

# THE



# ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 80, No. 2

FEBRUARY 1975

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: TIME OF DANGER . . . . .	3
FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY . . . . . <i>by Peter Cadogan</i>	4
ETHICAL FEELING . . . . . <i>by Colin Hamer</i>	7
COMMUNITY VALUES AND LOCAL DEMOCRACY . . . . . <i>by T. F. Evans</i>	9
FOR THE RECORD . . . . . <i>by the General Secretary</i>	11
DISCUSSION: EDUCATION—SOCIAL CONDITIONING?	14
FORUM: THE NORMAL NEUROTIC . . . . .	16
YOUR VIEWPOINT . . . . .	17
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

### Sunday, February 2

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: HECTOR HAWTON on The Male Chauvinism of D. H. Lawrence.** Soprano solos: Maria Fogerty

6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice** in the Library, with light refreshments

6.30 pm—**Concert:** Ilse Wolf, Paul Hamburger, Janet Hilton. Schubert "Der Hirt auf dem Felsen" Op 129, Schubert Leider. Brahms F Op 120, No 1, Poulenc 1963 clarinet and piano sonatas

### Tuesday, February 4

7.00 pm—**Discussion** introduced by Michael Duane. **The Politics for the Size of Classes** (first in Education discussion series)

### Sunday, February 9

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: SHEILA ROSENBERG on Unitarianism, Positivism and the Fox Circle.** Tenor solos: Harvey Kesselman

3.00 pm—**Forum: Ireland and the English Conscience** with Bill Hetherington

6.00 pm—**Bridge practice**

6.30 pm—**Concert:** Tilford Festival Ensemble, Lissa Gray. Schoenberg "Pierrot Lunaire", Roussel Trio Op 40 F. Schmidt trio

*(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

THE USES OF PAIN Jonathan Miller 10p

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

# THE ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 80, No. 2

FEBRUARY 1975

---

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

---

## EDITORIAL

### Time of Danger

THERE is an ominous aspect to the troubled times in which we live, and the matter has importance for all thinking people.

With rampant inflation, shortages of normally plentiful goods, political strife and the apparent absence of a competent future leader of any hue, a dangerous situation exists.

Dangerous because they are factors which have been important in the development of tyrannical and barbarous societies in the past.

The only real difference in most of the other countries has been that an extremist party has had popular support. Hitler's party had a majority when the atrocities started, but it is the man's rise to power with which we should be most interested.

At the moment, there is in Britain no single person who could be singled out to rise to power on the backs of people whose living standards are declining. But there may be, in the background, the very man with eloquence and charisma to capture public imagination. But the time is not yet ripe, and such people know when to step into the arena. We must be on our guard.

There seems to be little threat of a military revolution in Britain just now, but again, when our lives are threatened by terrorists, we are more dependent than usual on the defence forces.

This, then, is the time when ideological argument needs to be made more forcefully than ever for the things we believe in. True, this holds good for whatever that belief is, but evil beliefs start off, at any rate, as minority ones.

To this extent, the demise of the peace movement in Britain is specially lamentable. People and organisations are more necessary than ever now to be on the lookout for danger signs.

On our own doorstep, recent events in Northern Ireland have shown how easy it is for a full-scale uprising to get under way. True, this has been kept under control, of a sort, by the army, but we in Britain have felt the effects, too.

At last, after nearly five years of violence, the churches admitted their role in the situation at the turn of the year and organised the talks which led to the ceasefire. All credit to them for that, but what a pity it could not have happened years earlier!

In our money-orientated way of life, idealisms have largely gone by the board, and it only needs someone, or a small group with persuasive rhetoric, to start the hatred ball rolling. Repeat, we must be on our guard.

# Freedom of Speech and Assembly

BY

PETER CADOGAN

IT WAS John Stuart Mill, close friend of *South Place*, who gave us the classic statement on freedom in his *On Liberty*. He wrote:

"If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, had he the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

This is, I think, the last word for people of our persuasion but words are only words until they were turned into deeds by the action, the movement, of people in time and space. Truth is not an incantation. It is the deed that gives substance to the word.

Unhappily great truths are all too commonly forgotten. They are only sustained by being continually restated and re practised in terms of changing circumstances.

The freedom of speech and assembly in England is to be understood essentially in its English context. Other cultures have different conditions and histories and the problem presents itself in different ways. The universal element underlying them all is justice, fairness in the way human beings deal with each other.

There are, basically, two conditions of society, says John Rawls in his *A Theory of Justice*. The first one is the one that we enjoy, that of the near-just or the near-free society. There is no such thing as the wholly free and wholly just society—that is our dream and our aspiration. And dreams and aspirations are what make us human. In practice justice-as-fairness wrestles all the time with an unequal social structure characterised by privilege and deprivation. What we have, though, is something of substance, i.e. "a constitutional regime and a publicly recognised conception of justice."

## Freedom Fight

For over 400 years, since the Fires of Smithfield, we have waged an unending struggle for freedom and justice and it has borne very considerable fruit. We have a great inheritance of tolerance in consequence, but it should never be taken for granted. Every generation has to fight the struggle for freedom all over again in order both to safeguard its assets and build anew. And this is not to make the case for conformity, quite the contrary. Experience shows that the powers-that-be are much given to misusing the law, to put freedom down; so much so that when traditional defences have failed there is then a principled case for recourse to active non-violent civil disobedience.

The other social condition is that of the unjust, unfree, tyrannical society. Unhappily there are still plenty of tyrannies in the world although it is well to remember that at least three countries enjoyed successful and substantially non-violent revolutions in 1973—Ethiopia, Portugal and Greece. In the unjust society free speech and assembly cannot be treated in the same way because neither exist in the first place. The struggle *has* to take forms that involve secrecy, conspiracy and slow silent work for long term objectives, of which (on the basis of the experience of the three countries mentioned) the most important is a split within the Armed Forces themselves. The struggle for freedom is slowly gaining ground in the Soviet Union and in Spain. Let's hope the final breakthrough will be in the 'seventies.

The first principle of justice is "the principle of equal liberty" and the second "the principle of fair equality and opportunity". These are, or

ought to be, fundamental in the courts, but they are not laws. This is so because justice and law are different things. Laws are particular, they are written down in legislation and the findings in individual cases. Justice is the idea of fairness that promotes and sustains good laws. Tyranny promotes and sustains bad laws.

From this it follows that good laws, rooted in justice are just as much the concern of the citizen as they are of the State, even more so, as there can be no such thing as a free society (i.e. a near-free society) if freedom is left to the mercy of the executive, because that is the very condition of tyranny itself.

We are all responsible for liberty and justice in those spheres of life in which we are personally involved and it is the universal involvement of the individual and the group in the practice of freedom that is the very foundation of liberty in the state as a whole. This means that we at Conway Hall, and in South Place as its proprietors, have a very full share of responsibility by virtue of the special and privileged position we enjoy as managers of that Hall. *There can be no freedom of assembly without places in which to assemble.* The decline in the availability of meeting places in London in recent years simply underlines the position.

### Continuity and change

The radical English reformer has always accepted the fact and importance of the law. The whole notion of reform i.e. of the redress of particular grievances, assumes in the first place that there is a body of law and the means of its enforcement that is open to piecemeal improvement. This is our guarantee against arbitrariness. Even the English revolutionaries of the seventeenth century took their stand on the power of the Common Law in opposing the Divine Right of the Stuarts and their use of prerogative courts like the Star Chamber.

Both reformers and revolutionaries had another side to their characters—their sense of vision, their utopianism, their yearning for the millenium. Vision's practical function is to yield inspiration and direction to the commonplace. Unhappily it can also yield irrational fanaticism.

Part of the trouble in England today is the breach, or the threatened breach, between the visionary and the reformer. New political and religious sects have grown up in the last fifteen years that are not answerable to the deed and will listen only to "the message". There are current political religions, Left and Right, that provide justification and publicity for each other and care nothing for freedom and justice. They openly despise them, and condemn themselves out of their own mouths.

The time is over-due then for the rise and the self-assertion of those who know what freedom is about and who care for and understand the achievements of 400 years. I call those people the non-violent centre and South Place, I think, numbers amongst them. We shall only count if we stand up to be counted. The alternative could be to go down to tyranny.

### The Background

It was about 1530 that the first radical puritans, Presbyterians and Baptists (Anabaptists as they were then called) began to assert religious freedom. They had Lollard and other ancestors but that was a broken tradition. Their inspiration was the Bible in English, the inner light of conscience, and the authority of minister and elder against the power of bishop and king. For many years they produced little or no literature and we know about them from the records of the courts before which they were brought for defying the ideas and practises of the newly established Church of England. It was against these people, and the many friends that they made in high places, that Queen Mary lit the fires of Smithfield and many other locations.

Queen Elizabeth persecuted Catholics and Puritans alike but England in its Golden Age could afford a certain tolerance—there was no Holy Office equivalent here.

Then came "the gathered churches" and later this Society itself began in that way. One man, called to a religious vocation, gathered others round him, secretly or openly according to the political temper of the times, eventually to build a new independent chapel free from the power of the hated bishops.

Charles I tried his best to turn the clock back. Preachers and printing were licensed and dissenters persecuted, but it didn't work. After Naseby, Marston Moor and Warrington Charles Stuart ended his days on the block in Whitehall. Under his son's restoration 'the sufferings' (as the Quakers still call them) began again and they were not resolved until after 1688. The pendulum swung backwards and forwards between freedom and tyranny.

Present day religious indifference began in the eighteenth century, especially among the governing classes. The reign of the bishops was over and the focus of freedom began to change under the influence of four revolutions, American, French, industrial and agrarian. Freedom of speech and assembly then turned on the freedom of political organisation (The Corresponding Society) of demonstration (Peterloo), of trade unions (The Combination Acts) of the press (against the Stamp Acts), slavery, parliamentary reform, the Corn Laws, The Charter, education, health, factory conditions, oath-taking and, overseas, in defence of those under the heel of the Czar and the Ottoman Empire.

### The Reckoning

By and large, with ups and downs and back-sliding, the struggle for freedom in England over 400 years has been one of great success at great cost. When we hear some people saying that there is no freedom here they are only demonstrating their appalling ignorance and undermining freedom itself. No one has to ask permission to hold a meeting in England. No one has to ask permission to publish anything in England. Given that certain traffic requirements are met, no one has to ask permission to stage a demonstration. And given certain restrictions over slander, defamation and incitement we are free to say what we please. (These restrictions can be abused, of course, and we need to be on to that).

So what it comes down to then (as regards meetings) is the physical availability of premises and their cost, and likewise the availability of printing facilities. These are not the business of the State and the law—they come back to us, the citizens.

William Johnson Fox, our Minister from 1817 to 1852 has this to say on religious liberty and nonconformity:

"We dissent because human legislators exceed their promise when they pretend to fix the religion of the country. Society cannot exist without government. It is for the good of the whole, that we should have laws, and that their administration and execution should not be left to individual zeal, but be the peculiar duties of persons appointed to the office. This requires the surrender of much natural right—of how much human wisdom must decide; it may fairly include life itself, which, when the good of the community requires it, should be offered as willing and patriotic sacrifice; *but the rights of conscience are, from their very nature inalienable* (my stress P.C.). Man never did give them; he can never give them. The right of believing where he sees evidence of truth, and of worshipping where he finds characteristics of divinity, as it cannot injure society, cannot belong to society. It is inherent in man as a rational creature and he cannot divest himself of it till he can recreate himself, and become another being and his own God."

It was that same Fox, who, all those years ago pledged the Society, with its whole-hearted support, to free enquiry, to civil and religious liberty all over the world.

We stand where we stood—there is no place better.

(Summary of a Lecture given on June 30)

## Ethical Feeling

BY

COLIN HAMER

THERE is no justice on earth apart from men that are just, no peace apart from men that are peaceable, no virtue apart from the practical judgments of men that are wise.

The wisdom in question is not theoretical or speculative but practical and empirical. In this sense it is a feeling.

We perceive some things that you could not easily, if at all, perceive in any way, Gilbert Ryle, for instance, once wrote that the perceptual use of "feel" in the sense of finding-out or discerning, e.g., the warmth of things by tactual or kinaesthetic detection was quite untechnical and referred to the use of an acquired skill. Thus, I feel how hot the water is, feel the rope round my neck, feel a pain, or feel that the spoon is sticky. I can perceive some things that you could easily, if at all, perceive in any way, unless perhaps you had me on the operating table—when my throat is constricted, for instance, or my heart thumps. Then there is the connected exploratory use of "feel" in which I feel for the matches in my pocket or feel my horse's legs. The latter use stands to "peer", "look" and "listen" as the perceptual use stands to "see" and "hear". It is quite incorrect to say that all perceiving involves feeling something in one of these senses. Feeling may accompany but does not constitute taste, and it has nothing to do with sight, hearing and smell. Close to the perceptual use of "feel" is the mock-use in which, e.g., the condemned man in imagination feels the rope round his neck.

Ryle noted that from saying that "I feel something brushing my cheek" I can pass quite naturally through "I feel something tickling my cheek" to "I feel a tickle on my cheek". One who feels a tickle has a felt impulse to scratch or rub himself. The tickle is not related to this impulse as effect to cause, neither are the tickle and the impulse identical. But the notion of feeling a tickle somehow involves the presence of an unsatisfied inclination. I say "I feel tickled" if I am highly amused in circumstances where I cannot laugh. I can feel a tickle now, or I can say I felt a tickle a short while ago. I may feel a tickle on my cheek, or I may feel tickles all over. Logically I can only feel my own feelings or sensations: tickles, seasickness, warmth, pin-pricks, pains, suffocations, thirst, nausea, aches, etc. And, of course, though a person can feel his own sensations, even he cannot see them. This led some disciples of Descartes to conclude that since sensations cannot be seen in the body, they must be somehow in the mind—which was a considerable logical howler. While a person may feel *acutely or intensely* ill, tired, unfit, sleepy, fidgety, worried, cross, or slack, he is said to feel *completely or perfectly* wide-awake, well, contented, at home and confident, i.e., not at all strange or dubious. "Sure" comes from *securus, sine cura*, without anxiety, and to feel sure is *not* to feel any qualms. There is a natural transition from feeling satisfied with a meal, to feeling satisfied with the person cooking or serving it, and thence to feeling satisfied with the recipe followed in its preparation, or with a

theory in general. Someone who feels sure is fully satisfied with his theory, it meets, that is to say, not his logical but his reasonable conditions for what a theory should be, just as a good dinner meets his requirements for a satisfying meal, without the goodness of the dinner being either seen or perceived by a "sense of taste".

Professor Ryle conceded that William James may have been right in identifying emotional feelings with sensations. There does seem to be a certain parallelism between feelings of apprehension and feelings of seasickness, glows of pride and glows of warmth, pricks of conscience and pin-pricks, flutters of excitement and flutters caused by over-smoking. But the behaviour of a thirsty infant or a dog with a tickle is easier to predict than that of an indignant, literate man, and while both rank as feelings, only the former are ordinarily called sensations. The man who tells us that he felt writing to *The Times* means that the idea appears to him as seductive in retrospect. There is a gradual transition from animal feelings of thirst to highly sophisticated feelings, like those of the irate journalist. Quite different from feelings like writing to *The Times* or feeling sure about one's facts is feeling that something is the case. The person who feels that something is the case has a certain nusus, slope or momentum towards thinking that something is the case, but he does not yet think so, nor does this feeling mean that he hankers to say or to believe that something is the case—since belief is not an act, one cannot hanker to believe.

I have outlined the main points of Ryle's treatment of "feeling" in *The Concept of Mind* (London, Hutchinson, 1949), in *Dilemmas* (Cambridge University Press, 1954), and in two articles he published on this theme—"Feelings" (*Philosophical Quarterly*, I, 1951, pp. 193-205) and "Sensation" (in H. D. Lewis's *Contemporary British Philosophy*, III, London, Allen and Unwin, 1956). In speaking of "ethical feeling" I shall be relating his remarks to certain observations of Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Bk. 2, cc. 3 and 6), where we are told that "actions are called just and temperate when they are such as the just or the temperate man would do; but it is not the man who does these that is just and temperate, but the man who also does them as just and temperate men do them", and also that "virtue is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean, i.e., the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational principle, and by that principle by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it".

### Five Principles

In speaking of "ethical feeling", then, I shall make use of a threefold or, if you will, a fivefold distinction: there is a dispositional capacity which, regarded optimistically, is a certain competence, and, regarded less optimistically, is also a certain liability; next, there is the attempted exercise of this capacity; and there is also the successful or illusory outcome. Ethical feeling in the dispositional sense is in the human body somewhat as eye-sight is in the eye, and just as eye-sight develops and improves with good practice in that variety of ways that gives us the marksman, the proof reader, the photographer, the painter, so the ethical disposition evolves gradually as a man's personality develops, but in ways that are far more varied, nuanced, complex, sophisticated and hard to predict. Moreover, just as the man of vision is acutely or intensely frustrated and unsatisfied if any situation arises to put him partly or wholly in the dark against his will, so the ethical man, when he is not asleep, experiences a similar momentum, slope or nusus towards moral behaviour. Regarded optimistically this state of dynamic tension that characterises the ethical man's attitude within his typical situation is moral virtue; regarded less optimistically, it is moral scruples—a wild and undisciplined need to

construe all situations in excessively moral terms, and a refusal to open oneself to the variety of experience. To be possessed of moral scruples is not to be morally blind and without eye-sight, but it is to have a squint, a distorted and limited vision, a poor focus, a viewpoint that is over-rigid, horizons that are too narrowly confined. The horizons must be pushed back all the time, because there are no limits. Eye-sight needs to be developed, and our ethical feelings, too, call for strengthening, deepening, extending, and diversifying in the school of sensitivity and experience.

The attempted exercise of one's ethical capacities is ethical feeling in a further sense that is related to ethical feeling in the dispositional sense somewhat as "looking" is related to eye-sight. Such ethical feeling constitutes our moral explorations of our own particular situations. The popular emphasis on the rights of the individual conscience points to the commonsense realisation that in moral as well as in visual matters only I can explore exactly certain features of my particular situation, because only I can have my own moral viewpoint, my definite focus, my present horizons. Of course, this is not to deny that a moral philosopher may be in a position to give a better theoretical account than I can of my situation and behaviour, just as the physicist or the optician may tell me something I otherwise wouldn't know about my eye-sight—and yet *I* see.

Perhaps precisely because looking is for seeing the person who really sees nothing may start seeing things, and the man whose exercise of his moral feelings fails to leave him completely and perfectly certain of the justice of his situation and at the same time of the specific injustices it contains, may be given to moralising, to delusions of grandeur, to faint-heartedness or to cries of "wolf!" Writing to *The Times* may constitute moral behaviour, but it can often be a poor substitute for it.

Thanks to his visual and general physical competence the healthy man sees not just a tree but the whole woods and walks through them with confidence; he sees his full field of vision, all its constituent features, their interrelations and their significance in terms of his own free response to that global situation. Similarly, the moral man, the just man, the man of refined ethical feelings is never petty, but is sensitively alive and alert to his whole world of values, to the conditions of its order and its elements of chaos, and in that situation he not only stands firm, but advances serenely towards his chosen goal—without anxiety, without regrets, strong in the midst of flames. So did Daniel live in the lions' den.

(Summary of a lecture given on October 13, 1974)

## Community Values and Local Democracy

BY

T. F. EVANS

IN A short time we shall celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the American Declaration of Independence. Not many years after that, if we manage to survive 1984, we shall celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the French Revolution. The years of these two events, 1776 and 1789, indicate great landmarks in the progress of human government. In those two years was asserted and put into practice the ideal of government by the people. Old ideas of authoritarian administration of the affairs of a sovereign people were cast aside and the era of what may loosely be called "liberalism" was ushered in. Of course there have been changes

since then but in the greater part of the world, certainly in those countries that would call themselves "advanced", the form of government derives from the type that was established in the American colonies in 1776 and in France after the dismissal of the Bourbons in 1789. Democracy on these lines has returned to those countries in Western Europe that had abandoned it before the last war. Even in those countries of the "Eastern bloc" at the present time, where Western democracy is not the prevailing form, some of the terms used, such as, for example, "People's Courts" are designed to emphasise that, ultimately, the people are in control.

Yet, no sooner have we congratulated ourselves on the widespread acceptance of our ideas of democracy than we have to admit that all is not well. In many countries during the last decade or so—including both the United States and France—there have been manifestations of deep discontent, shown in such forms as serious labour disputes and student riots. In this country, politics, politicians and political activity generally have reached the depths in public esteem. Voting figures in elections, whether national or local, do not indicate a white-hot interest in the processes of democratic government. There is, with some exceptions, great difficulty in finding either candidates to stand for office or workers to carry out the laborious chores of organising and conducting election campaigns. The public mood seems to be a compound of extreme scèpticism and bitter cynicism. One local politician of my acquaintance was told on the doorstep that "All you candidates are the same; you're like bananas; you start green, you turn yellow and you're bent all the time." (It is not everyone who feels that great changes will follow the implementing of the proposals for public registers of the interests of members of legislative bodies.)

### To the Surface

When discontent with democracy goes further than mere verbal expression and friendly abuse, and yet stops short of physical violence, it tends to take one of two main forms. First, it shows itself in an enthusiastic call for local participation in decisions on local matters. Pressure groups grow up, not connected with existing parties and often having merely one purpose such as, for example, to keep a proposed motorway or airport or prison or mental hospital or even fire-station as far as possible from a "threatened" beauty-spot or quiet residential area. Campaigns with such ends are usually pursued with great skill and energy and often succeed. The other form that shows itself is voting, when one votes at all, for a "splinter" party or party of protest. This has often been a small party that has done well at by-elections or in local elections without being able to gain large numbers of seats at general elections. The Liberals and nationalist parties come into this category. There may be signs that they are now able to establish themselves more strongly than ever before, even at general elections, but the question is by no means free from doubt.

So far, this may seem not unsatisfactory. In one light, the readiness to work for local causes and to vote for parties of protest may indicate healthy attitudes. Yet, there are serious paradoxes that show themselves at the same time. The insistence on community values comes, very largely, from the belief that small interests are being completely ignored while sham battles are fought over so-called national issues on the larger stage. This belief is encouraged by the gradual loss of power of the back-bench Member of Parliament, or of Parliament itself, in the face of the enormously increased strength of the executive, by the steady reduction in the number of authorities in local government and by what seems the increasing remoteness of those bodies, whether actually parts of the government system or ancillary to it, such as the large public utility organisations

to which the citizen feels that he would like to turn for advice or, just as frequently, to lodge complaints. Unfortunately, it is often found that there is an inescapable contradiction in the working of the democratic system. Education may serve to illustrate this. There are in the minds of many people, perhaps a majority of the population who concern themselves with the administration of the education system, two fundamental ideas. One is that, as far as may be, there should be equality of educational opportunity for every child in the country. Even now, it is still possible for a child's future to be largely affected by the accident of his having been born on one side of the road rather than the other. The gradual diminution in the number of local education authorities has meant that, in the years since the war, it has been possible to speak of a "national" policy in education. There is still local variety but the main lines of the service are more or less uniform throughout the entire country. At the same time, many of the people who insist most strongly on the idea of equality of opportunity, demand just as forcefully, that local education authorities should be accessible to members of the public. Unfortunately, the larger the areas of administration, and large areas are inevitable with a smaller number of authorities, the less easy is it for individual members of the public to establish contact with the officials or elected members responsible for decisions affecting themselves or their children. Large scale planning appears essential for justice and efficiency but it seems to rule against the chances of the individual putting complaints and making successful representations to those who exercise power.

Unfortunate though it is, there appears no simple way out of this dilemma. Some forecast the breakdown of the present system of government, although no reasonable alternative has yet been suggested. It is certainly not complacency which leads some others to think that the present system must be made to work: the immediate consequences of breakdown are too awful to contemplate. The great question for the future may be—is there a possible means of reversing the recent trends towards larger units of local government in order to give to individuals in their own community a greater opportunity to participate in the making and taking of decisions on matters that affect them? If we are optimistic, we may think that there could be. If we are not so optimistic, we must add the rider that it could only be possible if a far larger number of people than now prove willing to participate in the drudgery and sometimes the boredom of working, as volunteers, as members of political parties or in any other way, show a far greater and deeper interest in problems of politics and government generally than can be seen at present.

---

## For the Record

BY

THE GENERAL SECRETARY

THERE IS a religious revolution in progress. People, especially young people, flock into yoga, transcendental meditation, mythology, mysticism and religio-political ideologies. The traditional churches, closing their doors one by one, look on in dismay. One church I know in London is actually paying its members to attend! And for the rest of society the other god, gold, is a failing deity.

Manifestly there is more to life than power and money but people don't

want to know about old fashioned denominational religion. Why should they label themselves in that way?

The human being is a religious animal, i.e. he is concerned with mystery, wonder, awe, imagination, enquiry, caring relationships, loyalty and the related needs of belonging and solitariness. These are the function of our religious nature and none of them presupposes a revealed personal God.

The social structures to cope with and express these needs used to be the family, the church, the school, the regiment and the small business. Today they are only shadows of their former selves. We need new structures and the reconstitution of some of the old ones on new lines.

In the last two decades there has been a remarkable new development of voluntary societies to meet just about every human need. This is the hope of the future. But there is still something missing in the centre of it all. Most of the voluntary societies are single purpose organisations. But where do people go when they are *not* in some kind of urgent need, when they simply want to be themselves among friends in an atmosphere of openness and enquiry with some scope for creative and critical activity?

In a world that is changing at a dizzying rate we all need bases and stability. We also need tradition, so that we know our roots, and vision so that we know our hopes and aspirations.

The denominational churches started to miss the boat over a hundred years ago and the political parties have followed them. At *South Place* we left our Unitarian label behind as long ago as 1834 and we stopped praying in 1869. The singing of ethical hymns ended in 1961.

At first we were regarded as terrible heretics whereas today, the general climate of opinion having moved clearly in our direction, we are very respectable, some people might say a little square! Even so our defence of the freedom of speech still gets us into trouble from time to time.

Ours has been, and is, a modest success story. England could do with a thousand *South Places* and the local churches might be well advised to take a closer look at the story of one chapel that decided to go it alone and take risks. Today the future is wide open.

## **The Open Door**

This column is written before the appearance of our programme scheduled for January 27 at 10.55 p.m. (date and time changed by BBC economy cuts and reorganisation). What has been said above concerns the theme and *raison d'être* of the programme. I'll save some inside stories for next month!

## **February at the Hall**

We didn't have a summer and now we are busy not having a winter either, so I am stuck for an adjective for February! Our Sundays though, look like starting with an interesting contention. D. H. Lawrence has never been a favourite son to people of our persuasion and it looks as if Hector Hawton is going to explain why. Being a bit of a Lawrence man myself does that make me a male chauvinist? It seems that I am about to find out.

It is very pleasant to find someone who has worked professionally on problems closely related to the history of *South Place*. Sheila Rosenberg lectures in literature for the Extra-Mural Dept of the University and has made a detailed study of Unitarianism, Positivism and the Fox Circle—her subject on her first appearance at *South Place*.

The nature of authority could well be the big subject for us all in 1975 for all kinds of most unfortunate reasons. There will be no ducking it and it is Harold Blackham's February subject.

Strauss was the German theologian and historian who in the second quarter of the nineteenth century who brought intensive and sustained scholarship to bear upon the historicity of the Bible, the New Testament especially.

That remarkable TV programme on the Christmas story was one of the end-products. What did Strauss do and what happened to the tradition he started?—Professor Wells's subject.

One of the things I like to do is to discover someone who has something important to say and bring his work to the notice of the Society. Lionel Tiger (if you can get over the name!) is a brilliant young anthropologist whose book *The Imperial Animal*, written jointly with Robin Fox, is one of the contemporary landmarks in ideas. It was Robert Waller who drew my attention to it. It will be my subject on March 2nd.

The traditional English view of Ireland is that it is a mistake. In February's first Forum we shall look not so much at Ireland but at ourselves, maybe that is the right way round. Bill Hetherington is a social worker, a one-time Committee of 100 secretary, and much involved in the recent pacifist activity over the issue of British presence in Northern Ireland. In the second Forum Edward Rosen, one of a group that has been studying the Middle East situation for years, will show a film and give us an opportunity to catch up on events. We might be well advised to prepare for new horrors in that direction. (My own gloomy prediction is an American-Russian invasion and carve-up of the oil states).

*Education and Teaching* (not at all the same thing) is the Tuesday theme for February. Michael Duane opens on the politics of the size of classes, Barrie and Pat Fitton follows on the depriving curriculum, and then we look at the black revolution in schools. This only affects parts of London but it has lessons for the other parts. One of our members Shanaz Durrani intends to bring her three children up herself i.e. not send them to school. Other parents have done this, sometimes with sensationally successful results, it is part of the deschooling thesis. Andrew Mann will take on the subject of parents as teachers. Of course all parents are teachers, but to what extent do we, and should we, recognise it institutionally?

## AROUND THE SOCIETY

□ We have just bought our own printing press for the printing of posters for both our meetings and our concerts. It is all due to the enterprise and hard work of Frank Hawkins. The results are already up on our noticeboards.

□ Mr B. O. Warwick is making slow but steady progress after being knocked down by a car in the street.

□ The Christmas Eve party went like a bomb. We had expected 40/50 and nearly 70 turned up. Philip Buttinger's daughter, last year's Yule Queen, crowned this year's Queen, Rahana Durrani while Philip conducted the ceremony. Stan and Margaret Chisman, Margaret Fowler and John Willmin produced a one-act allegory, my daughter Claire played the piano for carols (and her father lost his voice in the process), nearly everyone got a present from under the Christmas tree, Tomoko Sata master-minded a massive feeding operation with the help of Faith Campbell, while Denis Campbell and John Hargreaves looked after our thirsts! At the following General Committee the Chairman, Mrs Booker, thanked them all for their good work, and that includes those who did the washing up!

□ The Annual Dinner will take place on Friday 14th February, the foundation day of the Society in 1793. Tickets will be £2, slightly up on last year, but inclusive of sherry and table wines—a prospect unrepeatable anywhere else in London and made possible because we dine at home. Evelyn Brown and Tomoko will be responsible for the catering as last year. The dinner will be in the Library and that limits the seating to 50. Guest of Honour: Nicolas Walter, the new Managing Editor of the *New Humanist*.

□ We need another piano—this time for the Small Hall. The present one is untunable and finished. Does any member of the Society have a reasonable instrument that he or she would like to give the Society or sell at modest cost? We have three first class pianos elsewhere in the building. The demands of the Small Hall are light but we should like to meet them properly.

□ The Art Exhibition for February will feature the work of three young artists of the Winchester School of Art—Brian Excell, Veronica Butler and Andrew Watchorn.

□ I spent some time recently putting together various ideas developed in lectures over recent years and have published the result with the title: *Direct Democracy*, subtitled in seventeenth century style, "The Case for an England of Sovereign Regional Republics, Extra-Parliamentary Democracy and a New Active Non-Violence of the Centre". It has sold very well on the bookstall and people further afield might like to see it—25p post free.

□ Some time soon all members will receive a notice of a Special General Meeting called in connection with our High Court case. We have put an enormous amount of work in over about seven years and it looks as though we shall, at last, get into court this year.

□ Due to an oversight I did not know when writing the piece about a funeral in the last *Ethical Record* that the deceased, Mr Hutcheon, was actually a member of the Society and had been for many years, his wife too. Our sympathies to Mrs Hutcheon.

□ You might like to know that Eve Boswell, the singer, has just joined us.

□ We have had some discussion in the Concerts Committee about the state of live music in the Society. Before the war we had an orchestra of our own but it perished shortly after the war. Today there is nothing of that order. Our professional music is first class, of course, but there the matter rests. Choral music, folk music, even pop—it is all possible. Everything depends upon finding individuals able and willing to start something. We have all the facilities. Any ideas?

PETER CADOGAN

---

## DISCUSSION

### Education—Social Conditioning?

MICHAEL DUANE opened the discussion by recalling that Pavlov was the first man to study conditioning in depth, but that we now know that the problem is more complex than he thought at the time.

Education does not take place *in vacuo*. It *does* things to people. Education is the transmitting of knowledge, skills and values, especially those laid down by people who enjoy positions of power in society.

Our capacity for learning is determined by what is called the A/S ratio, that is the ratio between the associatory cortex and the sensory cortex; the first being a matter of mind and the second of body, although the two are not separable. The brain contains a hundred million million cells and the activity of learning is therefore extraordinarily complex. Conditioning is to some extent necessary and inescapable. We need, for example, to speak our mother tongue, use a knife and fork, wear shoes and perform countless little acts learnt in our childhood through constant association with adults and their approval and disapproval. A brain with a small A/S ratio is very vulnerable because it cannot learn from experience.

We have a spectrum of work from the least to the most skilled and a comparable spectrum of reward with little at one end and a great deal at the other. Today about 30 per cent of our people have a take-home pay of about £22 while 1 per cent has about £400. The differences are financial, political and also linguistic.

There seem to be three grades of the more affluent of their side of the spectrum. First come the upper professional and managerial people, directors and effective decision-makers who decide the main lines of policy. Then come the professionals whose business it is to translate the decisions of the top people into feasible forms. Thirdly, the clericals, whose work is concerned with transmitting, multiplying and disseminating information and decisions. All three groups are concerned with words, ideas, direction, regulation and control. The main difference is that argument is denied to the clericals. Initiative starts at the end of the spectrum.

In the Middle Ages products of the arts and crafts were designed according to their function by craftsmen and artists to meet the need of the customers. The most marked contrast today is typified by the motorcar production line. It takes three years to conceive and produce a new car and after that linguistic and symbolic skills and craftsmanship are eliminated. All the component parts are as standardised as the process of assembly itself. If no brain-power is required at work something appalling happens to the linguistic activities of thought and judgment. Production-line processes dehumanise the greater part of the population.

#### Fromm's Family

Michael Duane quoted Fromm's *Fear of Freedom* to the effect that the Germans who welcomed Nazism did so because they believed it fulfilled a deep-seated need for socialisation. People need to work together. *Homo Sapiens* survives because he works in groups. We will perish on our own. In this sense love is not religious or political, but biological. It is through language that man has taught himself how and why to work together with his fellow-men.

All societies educate their children for their future roles in life according to existing and established patterns. In England 5 per cent of our young go to Public Schools, 4 per cent to Direct Grant Grammar Schools, 19 per cent to Grammar Schools, 31 per cent to Comprehensive Schools and 41 per cent to Secondary Moderns.

In the case of the 5 per cent attending Public Schools the teachers come from the same social group as their pupils and therefore the expectations of the home equates with those of the school to the great advantage of both. This is also substantially true of both types of Grammar Schools, although it is here that the 6 per cent mobility is found, representing children of working-class origin entering what are traditionally middle-class schools.

In the case of the Comprehensive and Secondary Modern Schools there is a culture clash between the school and the home. Expectations are manifest in our schools and these expectations approximate to those that arise out of our given social divisions.

For a long time it was thought that children were born bright or dull and IQ testing was a means of quantifying this situation. In Mr. Duane's view, apart from the 2 per cent of the population who are physically and emotionally damaged, intelligence has no genetic foundations. It is, in his view, the end-product of the quality of background and education. IQ scores he sees as being a method of registering linguistic skills. Human beings are ultimately concerned with language and symbols. As things are at the moment, because the symbolic usages of language, mathematics and science are important for wealth production and acquisition, they are in practice held to be of more consequence than other symbolic usages, e.g. involved in sculpture, music and painting.

· Language encapsulates human experience. Through it we take over all that our species have learnt so far. Language is then the vehicle for the further development of human culture. Furthermore, language is a kind of social control because it moulds individuals to the patterns of the group.

Genetics concerns structure, not function; the constellation of genes sets a pattern. Identical twins start to have different experiences from the moment of birth, so to compare them is not to make a straight genetic comparison. Structures can be measured, but functions are determined by experience; intelligence and linguistic skill are the product of experience.

Some members of the audience demurred at this conclusion, but whatever people make of it, it certainly clarifies the terms of the argument. In conclusion Mr. Duane said that the aim of education should be to minimise the conditioning element in its restrictive sense (as manifest in exclusive private educational practice) and maximise individual potential.

P.C.

(Report of a Discussion on Tuesday, February 12)

---

## FORUM

# The Normal Neurotic

BY

MARK MOSKOWITZ

Mark Moskowitz introduced this subject at a Forum on November 24.

None of us is either consistently original and brilliant *or* a robot, he said. Our thinking is polarised between intelligence and rationality on one hand, and set patterns on the other hand. Intelligence, he defines as that faculty that enables us to respond imaginatively to every situation under the guidance of reason and intuition. We can place our position between these two poles.

There is an element of choice over whether we are to be restrained by our pattern behaviour *or liberated* through our intelligence. If we are over-patterned we are held back and this is the condition we call "distress". We are all subject to distress and it has a relationship to our capacity for our intelligence as defined above.

There are two ways to diminish distress and enhance our intelligent responses. The first is to discharge painful emotions by crying, laughing and shaking. The second is by use of Zen, i.e. learning how to let things happen, how to let go, paying more attention to the means than to the ends.

It is important to recognise that we have patterns, habits, addictions and compulsions. Becoming aware of these is part of the task of transcending them, but this takes effort as patterns are *very* comfortable.

It is possible to find new directions and the result is the liberation of the intelligence. We have more potential intelligence, said Mr Moskowitz, than had even been manifested by the greatest genius. He reckons we use 10 per cent and the genius uses 25 per cent. Because we accept our distress we are landed with our patterns.

Our intelligence is aware of an underlying law and order in the universe, the notion of cause and effect. Intelligence is associated with little or no effort and gives a sense of increased energy. There is no need to push or drive.

. Patterns, on the other hand, are associated with tension, effort, fatigue and a great deal of pushing and driving. Intelligence can listen, patterns must make their point and command. Intelligence is sensitive to feelings, but is not a guide to action; while patterns are directed by feelings and feelings are then made to fit intended actions.

. Intelligence is kind, caring and warm and has no ulterior motive; patterns tend to be hurtful and may feign kindness for purposes of taking advantage. Intelligence is concerned with means; patterns with ends. Intelligence learns from mistakes; patterns are concerned with power itself and must prevail. Intelligence takes full advantage of the whole psyche; patterns complain about its deficiencies. Intelligence accepts statements of others and give them due consideration; patterns will not listen and are greedy and hostile. Intelligence has courage and wants to know experience; patterns are fearful and know *about* experience. Intelligence has humility and is spontaneous; patterns are arrogant and calculating.

When we are hurt we cannot think clearly. The hurt is glued to the intelligence, but then nature heals the wounds and the intelligence's functions are restored. If the healing process is blocked, the attempt is made to heal the hurt in some other way. The cry of a baby is a natural healing process, but we are then taught not to cry and show fear or embarrassment; yet if we are foiled in our intelligence we persist in unhealed wounds. Just as an open sore is the more sensitive, so emotional wounds make us extra-susceptible to hurt.

All wounds are repairable and healing can occur at any time. It is not easy, it is not without discomfort, but it can be done.

P.C.

(Report of a Forum on November 24)

---

## Your Viewpoint

### An Ethical Memorandum

The events in Red Lion Square on June 15 last were so repugnant that we must not shirk the word "guilt" when we speak of the several agencies which contributed. From our own experience of the South Place Ethical Society, as members and active participants in using the halls, we know that "guilt" is still understood there. Far from being a metaphysical abstraction, dismissed in our scientific age, it signifies *a state of the conscience*, the very stuff of ethics.

Possibly this old Society with its Chapel roots may fail to qualify as religious; that of course will depend on the criteria employed. But if it ever fails to qualify as *conscientious*, then those who steer it into that calamity will be guilty indeed. Such action would break tradition and also trust, in every sense of the term.

What bearing has this on June 15? Common sense tells us that the disturbance in the streets was only an outward sign caused by disturbances in purposeful *minds*. For many of the people involved, the issues no doubt were political and SPES cannot take sides in this.

But SPES cannot wash its hands, either. Ethical obligations are concerned with conduct, not verbiage, so we must withhold aid of any kind from all who flout ethical principles.

We affirm that racialism conflicts directly with the ethical principles to which the Society is bound by its declared Objects. In essence, *no ethical case can be made* for wilfully placing on any person a permanent dis-

advantage solely on account of a passive condition which he did not choose and cannot alter. (Passive=what he is said to *be*, not what he is said to *do*.)

Benevolence and compassion, even towards unfortunate people who suffer from congenital disabilities or other handicaps of nature, may not be intuitive in all of us, but that is beside the point. Ethical principles do not have to perpetuate the spontaneous reactions "natural" to primitive people faced by intruders; and to that proposition *all* parties in the clash on June 15 should give intense thought.

It is fallacious in ethics, just the same as in science, to hold sacred and immutable the conclusions of any sage in a past age. Tautologies can be expected to stand the test of time, but only blunted minds rely on *authorities for all-time revelation*. One branch of the religious tradition is freedom of thought in matters of conscience, and on that branch SPES has grown. The tradition entails freedom of speech to express *thought*, not to proclaim the unthinkable. There is something unreal about the alleged solicitude for political activists who seem to equate ideals with army boots and "ours not to reason why".

Accordingly, we expressed our opinion to the General Committee of SPES on September 4, 1974 as follows:

1. Can we persuade the General Secretary to consider a less rigid line on the matter of free speech.
2. We did exclude some hirers in the past, so we cannot truly say it would be contrary to our tradition.
3. In the event of banning the NF specifically, this would not really split the Society down the middle.
4. The objection to the NF is on ethical grounds, a clear and precise case can be stated, and politics can and should be kept out of the argument.
5. SPES sorely needs to brighten up its image as an ethical-religious body, and not act as though law-abiding is our highest ideal.

These points were not refuted, but *set aside* until the report of the Scarman inquiry appears! We see no reason to temporize, and urge the Society to act immediately in the public interest.

RAY LOVECY  
ALBERT LOVECY

### Humanist stance

Reading your editorial in January's issue made me sit back and think "Just what does Humanism mean to me?" I found it could be perfectly summed up in the old adage "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

To me that is the Humanist's one Commandment, and if everyone, everywhere, tried to follow it, what a much nicer place the world would be to live in. In fairness, I'd better mention I don't find it all that easy to live up to myself, but I try.

Peterborough

KATHLEEN GUNN

### Veganism

Apropos Marjorie Mephams' letter (January) in support of Mr Orkell's plea for veganism; surely no ethical grower and/or eater of vegetables, or fruit, can ignore the issue of 'pest-control'. For instance, any ethical home-gardener who has tried to grow a row of Broad-Beans will surely have wondered about the ethics of—as it were—'inviting' Blackflies to the party (or feast) and then 'refusing' them their natural enjoyment with a dose of 'pesticide'.

Farnham Common, Bucks

CHARLES BYASS

## Free Speech

As a member of the SPES general committee I voted for the maintenance of free speech and right of assembly in the full knowledge of freedom within the law, as Charles Byass points out in his letter of October and also listed by Peter Cadogan in September issue i.e. slander, incitement, defamation and obscenity. These laws have been used by the establishment ruthlessly in the past when the state felt itself so threatened. These laws may not be perfect in themselves but I do not think that citizens should have any qualms in bringing any evidence forward in what they believe to be a crime against democracy. John Lewis cites the Potsdam Agreement of 1945, which forbade the freedom to re-establish the Nazi Party. The Nuremberg trials established accountability of all men for crimes against humanity. It is our duty to see that these are upheld wherever possible. I see no reason why the Council of Civil Liberties offices cannot be used as a point to assemble citizens' evidence and compile a dossier against all those who would destroy democracy by violence. When enough evidence has been accumulated against individuals or organisations, hand the dossier over to the Public Prosecutor.

It is interesting to see Peter Cadogan standing his argument upon the establishment of properly constitutional values and government and laying claim to our successful struggle for Freedom of Speech and assembly, I take it under the law. "For the last 400 years", he says, forgetting to mention an occasional lapse or two related to the traditions and conditions that obtained. Peter cannot wave aside the Potsdam Agreement as if it too were not part of our tradition and our position here and now. I agree with John Lewis that you do not invite the fire raisers to set fire to your house. But I do not think we have reached that stage yet. There is power in the argument that once they have heard the National Front speakers most people will have nothing to do with them. But it is also true that there is a type of person around who is looking for this sort of "punch-up". Karl Liebknecht said of his Socialist Germans "at the first rattle of the sabre, you forget your socialism". I do not think we should panic and close our doors at the first cries against the National Front. There is power in Peter Cadogan's statement of the people's intelligence and commonsense. They have a real responsibility to contain any excess the National Front may try to perpetrate. I am satisfied that we have done all that needs to be done to date. If the situation does deteriorate we may have to think again.

V. S. ROSE

Bromley, Kent

☉ Peter Cadogan argues that "if it is right for us to deny any organisation access to Conway Hall then it is right for others to do likewise". He is quite right and I accept that this is the position. But it *does not* follow that "freedom of assembly becomes a nonsense" because, in fact, taking the case in point, it is quite obvious—as I have already pointed out—that there are plenty of other people who are willing to assist the National Front's propaganda by letting halls to them. The argument is therefore an unreal one.

As for Peter's "kite", the suggestion that we should "organise a picket outside Conway Hall" against the National Front, really what would be the object of this? As a trade unionist, I take a picket to be organised to try and persuade people not to cross the picket line. Are we really going to let Conway Hall to the National Front and then hang about outside trying to persuade the public not to go in?

I, for one, have better things to do with my time. The only adequate

comment that occurs to me is the words of George Orwell—"you have to be an intellectual to believe things like that—no ordinary man could be such a fool".

*Windsor, Berks.*

J. STEWART COOK

④ We live in a time, where the whole world seems to be moving irrevocably towards totalitarianism. Almost daily freedoms, which we had taken for granted, are taken away from us. In most cases they don't affect us directly and so we shrug our shoulders and move on. Force of argument counts for less and less, and brute force has taken over in our society.

May I quote as an example the Polytechnic of Central London. I teach there, and not so long ago we took pride in having an active debating society where everybody of all races and opinions could air their views, but now this has all been forcibly stopped. For instance, last July the Conservative Students Association tried to hold a meeting. They had invited a Member of Parliament to speak to them, and to avoid trouble, they had advertised the meeting only on the last day before the meeting was due to take place. No luck. When the speaker arrived, the militant left had already got its marching orders. All entrances were locked and the room was full of totalitarian youths. In an attempt to save the situation, I invited the speaker and some of his audience to meet in my staff-room in a different building. Within minutes the meeting was broken up and we moved to a pub. By this time there were more reds left than students.

When I speak about these things with my colleagues, they are apathetic. It doesn't concern them, or does it? Perhaps it is worthwhile to quote some facts from *The Guinness Book of Records* just to remind people of what happened in other countries, when the principle of freedom of speech was denied to the opposition:

1936-1938 During the great purge, or Yezhovshchina, an estimated 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 people were executed in the UUSR.

1941-1951 During the second world war between 900,000 and 5,700,000 Jews were executed by gas chambers or starvation in countries occupied by National-socialist Germany.

1950-1955 During the Hsiao Mieh (deprivation of existence) campaign organised by Lo Jui-ching, the Minister of Public Security of China (mainland), an estimated 800,000 to at least 20,000,000 people were executed. An informed estimate in 1962 put the figure at more than 5,000,000 but less than 10,000,000.

Please don't tell me this can't happen in Britain. It can and it will.

*London SW17*

PHILIP BUTTINGER

### Free Speech

It seems to me that the society has existed for 182 years because it has always upheld its basic tenet, "rational religious sentiment free from all religious dogma". It should continue to do so.

Membership in any society consists of individuals who vary from those making a narrow, to those making a wide, interpretation of aims.

Surely, any subject or religion can be discussed, provided members are each allowed exactly the same amount of time, to reply to what has been said, in exactly the way *they* want to, without interruption. Some contributions may be boring, but to cut short or interrupt—unless there is some very exceptional reason—is denial of free speech.

The cultivation of friendliness and a sense of belonging, among members, is surely the first task of paid or honorary officers, and should it not be understood that elderly members, who have supported the society for decades, will be written to and visited, if they become ill?

SPES contravenes its own aims where the letting of the hall is concerned, if groups are allowed to conduct *closed* meetings during which eastern religions are practised, or the establishment of temples to tyrannical religions are discussed, or exclusive schools, or if secret societies or political groups are given a "roof", when aims may be undemocratic and destructive? That is not a "Speakers' Corner". There, heckling and argument prevail—all can attend—and police are present to stop seditious statements and riots.

*East Horsley, Surrey*

GEORGE E. SWADE

*The General Secretary replies:* The first four paragraphs of Mr Swade's letter are agreed Society policy and method. The last paragraph confuses our meetings with those of people who hire rooms in our hall. Hirers are entirely free to conduct their own meetings in the way they want, open meetings, closed committees, etc. It is not for us to interfere. The relationship between us and our hirers is defined by the 17 clauses of the contracts that they sign. Ours is a business relationship not an ideological one, given our principled adherence to civil and religious liberty.

### **Historical Formula**

If it is seen as half of a "formula", the declaration for "a rational religious sentiment" could become a most important one in human history, even if SPES had never existed. The whole "formula" is a "rational religious sentiment", versus "a rational survivalistic sentiment".

I feel that each of us vertebrates is effectively and really two brains and one "unconscious" bequeathed to us by psychologists in the past century. The "Iceberg"! Because I feel that the subjective in each of us would be better depicted by a crucifix, or beam scales.

I feel that each of us vertebrates is effectively and really two brains and two never systems facing inwards in opposite directions. Otherwise, how do we account for pain, pleasure, fear, hate, love, revulsion, sex-attraction, orgasmic-resonance, stereo-vision, balance, stereo-hearing, and so many subjective miracles?

It is the only basis upon which we could explain a difference between humans and the animal world, which would call for no physical difference in principle in the brain or nerve system of either. Take a hawk or an eagle or a tiger; if they got extreme scruples about killing! Their integrity, which had needed every bit of two opposed nerve systems, would split, and have to accommodate—if they even survived as species any longer. But suppose species that had already stood up on their hind legs, etc., had become so able that they could survive? In that case, a species "impossible", having a split-integrity in its subjectivity, would have emerged out of evolution! Part of the necessary adaptation of such a species would be a need to split the outside world as part of its own subjectivity—but blindly, unknowingly—simply as what seemed to it "normality", "objectivity"!

The species would perpetrate what we have known as human history! Human history would have to continue until, among its mounting other discoveries, the creature discovered what had happened to it for it to start human civilisations. But more important, what it had to do, if this new Humansphere got universally nasty. And what it would have to do, assuming that in the beginning it had split into two Integrities, would be to mould the whole Humansphere to the newest integrity—the new hitherto unknown, never before existent or possible thing. Because, implicitly, the species could never go back. A time on earth would come, of total either-or choice.

If species have to have twin brains and nerve systems that look like one, and a species arose which could successfully rebel mentally, the subjectivity would split in two. The compensation would have to take the form of *making the world itself into a communal outer subjective brain and nerve system*. And all this "projection" would have to be split, polarised "projection". I firmly intuit that this is how "intuition" emerged on to earth, and is what we mean, and have meant, by "intuition". Still speaking in general context, what the split in Subjectivity would have done to a very able species, would be to have split its subjectivity into an instinctive subjectivity and a counter-instinctive subjectivity. This counter-instinctive subjectivity is what we have grasped—when we could—as "intuition".

One can see, as some Hebrew intuitives saw, that history has indeed been a battle of good and evil, fought blindly, compulsively, for a kingdom of heaven on earth. And with an inescapable Armageddon sooner or later. The "kingdom" is merely a Humanosphere wherein intuition reigns supreme, because humans have come to know at last why it must—and why any vestige of instinctivity in the Humanosphere is subjective dynamite! In the "formula"—(it is *implicit*, by the way; I haven't *invented* the "formula")—the word survivalistic can just as well be "instinctive"; and the word religious can mean the genuine intuitive element in all religions before they have always (in history) been swallowed by survivalism.

The "formula" shows how neither reason nor sentiment will alone help us. Because they cancel-out! They have served both "good" and "evil" equally, ambiguously! A good bomb; a good patriot! No, Armageddon is between instinct and intuition in the whole Humanosphere, and is total and to the death of one, in the Humanosphere. And is probably now in our time.

R. STUBBS

London, NW4

---

## South Place News

### New Members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members: Ms T. O'katz, London NW3; Mrs O. Waterman, London SE25; Mr V. Abraham, London N10; Mrs P. Wood, London N16; Mrs E. Boswell, Middx and Miss L. Burchell, Middx.

### Obituary

We regret to report the deaths of Jack Green, a Trustee; Percival St. John Dixon, a past-Trustee; and Alfred Wolfe.

### Annual Dinner

The 1975 Annual Dinner will take place on February 14, at 7 p.m. for 7.30 in the Library, Conway Hall. Tickets cost £2, including sherry and table wine. The guest of honour will be Nicolas Walter.

### Bridge Drive

This will take place on Thursday, February 20, in the Library, at 6.30 p.m. There will be the usual welcome for newcomers and light refreshments.

Bridge practice takes place each Sunday, in the Library, at 6 p.m.

## Sunday Social

The February Sunday Social is on the 16th, at 3 p.m., when Mrs Burns will give an illustrated talk on A Grand Tour of France. The talk will be followed by tea (10p).

## Country Dancing

In co-operation with the Progressive League, there will be a country dancing session on Saturday, February 15. Starting at 3 p.m., the first half-hour will be devoted to basic instruction, and the session continues till 6 p.m.

## Kindred Organisations

Dora Russell will be guest of honour at the National Secular Society's annual dinner, London, Saturday 22 March. Other speakers are Michael Duane, Phyllis Graham, G. N. Deodhekar and Barbara Smoker. Advance booking essential; tickets £2.70 each from the National Secular Society, 698 Holloway Road, London N19; telephone 01-272 1266.

The study course on "The Religious Significance of Agnosticism", organised jointly with the Extra-Mural Dept of the University, Peter Cronin, Tutor, will start on Monday April 7. (Times: 6.30 to 8.30 p.m.) Booking by £1.00 registration fee either to *South Place* or the Extra-Mural Dept.

---

(Continued from page 2)

## Tuesday, February 11

7.00 pm—Discussion introduced by **Barrie and Pat Fitton. The Depriving Curriculum**

## Friday, February 14

7.00 pm—Annual Dinner

## Saturday, February 15

3.00–6.00 pm—Country Dancing

## Sunday, February 16

11.00 am—Sunday Meeting: **HAROLD BLACKHAM on Authority in our Society.** Contralto solos: Irene Clements

3.00 pm—Sunday Social

6.00 pm—Bridge Practice

6.30 pm—Concert: Dartington String Quartet. Mozart F K590, Bush Dialectic, Turina "La Oracion del Torero", Mendelssohn FmI Op 80

## Tuesday, February 18

7.00 pm—Discussion: **The Black Explosion in Schools**

## Thursday, February 20

7.00 pm—Bridge Drive in the Library

## Sunday, February 23

11.00 am—Sunday Meeting: **PROF G. A. WELLS on Strauss and the Development of New Testament Criticism**  
Cello solos: Lynden Cranham

3.00 pm—Forum: **Middle East—To Live in Freedom** (with film)

6.00 pm—Bridge Practice

6.30 pm—Concert: Delme String Quartet. Haydn Bfl Op 103, Martinu No 5, McCabe No 2, Beethoven C Op 59, No 3

## Tuesday, February 25

7.00 pm—Discussion introduced by **Andrew Mann. Parents as Teachers**

# 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.

---