jonathan Miller 10p

3½p postage for one—7p for two or more

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, £1 p.a.; Life Members, £21 (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 £1) 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 £1. Matter for publication should reach the Editor, Eric Willoughby, 46 Springfield Road, London E17 8DD, by the 5th of the preceding month.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

SOUTH PLACE SUNDAY CONCERTS

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

Alfred J. Clements, Organiser and Hon. Secretary from 1887 to 1938

REPORT OF THE EIGHTY-THIRD SEASON, 1973-74

AS can be seen from the lists overpage, the aim to have a good cross-section of Mozart's chamber music was mainly achieved, only one work hoped for, the string trio E flat Divertimento, not being included. We plan to have it next season. Another aim, not advertised, was to have as many woodwind works as possible. In consequence programmes were more varied than usual.

Attendances were up on the previous season with 500 more tickets sold. Although we think our attendances are reasonable considering the size of the hall and the large number of concerts in London on Sunday evenings, we do have room for bigger audiences, and a main aid to a fuller hall must be the personal advertising of our regulars. They have a strong case—the finest artists, high quality and varied programmes, excellent acoustics and modest admission charges—all made possible by the generous co-operation of the artists and financial help from South Place Ethical Society, the London Orchestral Concert Board and the London Borough of Camden.

Musicians' Benevolent Fund Concert

The Gabrieli String Quartet gave their services on 28th April for this concert. Sir Thomas Armstrong spoke of the work of the Fund. South Place Ethical Society paid all running expenses and gave the Hall. This meant that admission receipts, the proceeds of a collection, special donations and the profits from the sale of scores which altogether amounted to the record sum of £142.91, could be paid to the Fund without deduction.

DONATIONS

We are very grateful for the support of the following subscribers to the Subscription Fund:—

A. N. Arnold, F. W. Dale, T. J. Gordon, D. H. P. Levy, W. Magee, M. Niemand, P. Timmins.

THE STORY OF TWO THOUSAND CONCERTS **BY FRANK V. HAWKINS**

Price 75p. Obtainable from S.P.E.S. Bookstall Sunday mornings, at the Concerts Sunday evenings or by post (80p post free) from the Hon. Treasurer, 129 West Hill Road, SW18 5HN.

Number of Concerts in the Season: 27. Total number of Seat Tickets sold: 6,777.

Total number of Concerts in the Series: 2,142.

LIST OF ENSEMBLES AND ARTISTS WHO APPEARED DURING THE EIGHTY-THIRD SEASON

Ensembles: New London Wind Ensemble with John Streets, Tilford Festival Ensemble.
Sextet (Strings): Georgian Quartet with Kenneth Essex and Olga Hegedus.
Sextet (Horn): Alberni String Quartet with Ifor James and Anthony Randall.
Quintet (Horn): Alan Civil and the Haffner String Quartet.
Quintets (Clarinet and Strings): John McCaw and the Jupiter String Quartet, Janet Hilton and the Lindsay String Quartet, Daphne Downe and the Tilford Festival Ensemble.
Quintets (Two Violas): Alberni String Quartet with Graeme Scott, Georgian Quartet with Kenneth Essex, Haffner String Quartet with Kenneth Essex, Lindsay String Quartet with Graeme Scott.
Piano Quintets: Clifford Benson and the Chilingirian String Quartet, Margaret Bateson and the Jupiter String Quartet.
String Quartets: Alberni (2), Chilingirian, Dartington, Delme, Edinburgh, Fitzwilliam, Gabrieli, Georgian (3), Haffner (3), Jupiter, Lindsay (2), Medici†.
Piano Quartet: Richards.
Oboe Quartet: London.
Piano Trios: Schiller†, Tunnell.
Trio (Clarinet): Thea King with members of the Tunnell Trio.
Trio (Flute, Viola and Harp): Robles.
Trio (Flute, Violin and Viola): Christopher Hyde-Smith, Galina Solodchin and John Underwood.
Violin and Piano: Manoug Parikian and Malcolm Binns.
Voice and Piano: Ian Partridge and Jennifer Partridge.
Instrumentalists: Mesdames Margaret Bateson, Sylvia Cleaver, Janet Craxton, Daphne Downe, Rachel Godlee, Joy Hall, Perry Hart, Olga Hegedus†, Janet Hilton†, Vera Kantrovich, Thea King, Nona Liddell, Jennifer Partridge, Marisa Robles, Mary Ryan, Galina Solodchin, Jean Stewart, Susan Tunnell. Messrs. Gregory Baron, Miles Baster, Michael Beeston, Clifford Benson, Roger Best, Roger Bigley, Malcolm Binns, Ronald Birks, Roger Birnstingl, Neil Black, Timothy Brown†, Mark Butler, Peter Carter, Levon Chilingirian, James Christie, Alan Civil, Peter Cropper, Howard Davis, Ian Davies†, Nicholas Dowding†, David Edwards, Kenneth Essex, Berian Evans, Michael Evans, Alan George†, Bernard Gregor-Smith, Philip de Groote, Keith Harvey, Brian Hawkins, Kenneth Heath, John Holloway†, Christopher Hyde-Smith, Ifor James†, Ian Jewel, Homi Kanga, Malcolm Latchem, Anthony Lewist†, Keith Lovell, John McCaw†, John Marson†, David Matthewst, Brendan O'Reilly, Manoug Parikian, Austin Patterson, John Phillips†, Peter Pople, Keith Puddy, Anthony Randall†, Bernard Richards, Bernard Roberts, Paul Robertson†, Simon Rowland-Jones, Colin Sauer, Alan Schiller, Ernest Scott, Graeme Scott, Kenneth Sillito, Paul Silverthorne†, David Smith, Stephen Srawley, John Streets, Charles Tunnell, John Tunnell, George Turnlund, John Underwood, Neil Watson, Christopher Wellington, Trevor Williams.
Vocalist: Ian Partridge.
Speaker: Sir Thomas Armstrong.

† FIRST APPEARANCE AT THESE CONCERTS

LIST OF WORKS PERFORMED DURING THE EIGHTY-THIRD SEASON.

Septet (Flute, Clarinet, Harp, String Quartet): Ravel Introduction and Allegro in G flat (1906).
Sextets (Strings): Brahms G Op. 36. Dvorak A Op. 48.
Sextet (Two Horns, String Quartet): Mozart Divertimento B flat K287.
Quintets (Clarinet and Strings): Brahms B mi Op. 115. Mozart A K581. Weber B flat Op. 34.
Quintets (Two Violas): Beethoven C Op. 29. Brahms G Op. 111. Dvorak E flat Op. 97.
Mozart C mi K406, C K515, G mi K516, D K593, E flat K614.
Quintet (Horn): Mozart E flat K407.
Piano Quintets: Bloch No. 1. Dvorak A Op. 81.
Quintets (Piano and Wind): Beethoven E flat Op. 16. Mozart E flat K452.
Quintet (Flute, Violin, Viola, Cello, Harp): Roussel Serenade Op. 30.

String Quartets: Bartok No. 1 A mi Op. 7 (1908), No. 2 A mi Op. 17, No. 3 (1927). Beethoven F. Op. 18 No. 1, B flat Op. 18 No. 6, C Op. 59, No. 3, E flat Op. 74, F mi Op. 95, F Op. 135. Brahms A mi Op. 51 No. 2. Dvorak F Op. 96, A flat Op. 105, G Op. 106. Haydn D mi Op. 42, C Op. 54 No. 2, C Op. 76 No. 3, B flat Op. 76 No. 4, D Op. 76 No. 5, E flat Op. 76 No. 6, G Op. 77 No. 1, B flat Op. 103 (unfinished). Hummel G Op. 30 No. 2†. Janacek No. 1 Emi†. Mozart G K387, D mi K421, E flat K428, F flat K458, A K464, C K465, D K499, D K575, B flat K589, F K590. Schubert D mi Op. Posth. D810. Shostakovich No. 8 Op. 110. Tippett No. 2 F sharp. Webern Five Pieces Op. 5†. Wolf Italian Serenade in G.

Piano Quartets: Kenneth Leighton Contrasts and Variants Op. 63†. Mozart G mi K478, E flat K493.

Quartets (Oboe and Strings): Britten Phantasy (1932). Lutyens "Driving Out the Death"†. Mozart F K370.

Quartet (Cor Anglais and Strings): Mozart Adagio K580a†.

Quartet (Flute and Strings): Mozart D K285.

Quartet (Wind): Stamitz E flat Op. 8 No. 2†.

String Trio: Purcell Two Fantasias.

Piano Trio: Mozart E K542.

Trio (Clarinet, Cello, Piano): Brahms A mi Op. 114.

Trio (Clarinet, Violin, Piano): Bartok Contrasts (1938).

Trio (Piano, Clarinet, Viola): Mozart E flat K498.

Trios (Piano, Violin, Horn): Berkeley Op. 44†. Brahms E flat Op. 40. Duvernoy No. 1†.

Trio (Flute, Violin, Viola): Beethoven Serenade D Op. 25.

Trios (Flute, Viola, Harp): Debussy Sonata G mi. Leclair Sonata D Op. 2 No. 8. Papastavrou Spinks St. Nicholas Suite†.

Trio (Oboe, Clarinet, Bassoon): Milhaud Suite D'Après Corrette.

Violin and Piano: Mozart Sonatas E mi K304, B flat K454, A K526. Nin Rhapsodie ibérienne†.

Horn and Piano: Corelli Sonata (arr. Sabatini)†.

Violin and Harp: Saint-Saëns Fantaisie Op. 124†.

Violin and Viola: Mozart Duos G K423, B flat K424.

Violin and Cello: Martinu Duo†.

Harp Solos: Hasselmens "La Source". Salzedo "Song in the Night".

Voice and Piano: Britten "Winter Words". Schubert "Schwanengesang". Purcell Songs (4).

† FIRST TIME AT THESE CONCERTS

These Concerts were given with financial assistance from South Place Ethical Society, the London Borough of Camden, and the London Orchestral Concert Board representing the Arts Council of Great Britain and the Greater London Council.

Eighty-Fourth Season, 1974-75

Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, Holborn, WC1R 4RL

Every Sunday from 6th October, 1974, to 27th April, 1975, excepting 22nd and 29th December and 30th March.

Committee: Mrs. E. Barralet, Mrs. I. Burall, Miss V. Hassid, Mrs. H. Hooper, Mrs. M. Lincé, Miss S. Sowter. Messrs. C. Barralet, J. Brebner, C. Browne, M. Goldesgeyme, O. Hooper.

Hon. Secretary: G. Hutchinson, 20 Earls Court Gardens, SW5 0SZ.

Hon. Assistant Secretaries:

Mrs. J. Hutchinson, 20 Earls Court Gardens, SW5 0SZ.

F. Hawkins, "St. Margaret's," Broomfield Avenue, N13 4JJ.

Hon. Treasurer: A. M. Lincé, 129 West Hill Road, SW18 5HN.

Concerts 6.30 p.m. (Doors open 6). Admission 25p. See *Daily Telegraph* every Saturday. Red Lion Square, 3 minutes Holborn Tube. Buses 5, 7, 8b, 19, 22, 23, 25, 32, 38, 38a, 68, 77b, 77c, 170, 170a, 172, 188, 196.

RESERVED SEAT TICKETS. A ticket of admission to the 11 Concerts from 6th October to 15th December which entitles the holder to a reserved seat up to 6.20 p.m. can be obtained from the Hon. Treasurer, 129 West Hill Road, SW18 5HN (stamped addressed envelope, please), or at Conway Hall before each Concert, price £1.38.

SOUTH PLACE SUNDAY CONCERTS

83rd Season, 7th October, 1973—28th April, 1974

Receipts and Payments Account

RECEIPTS	£	PAYMENTS	£
Admissions	993.63	Artists' fees	1,560.00
Season Tickets	350.34	Performing rights	64.16
Sale of programmes	93.24	Printing of programmes	118.00
Mailing list	6.04	Printing of handbills	158.32
Grants: S.P.E.S.	736.53	Advertising (Press)	104.50
L.O.C.B.	830.00	Postage and telephone	125.30
Camden	250.00	Rent for hall, piano	1,084.24
Transfer from Subscription Fund	22.97	Printing and stationery	59.09
		Refreshments for artists	7.85
		Bank charges	1.29
	<u>£3,282.75</u>		<u>£3,282.75</u>

Subscription Fund, 1973—1974

RECEIPTS	£	PAYMENTS	£
Balance brought forward	622.76	Transfer to main account	22.97
Donations	38.03	Balance carried forward	673.22
Interest on deposit account	34.75		
Profit on sale of books65		
	<u>£696.19</u>		<u>£696.19</u>

Special Concert in aid of The Musicians' Benevolent Fund, 28th April, 1974

RECEIPTS	£	PAYMENTS	£
Admissions	46.50	Advertisement	4.50
Season ticket contribution	12.50	Printing of programme	4.75
Collection	75.60	Cheque to M.B.F.	142.91
Sale of scores, profit82		
Sale of programmes	4.24		
Coffee fund contribution	2.50		
Grant from S.P.E.S. to defray expenses	10.00		
	<u>£152.16</u>		<u>£152.16</u>

Clements Memorial Fund

RECEIPTS	£	PAYMENTS	£
Balance brought forward	170.81	Advertising	2.00
Interest	3.72	Adjudicators' fees	31.50
Competitors' fees	9.60	Prize	100.00
		Postage	10.47
		Balance carried forward	40.16
	<u>£184.13</u>		<u>£184.13</u>

Hawkins Chamber Music Library

RECEIPTS	£	PAYMENTS	£
Balance brought forward	60.92	Purchase of scores	104.60
Interest (P.O.)	1.26	Balance carried forward	63.49
(Deposit)	2.32		
Sale of scores	103.59		
	<u>£168.09</u>		<u>£168.09</u>

A. M. LINCE, *Hon. Treasurer.*

Examined with the books and vouchers and found correct.
F. V. HAWKINS, O. HOOPER, *Auditors.*

June, 1974.