

THE MONTHLY RECORD

Vol. 51. No. 7.

JULY, 1946.

Threepence

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE CHALLENGE OF OUR TIME. <i>By S. K. Ratcliffe</i>	2
THE ENGLISHMAN OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. <i>By G. W. Keeton</i> ..	4
THE LARGER EDUCATION. <i>By J. McCabe</i>	5
LOYALTIES. <i>By Archibald Robertson</i>	6
SOME NEEDS OF A UNITED WORLD. <i>By J. C. Flugel</i>	9
NOTES	11
WORLD UNION OF FREETHINKERS' CONFERENCE. <i>Professor Haldane on "Nature"</i>	12
R.P.A. ANNUAL DINNER	14
CORRESPONDENCE: <i>R. B. Kerr</i>	16
OBITUARY: <i>F. H. Mansford</i>	17
REVIEWS: THE RESURGENCE OF ASIA. <i>By S. K. Ratcliffe.</i> DRAGON DOODLES. <i>By Howard Kelly</i>	18
THE SOCIETY'S NOTICES	20

PUBLISHED BY

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY
CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

Chancery 8032

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR TIME

It seems to be generally agreed that the recent broadcast talks under this heading were unusually successful. There is a large and growing audience for the discussion of serious themes, and the public is evidently learning to demand continuity. The speakers made a varied group. Physical science was well represented, but there was a noticeable lack on the side of sociology. Contrary to the unvarying rule of the B.B.C. in the matter of religious services, there was no ban on the heretics. The Oxford historian who pleaded for a religious view of the universe and, surprisingly ended by taking refuge in Wordsworth's Tintern Abbey (a pill for the earthquake, indeed) stated that he could not find an answer to the riddle of existence "in terms of the dogmatic belief of the Christian creeds." With the exception of Professor Haldane, the other speakers who are on his side did not think it needful to be equally precise.

The challenge of our time is something we are made aware of every day. Readers of Emerson (and they are still not few in number) will remember how he began *The Conduct of Life*. It chanced, he said, that in Boston and New York several men of note had been reading discourses on the Spirit of the Times and that certain writers in England also were concerned with it. Emerson himself was repelled by the amplitude of the subject. He held that the one practical question for everyone of us was, How shall I live? "We are incompetent to solve the times. Our geometry cannot span the huge orbits of the prevailing ideas. We can only obey our own polarity." That was 1860. The world which existed 90 years ago, seemingly in complete security, has been shattered. We are no more competent than were our forefathers to meet the challenge of a time that is vastly more perplexing than theirs. Only we cannot evade it, and it is directly connected with the individual question as to how one ought to live.

In the radio series the first shots were fired by Arthur Koestler, with whose attitude no one of the later speakers agreed. Two of his statements were particularly objected to: that in the contemporary world ruthlessness was dominant, and that what we call progress is an express train with expediency as the engine and morality no more than the brake. Professor Haldane took him up sharply on both. He pointed out that we had witnessed of late the overthrow of the worst system of ruthlessness ever known: the civilized peoples would not have it. As to expediency and morality, he contended that in the sphere of ethics Science now offered only the sharpest of alternatives. We have got to behave better than our forefathers, for if we did not do so Science would kill us. Here, surely, was the central idea of the neo-Marxists stated in the simplest form.

Professor Haldane also had a point in answer to E. M. Forster, who made a protest against planning in matters of the mind and spirit. What else but that, he asked, was the English academic tradition? Its victims were all suffering from spiritual planning in a form so efficient that they had grown up without noticing it. The system had turned out men for administration whose knowledge was all of the past: men, for instance, who did not know the difference between typhoid and typhus. For Haldane, for J. D. Bernal and the other men of science, the answer to the challenge we are discussing lies in the proper use of Science, including the control of economics. The Master of Balliol, who had the last word, dubbed them "self-confident scientists," but that obviously, was no way of meeting their arguments.

Professor Bernal, for example, urged that, since Science had now come

of age, mankind must accept, for the first time, the responsibility of running his world in a sensible way. For ages it had run itself, piecemeal. A world directed by Science, he declared, could not be a dictatorship. It would have to be managed "through the integrated and voluntary co-operation of hundreds and thousands of small groups working together." Most of us would accept this as sound doctrine; it agrees with Professor Farrington's appeal for popular support of the scientists in the carrying out of their social obligations. Dr. Bernal, by the way, is always ready to avow his Left political faith. All the more notable, therefore, is his affirmation that in a scientifically ordered world both democratic freedom and the importance of the individual would need to be assured. There can be no worse evil in a world such as ours, he adds, than the temper which fosters a fear of using our full powers.

During the generation before the War we were continually being reminded, from all sides, that our general condition in respect of wisdom and morality bore no relation to the range and speed of material progress. Man, that is to say, had achieved command over the forces of nature before he had learnt how to command himself. And this would appear to be the one and only article upon which the radio speakers are in full agreement. The main difference between them is found in the relative weight they attach to economics and the material conditions of life. The "self-confident scientists" on the whole are convinced that all could be well with mankind in a world of plenty, with freedom from want and fear, while their orthodox opponents, including Lord Lindsay and Professor A. D. Ritchie, are convinced that advancing knowledge and material well-being have little to do with happiness and spiritual fulfilment. The former, indeed, says ironically that the scientific planners are inclined so to arrange the comforts of life that in the near future there should be no need to be good at all!

The broadcasts, as I have said, were widely appreciated, but I am inclined to think that if they were to be issued in pamphlet form they would seem in the main rather thin in substance, often remote from the grim realities of the hour and decidedly lacking in concrete suggestions for guidance. I am struck, for instance, by the fact that no member of the team seems to be particularly anxious about the atomic bomb, whereas if the debate had been American the bomb would have been in every talk. It is the Marxist Haldane who is most definite on the moral aspect of the question. Applied science is for him the coming autocrat of behaviour. It is in the opposite camp, as we should expect, that a more familiar ethical note is struck. "We want the new economy with the old morality," says Mr. Forster. "We have to combine goodness and cleverness," says Lord Lindsay. "We must harness the scientific mind in the service of the merciful heart," and that, I suggest, is a fine sentence to which we may all give unqualified assent.

Listeners to the talks can hardly have failed to remark that these selected teachers, all alike, had nothing to say about any means by which the challenge of our time could be made actual, as regards mental attitude and personal conduct, for the younger generation. The Churches, by their own complete admission, have lost their hold, and it seems to be recognized that in this sphere the schools are unable to exercise a positive influence. This being so, beyond all dispute, it would seem that we must look for practical aid to the creative workers (if that is not too high a rank to accord them) in scientific research and social experiment. But how if they feel that this is too much to ask of them?

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

SUNDAY MORNING LECTURES

Professor G. W. Keeton, M.A., LL.D., on "The Englishman of the Eighteenth Century"

May 12, 1946.

Readings from: Addison's Essays (Golden Treasury Edition).

The three greatest periods in English history have been the Age of Elizabeth, the Age of Queen Anne, and the Victorian era. Of these, the most brilliant of all was the Age of Queen Anne, which ushered in the century when the British overcame every rival in every quarter of the globe, and when the Dutch and the French, and even the Spanish, were compelled to surrender their overseas possessions to us. The period also included a succession of decisive British victories on land and sea, which have played a most important part in shaping the history of the modern world. It produced, moreover, our two most brilliant soldiers—Marlborough and Wellington—and one of our two greatest admirals—Nelson.

The British Empire was built up in the eighteenth century by gentlemen, and by the sons of gentlemen. The "glorious revolution" of 1688 had made England safe, apparently in perpetuity, for gentlemen. They therefore took commissions in the Services, or bought places in the East India Company, and with the devoted assistance of the sweepings of jails, they performed miracles and conquered continents.

The eighteenth century also saw a social revolution. It marked the growth of toleration, and a general softening of manners. This change is marked by equally significant changes in literature. Literature adopts the language and tone of polite conversation. It seeks to mould society into a more cultured, polite and tolerant outlook, and it pokes ridicule at the fanaticism and archaic habits of the pre-Revolutionary era. Prominent amongst those who instituted this social revolution through the medium of popular literature was Joseph Addison, himself a member of the class of county gentlemen, and also a member of the Whig group which was primarily responsible, first for the Revolution of 1688, and then for the succession of the Hanoverians in 1714.

The most outstanding characteristic of the eighteenth century is freedom. In religion, toleration had triumphed. In the political sphere, session after session passed without one notable new measure being introduced, and the ordinary citizen hardly noticed the impact of government upon him at all. Direct taxation was unknown; and even indirect taxation was confined within narrow limits. There was, of course, another side to this. There were vice, squalor and disease in the backstreets of towns; but the towns were as yet small, and we were overwhelmingly a nation of country dwellers, exporting substantial quantities of foodstuffs. The consequence was that he had a settled population, with very little able-bodied poverty. The country gentleman lived amongst his own folk, and was largely self-supporting. If society was exclusive, it was not a caste system, and the growing wealth of the commercial middle classes was already making a considerable impression upon it. The literature of the eighteenth century, whether prose or verse, is particularly rich in descriptions of the rural life which was the foundation of British vitality and greatness, and a study of wages and prices shows that in terms of real purchasing power the farm labourer's lot was far better than at any subsequent period.

The eighteenth century system was completely overthrown by the Industrial Revolution. This drew the rural worker from the countryside into the towns. He would not have gone had not the dislocation following the

Napoleonic Wars created large-scale rural unemployment which was increased by the repeal of the Corn Laws and the virtual destruction of British agriculture. Thus we became an urban community, with increasing dependence upon imported foodstuffs. This has been represented in the books as progress, but if the conditions of the eighteenth century are investigated, it will be found that they were more stable and equitable than those of the periods which have followed.

(Contributed by Professor Keeton)

Mr. Joseph McCabe on "The Larger Education,"

May 19, 1946

Readings from: (1) Dr. Ira Cardiff's "A Million Years of Human Progress."

(2) Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus."

Warnings multiply that grave dangers beset what we call our peace. A week ago Mr. Herbert Morrison said in America that "the forces of civilization are taking a worse beating today than they did at the time of Pearl Harbour or of the collapse of France." Dr. Gilbert Murray says in an article, which describes our age in its title as "The Rule of the Lie," in the current *Contemporary*, that in his judgment "the position of the civilized world since the San Francisco Conference is more precarious than at any time in the last 100 years." From America comes a book "Our World or None," sponsored by the Federation of American Scientists, and written by eighteen distinguished physicists, which repeats that warning from end to end. Professor Urey says that "it adds up to the most dangerous situation that humanity has ever faced." There are a score of other pronouncements which relieve me of the feeling that I am alone in the universe or that I trouble people with depressing views of life which others do not endorse. But I am not making any sombre survey of the world this morning. I ask you to consider how or why we have again drifted into so serious a situation.

The theory, which is so largely regarded as profound, that the development of the intelligence of the race has outstripped its moral development is an empty, new pattern of words. Apart from the fact that modern psychology entirely rejects the idea of a moral sense other than the intelligence itself applied to moral problems, where should we look for this sudden and remarkable advance in intelligence? In the theological world? Or does anyone contend that statesmanship has in our time risen to a higher intellectual level? The only advance which these theorists have in mind is the remarkable progress of science in the last quarter of a century, but it is precisely in the scientific world of our time that we find the highest moral standard. The men of science, apparently deceived by representations made to them, made a grave mistake in co-operating in the production of the most diabolical instrument of warfare yet invented. But while most of our men of science seem to be intimidated by the sheer savagery of the sentence passed on Dr. Nunn, the scientific men of America are making so splendid and successful a fight against the powerful elements that are pressing for the use of the bombs on Russia that we are beginning to hope. Their moral courage, while the churches are silent or on the wrong side, is as notable as their intellectual advance. On May Day the great Russian physicist, Kapitza, walked in the Moscow procession at the head of the atom-bomb squad. Yet the American Academy of Science did not hesitate to elect him a Foreign Associate.

In democracies this theory of intellectual and moral development must refer to the mass of the people, and again it is ludicrous. Apart from the abnormal conditions created by the war this generation will compare in average character with any that has preceded it, and the particular complaint

that our youth is unsound is little more than the confusion, which can be checked by statistics and records, of disgruntled old fogies. What the mass of the people want is not so much moral education as a stimulation to mental vitality that will make them more critical, more vigilant, more determined to have the truth about the world and the causes of its disorders. What is fundamentally wrong with the world is that, as a body, it surrendered itself prematurely to dissipations that strangle the critical intelligence and the sense of world citizenship. We opened the century with such a chant of triumph that we thought the battle was over. In a century of heroic fighting we had won democracy in most countries, and the representatives of the people henceforward relieved the common man from the work of vigilance and thinking. We are paying for the illusion.

Since we cannot look to what is narrowly called education to make much difference in this respect we need a larger education. The teacher has the guidance of a child during only about one third of its waking hours for ten years or so. In that time he is compelled by stubborn authorities to impose upon the child's mind such a mass of detail that is irrelevant to life that an educational reformer was recently moved to say that "teaching ought not to be an obstacle to learning." It would be a valuable experiment for teachers and sociologists to examine some few hundred young men and women of the age of twenty-one and test exactly how much is left of what they learned in school. The weakness has been repeatedly pointed out, and there are organizations for adult education, but the need is so large, and now so grave that something immensely larger is needed; and this is now a plain corollary from psychology.

Fifty years ago it was the fashion to discuss "the psychology of the crowd," in the words of the French writer, Dr. Le Bon. Twenty years later it was "the instincts of the herd," as Trotter put it. All this stuff was anti-democratic and disdainfully assured us that what happened in crowd-phenomena was that man's "primary instincts" came to the surface and found expression. But these discussions led psychologists, especially in America, to study the real relation of the psychology of the individual to the social group, and a new science was born. It discovered, in the words of Professor Dewey, that what we had called human nature is "a product of social experience." Man inherits a neuro-muscular apparatus that gives the baby only two or three elemental urges which are necessary for survival. His mental life is slowly created from the nursery onward by his environment (parents, teachers, preachers, newspapers, books, etc.). Life is a school from the cradle to the deathbed. No one wants uniformity in the environment. Clash of ideas and theories is a stimulus to progress. But a vast amount can be done in the way of warning men against untruths, and stimulating and helping them to demand and get the whole truth about past and contemporary life.

(Contributed by Mr. McCabe)

Archibald Robertson, M.A., on "Loyalties,"

May 26, 1946.

Readings from: (1) "Leaves of Grass," by Walt Whitman;
(2) "Man and Superman," by Bernard Shaw.

Man is a social animal. Everyone is brought up to feel allegiance to some whole of which he or she is part. But as to the nature of this whole opinions differ. The tragedy of past and present history lies in this conflict

of loyalties—not in the clash between individuals whose aims are through and through selfish, but in the clash between individuals whose aims are predominantly unselfish and conflict for the very reason that they are unselfish.

Most of us were brought up in the belief that the chief object of loyalty was the sovereign State. In the words of the catechism of the Church of England, our duty was "to honour and obey the King, and all that are put in authority under him." This and similar formulæ are a heritage from Tudor times, when the modern world was in the making and absolute submission to the sovereign State was the only real alternative to feudal anarchy. Our social, political and religious traditions have descended to us from that time without essential alteration, although the economic structure of the world has changed out of recognition.

We, however, who frequent Conway Hall have each in our own way been jolted out of the traditional rut; otherwise we should not be here. One potent agency in the subversion of such traditions is the discovery, made by everyone who studies the past for himself, that loyalties are relative. We grow up believing that obedience to "the King and all that are put in authority under him" is a self-evident duty and that only rogues and traitors refuse it. In civil war and revolution all the good people are on one side and all the bad people on the other. In the case of international war we may (though this is difficult) achieve the broad-mindedness necessary to see the enemies of our country as honourable opponents: they, after all, are fighting for *their* sovereign and doing *their* duty. But a rebel or revolutionist is just a disloyal person: there is nothing to be said for him. Then we throw away the text-books and read history on our own account, and find that this is not so. The rebel and revolutionist has a great deal to be said for him: he too has his ideal, his sense of duty and his capacity for self-sacrifice. Writers like Carlyle, though not to be recommended as scientific historians, have at least the merit of presenting "the other side of the medal" and correcting the Philistine orthodoxy of school text-books.

In this way it dawns on us that the beliefs in which we were brought up are not eternal truths, but the ideology of a class. The concept of loyalty inculcated on the youth of the upper middle class does not transcend the frontier of class: the masses are just "cads," strikes invariably anti-social, and the unemployed automatically undeserving. Our reading of history introduces us to another loyalty—that of Franklin, who boasted, "Where liberty is, there is my country," and of Thomas Paine, who capped it with, "Where liberty is *not*, there is mine;" that of the Paris Commune of 1871 who, asked for what he was fighting, replied, "For human solidarity." This confronts us at once with the fact of a conflict of loyalties. To the loyal subjects of George III, Franklin and Paine were traitors who deserved, if caught, to be hanged, drawn and quartered. To the French bourgeoisie the Communards were *canaille* to be shot like dogs. The loyalty of one was disloyalty to the other. We seem to be driven back to the conclusion of the old Greek "sophists" that might is right and justice the interest of the stronger.

Is there no other criterion? I believe that no cogent criterion can be supplied by pure reason. But the student of history may arrive at a criterion of a sort. The world is still in the making. In Tudor times, as we saw, the modern State was just emerging from feudal anarchy. Then it seemed necessary to those who drew up the English Prayer Book to lay down obedience to royal authority as an important part of the duty of every

man and woman. This seemed to us in our youth quite simple and straightforward; but it was not simple and straightforward in Tudor times. There was a conflict of loyalties then, as now. Sir Thomas More and many others went to their deaths rather than accept the new dogma of royal supremacy: The battle between the old feudal and Catholic order and the new capitalist and Protestant order was fought out at the stake, on the scaffold, and on the stricken field. The new order won; and obedience to "the King and all that are put in authority under him" became part of the pattern of life for the new English ruling class and their dependants. The Whig Revolution of the next century reduced the King to a rubber stamp in the hands of the ruling class, but it took care to preserve the rubber stamp. In effect, loyalty to the sovereign State as administered by its ruling class became the first principle of public morality.

Since then the world has been transformed by the Industrial Revolution and the domination of big business. Capitalist competition for markets has led to an international anarchy even more destructive of human welfare than the feudal anarchy of the Middle Ages. Frontiers have become an anachronism and nations a nuisance. Yet the duty of loyalty to the sovereign State, dating from a time when the sovereign State was the only alternative to feudal anarchy, continues to be inculcated by school, pulpit, Press and radio, at a time when the sovereign State itself has become a millstone round the neck of mankind. Every vested interest dating from the pre-scientific past—even the Catholic Church—now shelters behind the screen of nationalism. The reason is obvious. The only force capable of making an end of international anarchy is Socialism; and in doing so it would also make an end of big business and of the political power of the Catholic Church. Ever since the economic unification of the world by the Industrial Revolution became apparent, it has been obvious to thinking men that political unification was its natural corollary. At one time it was expected that this would be effected by free trade and *laissez-faire*. This left out of account the conflicting interests of the capitalists of different countries and therefore proved a mirage. A stable world order is possible only on a Socialist basis. Confronted with the choice between world anarchy and Socialism, the interests threatened with extinction by Socialism may be expected (especially if they think they have a monopoly of the atom bomb) to see in world anarchy the lesser evil.

Today, therefore, we are confronted with a conflict of loyalties similar to that which confronted men in the sixteenth century. On the one hand we have the traditional loyalties which have come down to us from that time—loyalty to "King and country," the "traditional England" of which Mr. Churchill is the avowed champion. On the other hand we have the relatively new conception of loyalty to mankind, including of course, our own countrymen as part of mankind, but involving possible disloyalty to the particular institutions under which they and we, as a historical accident, happen to live. It will be a tragic conflict, as was that of the sixteenth century. Our age too will have its Moors and Fishers, its Latimers and Ridleys. We of the Ethical movement will do well not to delude ourselves with the hope that we can avert or bridge this clash of ideologies. What we can do is to understand it, and in the light of understanding to choose whom we will serve. If a unified world emerges from the struggle—a world in which loyalty to mankind will become as axiomatic as was loyalty to King and country in the days of our youth—one riddle which theology and metaphysics have vainly sought to answer will have been solved by human action.

(Contributed by Mr. Robertson.)

Dr. J. C. Flugel on "Some Needs of a United World"

June 2, 1946.

Readings from: (1) "After Democracy," by H. G. Wells.

(2) "The Challenge of our Time" (a recent broadcast by Professor J. B. S. Haldane).

This week and next we shall be celebrating Victory. Most of us are approaching the celebrations in a sober and perhaps sombre mood. This betokens no want of gratitude for the achievements of the fighting forces but rather a sense that our task is only half accomplished, and that if we have won the war we are very far from winning the peace. To do that we need some limitation of the independence of the eighty or more States which exist today and a greater sense of human unity. It is only by applying our thoughts to this end that we can hope to find a solution.

We need a political structure above the individual States, but apparently we have come to the conclusion that it must be built upon those States, and Uno is an attempt in this direction. In order to make Uno a success I will draw attention to some important needs which are not receiving the attention they deserve.

First, the necessity of creating loyalty to Uno. It is not sufficient for political and legal machinery to be created: the peoples of the world must be loyal to it and take it seriously. To use an Americanism Uno must be sold. We must create enthusiasm. In our victory celebrations we should have before us some symbols, not only of ourselves and of our Allies, but also of Uno as a great institution which has emerged from all the suffering and fighting, and we must use all the devices discovered by advertisers. Uno is so important that some portion of the time of the broadcasting systems in all the constituent nations should be devoted to arouse interest in its proceedings. Something has already been done in this direction in America, and there are signs that it has aroused great interest. Then there should be a Uno magazine, attractively edited, and exhibited on the book-stalls of all the constituent nations. This propaganda should be put forward honestly with a view to link up existing loyalty to the State with loyalty to the greater organization of mankind. It is necessary to conceive a kind of hierarchy in which individual States play their parts in the whole, and we should create the idea that our individual welfare is bound up with that of Uno, otherwise we shall soon fall victims to that atomic bomb referred to by Professor Haldane in his broadcast.

One of our present difficulties arises from insistence on the sovereignty of the State. It so happens, unfortunately, under modern conditions, that we have become intensely interested in our nation States at a time when scientific progress is making us realize there is only "One World" in which there is no room for national States. We might adopt the point of view of Dr. Ranyard West who, in the Penguin Volume *Psychology and World Order*, points out that the term "Sovereign States" as applied to external and internal affairs respectively, has different meanings. The importance of the sovereign State in internal matters is that all the subjects are subordinate to it. Our rights are dependent on our State as the embodiment of the collectivity to which we belong, and in that sense it is sovereign. In matters of dispute between ourselves as individual citizens we must submit to the law of the State to which we belong, which should be impartial, and which has the supreme power. In external affairs, however, the State has no longer complete power because it is limited by the power of surrounding sovereign States. Secondly, there is a moral and legal difference, for sovereign States cannot morally claim to be judge in their own cause, and must be ready, therefore, to submit to judgment by a higher and more powerful authority.

Walter Lippmann has written that any international organization should have moral and legal control over individuals. This notion is not altogether new because it has been recognized in many spheres. It has been claimed that international law has the right to protect individuals as in the suppression of slavery, and the White Slave and Drug Traffic. The campaign for the international control of atomic energy really implies that the international authority shall directly control individuals who will have to recognize that they are subservient to its rules. Lippmann admits that such a state of affairs implies that the laws of individual States must be in harmony with other national States, and that if we are to take Uno seriously constituent States must see that their internal laws are in harmony with the rules of international authority. Here is a big task.

We have also the task of fitting our national States into the moral and legal organization of Uno, which implies the moralization of national groups. It is often said that corporations have no conscience. This may be an exaggeration, but their moral sense is certainly less acute than that of individuals. The correction of this tendency has to be considered. There are good psychological reasons for bad conduct on the part of groups. We are so conscious of the power of the group that we feel so many of us cannot be wrong, and we hand over our conscience to the group. We have to counteract this tendency and stress the need for moral behaviour on the part of the group. Ranyard West considers that, by and large, law is the embodiment of our better impulses and the way in which we feel we ought to behave, although we are sometimes tempted to disobey. We must realize that international law is the same thing applied to States, and that the rules of Uno represent, in the last resort, the better moral conscience of the national groups. Just as the individual may be tempted to flout the law but not approve of flouting it, national States are similarly tempted. Statesmen should remember that international law is something to which they should adhere just as the individual supports national law.

All this would be helped by a greater sense of a common background. We have the Four Freedoms, and more detailed formulations such as Lord Sankey's Rights of Man, but there is a tendency to shirk the issue. How far, for instance, could all nations agree that every man has the right to the greatest freedom of expression, discussion, association and worship? Would the U.S.S.R. agree? Or would the democracies agree to the proposition that buying, holding and selling again, simply in order to make a profit is not lawful; that it is speculation; that it does no service; that it makes profit out of want; that it tempts men to a complex of anti-social activities. I mention these instances because they show the difficulties which may arise in getting an acceptable basis.

The most important problem of all is that there should be some kind of general economic policy and some agreement about standards of living. Then there is the question of population. If we are to have a peaceful world we must face the fact that present population densities in the world may change and be a cause of war.

There is need for a common language. Hitherto there has been failure to implement any such idea owing to want of agreement as to which language should be used. I myself would say that the best claim is that of Esperanto. It has existed and worked for sixty years, and has survived the difficulties of two-world wars. It should be taught in all the schools of the world. This would be a magnificent gesture signifying desire for mutual understanding.

There is need not only for a common ideological background, but we must contemplate ourselves as individuals co-operating in a great common task. We readily feel this in time of war, and our task is to produce a similar feeling in time of peace. In this co-operation it is important, not

only that our late Allies and neutral countries, but that our ex-enemies should be brought into the circle of co-operating nations as soon as possible. The best way to rehabilitate an individual is to produce in him a sense of co-operation in a common task. Much the same must apply to a nation. If there is to be One World there must be some fundamental agreement as to the ultimate end of human life. This should be no mere academic agreement, but must find expression in an active sense of co-operation in the common task. This is the problem which confronts us in this week of Victory—as inspiring as any problem which the human mind has envisaged throughout the period of its history.

• F. G. G.

NOTES

The title of Mr. Joseph McCabe's lecture on July 28 is "Fifty Years Retrospect." This is understood to refer to the fact that it was on May 31, 1896, that Mr. McCabe delivered his first discourse to South Place Ethical Society. His subject is not on record, and as both the seven preceding and the seven following lectures were delivered by Dr. Moncure D. Conway it may be that Mr. McCabe, who had only recently left the Roman Catholic Church, was invited to take Dr. Conway's place at short notice. On September 13 of the same year Mr. McCabe made his second appearance on our platform when he spoke on Christ and Christianity. After that date he was not heard again on a Sunday morning until September 7, 1902, but during many succeeding years he was a frequent lecturer, and except for occasional intervals, he has been serving the Society over half a century. His discourse on July 28 will be listened to with much interest.

Mr. McCabe has accepted an invitation to be the Society's Guest of Honour at the Annual Reunion on Sunday, September 29.

There was a good attendance for the Annual General Meeting on May 30. It was presided over by Mr. W. C. Keay who proved an excellent Chairman. After a short discussion the Report and Accounts were duly adopted. The principal criticism referred to the failure to inaugurate Club facilities. As stated in the Report an effort had been made, but no evidence of sufficient support had been forthcoming. It is understood that the Social Committee will give the matter further consideration.

The following ladies and gentlemen were elected to fill the seven vacancies on the General Committee—Mr. H. L. Bullock, Mr. G. C. Dowman, Miss R. Halls, Mr. G. Hutchinson, Miss P. Snelling, Miss S. Toms and Mrs. I. Wood. The candidature of Mrs. J. R. Hinchliff was withdrawn.

A large part of the time of the meeting was occupied in discussing the motion "That hymn singing at the Sunday morning meetings be discontinued." Many members took part and the Chairman found it necessary to put a limit to the length of speeches. Eventually the motion was defeated by a substantial majority of those who voted, but many members preferred a non-committal attitude.

That this subject of congregational singing gives rise to much deep feeling is shown by the following extract from a member's letter to the Editor:

"My mind is still considerably disturbed by the divergence of opinions disclosed at the A.G.M. I had hoped that the form of 'service' provided by our Society would fulfil the needs of the two groups so aptly described by Julian Huxley in his *Religion Without Revelation*, but personally I

would not press for the continuance of anything which is likely to cause embarrassment to others, or keep anybody away."

Our Correspondent enclosed the following extract from the preface of the work referred to:

"... the spiritual values of religion are in large part still in the possession of the organised churches, while these same churches have lost all claim to the intellectual values. The head and the heart of civilisation are being torn in different directions. Men in whom temperament or accident makes the head the more powerful stay wholly outside the churches, but do not see why the tradition of religion, the hallowed beauty of the buildings, and the solace of religious service should be the vested interest of a creed which is intellectually and socially outworn. Those in whom the heart has taken the ascendancy will, in their spirit's need, have become members of this or that church, but many of them are filled with intellectual despair and long for a breath of the spirit of truth, which in the hands of science is transforming the world."

There is obviously a desire to resume still more of the Society's pre-war activities. We hear that enquiries with a view to arrange an Easter Co-operative Holiday have been put on foot. If there were evidence of sufficient support no doubt the Play Reading Circle could be re-started. In the meantime, however, Miss Winifred L. George of the General Committee has very kindly offered to revive the Society's Rambling Section. Circumstances permitting, there will be a "surprise" ramble after the Sunday morning meeting on July 14. Lunch should be brought.

Miss George will welcome offers to lead full day rambles on Sundays in August, and half-day rambles in subsequent months. She will be available for consultation at the Bookstall after the morning meetings in July.

We are glad to hear that our friends of the Ethical Union have arranged a Week-end Conference on "Aspects of the Social Ideal" at High Leigh, Hoddesdon, from Saturday to Monday, August 24-26 next. The charge will be £1 with 2s. 6d. extra for lunch on Saturday. There are not many vacancies and immediate application should therefore be made to the General Secretary at 4A Inverness Place, London, W.2.

The programme will resemble those of the Conferences which were a feature of the work of the Ethical Union before the war.

WORLD UNION OF FREETHINKERS

Professor J. B. S. Haldane on "Nature"

Mr. Joseph Reeves, M.P., opening the Session at Conway Hall, on Friday, May 3, said it was gratifying that the Union was able to meet so soon after the world war. It was good that men who believed in freedom of thought could foregather to discuss their problems, and the fact that they were able to do so was a great contribution to the spirit of man which had triumphed over two devastating conflicts.

Dr. Harry Roberts, who it had been hoped would speak, was unable to be present. His address was read by Mr. H. J. Blackham. A reference in it to man's purpose in the Universe gave rise to considerable criticism in the discussion which followed.

The Chairman then introduced Professor J. B. S. Haldane who, having been greeted with much applause, delivered an address on "Nature." We are only able to publish a shortened version which has not been checked by Professor Haldane. Here is part of what he was understood to say.

I take it that I am not expected to give an account of Nature, but to

suggest how Freethinkers should regard it. Most of us agree that Nature exists apart from our minds and that it existed before human beings became aware of it. Most of you would also agree, I think, that we are part of it. If we were something outside Nature, attached in some peculiar way to a different system, we should not have the same ground for confidence in our own judgment. As it is, if our opponents say Nature is rational and must therefore have had a rational creator, we can say reason is natural and is therefore within limits an efficient guide to truth. I shall not try to say what Nature is, but how we should regard Nature intellectually and materially. Here there is a very sharp contradiction in human thought. For example, on the one hand to describe certain conduct as unnatural, is to deliver an extreme condemnation. On the other hand, St. Paul said that natural man is sexual and devilish. A contrast of that sort is inevitable if we regard Nature as a planned whole, but as a matter of fact Nature is full of strife, and our human struggle is only an incident in it. From the point of view of a student of Nature not particularly interested in Man he is not specially important compared with the forces which built up the mountains to level them again, or were concerned with astronomical events. Nature is a realm of strife and is not something planned. But in order that he could try to see some principles running through Nature it was necessary for Man to pass from an animistic stage when every natural object, be it tree, brook, thunderstorm or what not, was inhabited by some spirit more or less similar to a human mind, to the stage of regarding Nature as created by a single intelligent being, and this way of thinking has left traces in the thought of the most atheistical among us.

We are too much cut off from Nature. An English field is as much a human product as a London street. Only on the seashore or wild moorland or mountainside can we see Nature as it was before Man came. The inevitable courses of our lives—birth, love and death are essential natural events which we share with other mammals. Our ancestors surrounded them with ceremonies. We should see them as part of the rhythm of Nature. Relations between husband and wife are the most natural of things, but we have surrounded them with ideas like sin and death. Children should see animals going through their natural cycles. We have to steer our way through two evils. One is to regard natural events, such as physiological love, as sinful, and its consequences, according to Christian doctrine, as a punishment for sin; another, equally serious, is to go any distance in the direction of worshipping Nature. The more we admire Nature the more we are inclined to praise the Creator, but we should remember that He lavished as much care on minute parasitic organisms as on the man whom they destroy. We ought for our own good to have access to, and knowledge of Nature. It is monstrous that any child should grow up without some intimate acquaintance with some plant or animal. When we get the houses we are promised, it should be possible for any London child to have space for a small aquarium in which fish or newts can live a reasonable time and breed, or for some other opportunity of seeing what non-human life is like.

We cannot avoid thinking of Nature in terms of religious origin, for instance, that it exists for some purpose, or that it obeys laws. I suspect that those who have not escaped from this bondage have to some extent confused the important ideas of purpose and function. We can speak of an organ having a function without implying any purpose—Darwin showed how that was possible. That does not mean there is no such thing as purpose. I have purpose, and also some animals have it; but when I am told that a jelly fish has purpose in its movements, then I reflect that if a piece of my intestine be placed in a jar it will move like a jelly fish because of the

way it reacts to its environment. If we admit purpose in the jelly fish, we shall have to admit it in our own insides. Perhaps then we can exaggerate the purposiveness which exists in the animate part of Nature.

We have to know Nature as it is. As we go to study Nature, particularly those who devote most of their lives to that study, we realize that the bacteria in our own systems are as interesting as the grasses growing by the wayside. We see struggles between classes and nations—struggles which like those occurring in Nature are capable of elimination. We can only begin to think scientifically about ourselves when we have thought scientifically about Nature. I believe that although nothing I have said is original it represents a possible humanistic attitude to Nature. F. G. G.

RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION Annual Dinner and Reunion

About 350 ladies and gentlemen assembled at the Connaught Rooms, London, on Tuesday, May 14. Included in the company were two members of the House of Lords and about 12 of the House of Commons. PROFESSOR BENJAMIN FARRINGTON presided. Between dinner and dancing there were speeches. The Chairman said that if Rationalists were going to be so rational as to ration speeches to ten minutes, and to eat, drink, and dance, it was a good omen for the future. He expressed the debt he owed personally to the R.P.A. from the time of his boyhood. A debt was also due to the R.P.A. for their efforts to make knowledge available to the ordinary man. When he was studying philosophy he wanted to read about Hume and was told that if the R.P.A. had a book it would only cost him sixpence. The R.P.A. exists not only to propagate rationalism, but also to organize a taste for literature which would otherwise be forgotten. It is very important to remember that we are defending something which has grown up in this country and other countries which without our efforts would be neglected. He was authorized to announce that the R.P.A. has founded a Lectureship in the University of Birmingham to be named after Sir Josiah Mason, a prominent Rationalist, and the founder of Mason College, which became the nucleus of the University. It provides for an annual course of eight or ten lectures on the social sciences, especially social anthropology. There can be nothing more important than that we should propagate a rational approach to society and its changes. He strongly approved any effort to proceed with social changes through a rationalist institution. In one of Mill's essays on religion there is a reference to the enormous amount of work for social reconstruction done by rationalists which has not been credited to them because institutions have been largely religious and have taken credit due to rationalists. By asserting the claim of rationalism the R.P.A. does work of fundamental importance.

PROFESSOR HAROLD J. LASKI, proposing prosperity to the Rationalist Press Association, said that when the Trustees of the admirable foundation announced by Professor Farrington chose the Lecturers, he hoped they would not regard social anthropology as confined to Polynesia, but would realize that British institutions, and still more, Irish institutions, needed most careful scientific scrutiny. Why, for instance, has President De Valera been able to turn an intellectual Ireland into a smaller edition of Portugal, and why is it that in all countries dominated by religious zeal there is invariably deep feeling and shallow thinking? A great deal of new knowledge may be revealed by such enquiries. He congratulated the R.P.A. on its publications during the war years and laid special emphasis on the three remarkable volumes in The Thinker's Library, written by Archibald Robertson. Few works have been published in the last generation which have combined such good qualities of scholarship and popular appeal. Professor Laski hoped that

the R.P.A. would continue its fight with the B.B.C. He noticed that many of his political friends were present, and he hoped that when at the close of this year the new Charter of the B.B.C. came up for adoption members of both Houses would insist on the monopoly of religion held by the B.B.C. being broken, and that it would be made clear that there is a very large section of the population which desires to hear serious religious questions discussed in rationalist terms, and which did not relish the peculiar forms of unction provided, particularly from 7.50 a.m. He appealed to the Directors to consider republishing works of the rationalist movement which appeared between 1750 and 1850. All except those of Thomas Paine are known only to those who can ransack old bookstalls. He was thinking of Helvétius and D'Holbach. If made available they would be certain of circulation. Whenever a great war was followed by changes in the social constitution, ancient organizations would defend themselves by more mysticism. There were signs of such revival. We should drink to an Association which acts in the spirit of T. H. Huxley by going forward to meet the enemy instead of remaining on the defensive in the hope of repelling his attack.

MR. JOSEPH REEVES, M.P., said there was a great crowd of people to bear witness to the work of the R.P.A., and that this was a proper place where a Professor and he—the product of an elementary school—could meet. He owed his outlook on life in no small measure to the cheap reprints which had a terrific impact on the minds of the young people of his generation. They introduced him to Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, Spencer, Ingersoll, Grant Allen and J. M. Robertson. He emphasized the cheapness of these reprints because that made the wide dissemination of knowledge possible. The R.P.A. has had to fight the most powerful forces of darkness in high places, but it could hit back and dared to go on with its work, and with so many victories over superstition to its credit it now embarks on another effort for freedom of thought and speech. You may say we already have it, but there is still a campaign to be fought on behalf of freedom of the air. The B.B.C. with its monopoly takes sides on one of the most controversial of subjects. It recognizes differences between religious sects but does not recognize rationalism. We can say what we like in Hyde Park, but not in Broadcasting House. We are far too tolerant over this discrimination. We must bestir ourselves and not allow great monopolies to clamp down on our freedom of expression. The great free thinkers are rarely invited to broadcast what are considered heretical views. When Julian Huxley and Bertrand Russell are asked to speak it is as members of that wretched Brains Trust which is an insult to the intelligence of our people. The Charter is due for renewal. This is our chance. We have already asked Sir William Haley to receive a deputation. Behind us are 46 members of the Commons and 12 of the Lords who have associated themselves with our demands, and 43 of them are willing to join the deputation. We must persevere in the interests of social justice.

MR. FREDERICK WATTS, responding to the Toast, expressed on behalf of the Directors the sense of honour conferred by the presence of so many distinguished people. Before the war they always had many from the Universities and the world of Science, but never before the support of so many Members of Parliament or representatives of literature and the book trade. We are said not to advertise ourselves sufficiently. There has been reason for our policy. The Association was originally, and remains primarily, a publishing organization. If, however, the R.P.A. had placed its insignia on works booksellers were accustomed to ban, they would not have been sold, so it had not been advisable to label them as advance guards of the rationalist movement. Organized on discreet lines, the cheap reprints were a great success. Our publications do their work for Rationalism

without, in any comparable degree, advertising the R.P.A. Mr. C. S. Lewis has said that no evangelical work can have wide success against the continual glut of cheap scientific books written on atheistical principles. That is a reference to The Thinker's Library whose success has been achieved by keeping the R.P.A. in monastic seclusion.

We are aware of thousands of people of our way of thinking who are largely isolated and quite unorganized. There are no means of rallying them against reactionary measures inspired by the Churches. In some districts such people have formed themselves into groups and they ask for assistance. We must, however, continue our essential work of publishing, and before we can undertake the organization of rationalists we must be sure that any new machinery will not react unfavourably on the printed word.

We want more prominent men and women to help us than do at present. Although sharing our outlook they will not declare their rationalism, and we know their difficulty. Doing good in secret is good enough, but doing good in the eyes of men, in the promotion of freedom of thought, is much better. If undeclared rationalists would come forward, it would then not be many years before we could give a report of great progress.

PROFESSOR A. E. HEATH in the course of proposing the Toast of the Chairman, and thanking him for his presence, said it was also fitting that we should think of Mr. Charles A. Watts, now in his 88th year, whose work laid the foundations of this Association.

F. G. G.

CORRESPONDENCE

India and the Malthusian

DEAR EDITOR,—In your June issue Mr. H. L. Beales says: "India likewise. 'Why can't these people be provident,' asks the Malthusian. 'Why can't they understand their own best interests?' But the answer is in terms that elude him. 'Share your prosperity; coax them to provident habits by giving them something to be provident about,' is the common sense of this situation."

In advising Indians and Chinese to limit their numbers, Malthusians merely advise what has already been done with brilliant success in many other countries. The death-rate is the most accurate test of social well-being. The registration of births and deaths began in England in 1838. For forty years there was no improvement whatever in the death-rate, although medical knowledge was increasing by leaps and bounds. Then Bradlaugh and Annie Besant began their birth control campaign, and the result was a tremendous fall in both the birth-rate and the death-rate. The same thing happened in many other countries. These facts are so notorious that they are mentioned in every standard economic textbook. Marshall's *Principles of Economics* is the standard text book in England. On page 192 of the 1922 edition it says: "The general mortality is high where the birth-rate is high."

In the British Medical Journal of March 9, Sir John Megaw, former Director-General of the Indian Medical Service, shows that the appalling death-rate of India is entirely caused by starvation, and that medical science can do nothing to reduce it until the birth-rate falls. In 1930 a Chinese province was ravaged by cholera, and a European doctor asked the Governor why nothing was done to combat the disease. The Governor replied that it would be absurd to do anything, because any decrease of the number who died from cholera would merely increase the number who died of starvation. (Arnold Daniel in *Free Europe*.)

335 Sydenham Road, Croydon.

R. B. KERR.

OBITUARY

Frederick Herbert Mansford, F.R.I.B.A.

Frederick Herbert Mansford (generally known as Herbert Mansford) died on June 13, 1946. He was born on April 10, 1871, and had thus entered his seventy-sixth year.

Herbert was the youngest of the four children of Mrs. Ann Mansford whose name, with those of her daughter and three sons, appears in the list of members of South Place Ethical Society for the year ended March 31, 1894, the earliest record available. Of these five, only two—Mrs. E. J. Harrington (originally Augusta; E. Mansford), and Mr. Wallis Mansford—now remain with us.

The family lived in Aldersgate street, only a few minutes' walk from the old chapel in South Place, Finsbury. They came under the influence of Dr. Moncure D. Conway, and they were all keenly interested in one or other of the aspects of the Society's cultural life. The eldest son, Mr. Tate Mansford, was for a time joint secretary of the Society.

Herbert's school days were happy, first at Lenham, in Kent, and afterwards at Horley Grammar School, in Surrey. On leaving there he entered his mother's stationery business in the City of London where he learnt the discipline of commercial life which proved useful to him in later years. He had, however, a strong bent towards architecture which led him to join the staff of an architect engaged on building construction in the North of England. Here he gained first-hand knowledge of practical work. Later, he entered the drawing office of Mr. Alfred Waterhouse, R.A., where he rose to the position of chief draughtsman. In 1906, he was attracted to Ruislip, in Middlesex, which had just secured its Town Planning Act. He had recently married Florence Lavinia Lyon, and at Ruislip he built himself a house. There he started in his profession as an architect on his own account. He designed several houses for Ruislip, Petersfield in Hampshire, and many other places. His architectural gifts will, however, best be remembered by Conway Hall, in Red Lion Square, Bloomsbury, which was erected to serve as the new home for South Place Ethical Society. This edifice is the most important example of his talent in design.

For several years from 1895, and, after an interval, for many succeeding years, Herbert Mansford was Secretary of the Society's Building Subcommittee. The chapel which had been erected in 1823 was ceasing to give satisfaction, and the question of rebuilding it on its own site was being considered. Plans were prepared by Herbert Mansford in 1901, but the estimated expense of carrying them out was prohibitive, and the war of 1914-1918 was a further cause of delay. In 1922, however, after schemes had been anxiously examined, a site was purchased in Red Lion Square. Herbert Mansford was commissioned to prepare plans, and in 1925 he was appointed architect. Thus he had full scope for his boundless enthusiasm, constructive ability, and for his gift of practical planning. When the building was completed in 1929 it gave great satisfaction, not only to its owners, but also to the numerous organizations that have made use of it from time to time.

In the Society's report for 1929, gratitude is expressed for the work of our architect and fellow member, Mr. Herbert Mansford, whose signal success is the result not only of skill which has won high praise in professional circles, but of long and devoted labour.

Apart from Herbert Mansford's great services as architect he assisted the Society in many other ways. As long ago as 1893, when only twenty-two years of age, he was reading a paper at a social gathering. He gave lectures on English and Continental cathedrals and abbeys illustrated by a valuable series of lantern slides bequeathed to him by his friend Mr. Joseph

Grimshire. He also conducted rambling parties over buildings of special interest. This he continued to do up to about ten years ago.

He also entered wholeheartedly into the social and cultural life of Ruislip. His influence was always exerted to uphold the amenities of the village and its surroundings. His exceptional knowledge and appreciation of old buildings was recognized by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and he was appointed one of the responsible experts to report on the desirability of preserving buildings situated in the County of Middlesex.

Herbert Mansford lost his wife in 1941, and after that he never fully recovered his former buoyancy. During his closing years he had to endure much physical inconvenience and suffering, but he continued to attend meetings at Conway Hall throughout the period of the war, and he seldom failed to bring with him on Sunday mornings an offering of flowers or foliage for the decoration of the platform.

He had great personal charm and will be remembered for his cheerful friendliness, and for his readiness always to be helpful. By the death of Herbert Mansford the Society has lost one of its most devoted and talented adherents, and the community of Ruislip a public spirited citizen. He is survived by Hugh, his only child, and by two grand-daughters. The cremation took place at Golders Green on Monday, June 17, in the presence of a large company. The service, in which this biographical notice was included, was conducted by an officer of South Place Ethical Society.

REVIEWS

THE RESURGENCE OF ASIA. By S. K. Ratcliffe. *Watts*. 1s. and 2s.

This admirably produced *brochure* presents in permanent form the Conway Memorial Lecture for 1946, of which a general impression by one of the audience appeared in our June number. Careful perusal of its pages confirms the view then expressed that the lecture is a grave and valuable utterance on a theme of the utmost importance to us all.

Mr. Ratcliffe, whose personal acquaintance with the East began some five-and-forty years ago, offers here the views of a shrewd, dispassionate and highly informed observer on the problem of Asiatic demands for freedom from the yoke of European exploitation and control—a complex problem pregnant with the gravest consequences for our Commonwealth of Nations. This issue was first thrust upon us as long ago as 1857, when the fierce Indian mutiny was relentlessly suppressed. It is now again in the foreground with our recognition of India's right to independence; but the man in the street does not realize, even now, the vast implications which that concession involves. He still sees vaguely the British Empire as assured of a permanent pre-eminence among less favoured peoples; and even far more discerning readers of the Press must be too puzzled and confounded by the tangle of actualities and motives to have a clear conception of the issues.

Mr. Ratcliffe opposes all easy optimism with a sternly realistic view based on a study of the rapid spread of nationalist movements among the Oriental races. This involves a brief *resumé* of modern history and politics throughout the regions affected—including of necessity China, which has never been subject to European dominance and has consequently remained incapable of the elaborate organization and control that are among the few benefits derived (with many disadvantages) by the East from the West. He has little difficulty in disposing of the legend of "the unchanging East" as a figment of European myopia, and in showing that the conception of vast Oriental regions ruled by a small Western autocracy—a doctrine that Kipling preached in and out of season—was at best a merely temporary expedient,

doomed by its own qualities to collapse as Western ideals spread among the populace.

The author's purview ranges across the continent, from Turkey and Persia via India, Siam, Indonesia and the Philippines to China and Japan; but it rests longest upon India—by far the gravest of the portents, and a land of which he has a close personal knowledge. There is a graphic summary of the last thirty years of Indian politics; the birth of *Swaraj* (Home Rule), the emergence of the ascetic Gandhi with his doctrine of civil disobedience, the efforts (pacificatory or repressive) of the viceroys towards a settlement, and a sympathetic sketch of the liberal but ill-fated Cripps' Mission of 1942. The personalities of Gandhi, Nehru and Jinnah, and their divergent policies, are vividly depicted. The first of these is described as "the solitary example in the modern age of a leader commanding a host of adherents with the aid of colleagues who reject his philosophy;" one who "dreams of an India without a Central Government or an adequate Exchequer." Nehru, in sharpest contrast, is "a fully-equipped citizen of the modern world" who "thinks as a European;" and Jinnah is shown as a rigid leader "barred from co-operation in a National Government by his uncompromising stand on the issue [Pakistan] he has himself made." And the way out through the entanglement thus created by opposing ideologies? "The only answer possible at the present stage is that no one, either Indian or British, can possibly tell."

In view of this impasse, and of that other—no less fraught with peril—in Palestine, Mr. Ratcliffe rightly terms the future of Asia "ominous beyond description." Yet he finds (as justly) ground for confidence in an ultimate solution, resting upon the solid basis of the will of an awakened people throughout the Orient, insistent upon that first of human needs: freedom.

ONLOOKER.

DRAGON DOODLES. From Fantasy to Fact. By Howard Kelly. *Watts and Co.* 6s.

This is a charming little book in which extensive use is made of the myths and fairy stories suggested by ancient Chinese emblems. The author has before him a fresco on which is shown a robe that once belonged to an Emperor, for it is decorated with the twelve sacred ornaments that only an Emperor could wear. The emblematic character of these ornaments is described and their connection traced with the development of our knowledge of mathematics and astronomy. A particularly brilliant chapter which starts with the story of a poetic little love affair between a Chinese Herd-boy and a Spinning Maiden leads on to a description of nebulae, certain fixed stars and the Milky Way. There is a fascinating account of Chinese writing. Another chapter traces the growth of our conception of elementary substances, from the theory of "earth, air, fire and water" up to the electrons and nucleus of the atom. The book is well illustrated and is suitable as a present to young or old. It contains no controversial matter.

New Members

Mrs. MARY H. LAWRIE, Burnley; Mr. E. L. PIERCE, Petersfield; Mr. K. H. MCALLISTER, Catford.

Birth

On June 10, 1946, at Queen Charlotte's Hospital, to DORIS and DOUGLAS BROUGHTON, a daughter (DEBORAH MURIEL).

Death

Mr. F. HERBERT MANSFORD, F.R.I.B.A., on June 13, 1946, at Uxbridge Nursing Home, in his 76th year.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY.

SUNDAY MORNING MEETINGS AT ELEVEN O'CLOCK

July 7.—**DR. J. C. FLUGEL, D.Sc.**—A Pioneer in Psychology. **C. E. Spearman.**
Violin Solos by **LINA TANNER**:

Romance in F *Beethoven*
Presto *Tartini*

Hymns: Nos. 227 and 207

July 14.—**PROF. G. W. KEETON, M.A., LL.D.**—Population Pressure and World Politics.

Soprano Solos by **IRENE EVANS**:

Silent Noon *Vaughan Williams*
The Nightingale *Delius*

Hymns: Nos. 76 and 220

July 21.—**ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, M.A.**—The Shriek Against Science.

Bass Solos by **G. C. DOWMAN**:

At the Mid Hour of Night, *Ella Ivimey*
Hill and Vale *G. C. Dorman*

Hymns: Nos. 147 and 141

July 28.—**J. McCABE.**—Fifty Years Retrospect.

Piano Solos by **ELLA IVIMEY**:

Largo and Rondo from Sonata No. 2 *Beethoven*

Hymns: Nos. 139 and 64

Pianist: **ELLA IVIMEY**

Admission is free. A collection is taken towards general expenses.

There will be no Sunday Meetings in August. They will be resumed on September 8.

Rambles.—Circumstances permitting, there will be a "Surprise" ramble after the Sunday Morning Meeting on July 14. Bring lunch. (See Note on page 12).
Hon. Secretary, Miss W. L. George, 62 Malta Road, Leyton, E.10.

At Homes.—Suspended until September 29, when the Annual Reunion will take place.

The Objects of the Society are the study and dissemination of ethical principles and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment.

Any person in sympathy with these objects is cordially invited to become a Member (minimum annual subscription 10s.), or Associate (minimum annual subscription 5s.). Associates are not eligible to vote or hold office. Enquiries should be made of the Registrar to whom subscriptions should be paid.

Officers

Hon. Treasurer: **C. E. LISTER**

Hon. Registrar: **Mrs. T. LINDSAY**

Secretary: **C. J. TURNADGE**

} Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.

The Monthly Record is posted free to Members and Associates. The annual charge to subscribers is 4s. Matter for publication in the August issue should reach the Editor, Mr. F. G. GOULD, 45 Traps Hill, Loughton, Essex, by Saturday, July 13.

The Society does not hold itself responsible for views expressed or reported herein.

Conway Hall is registered for Marriages. Funeral Services can be arranged. Applications should be addressed to the Secretary.

FARLEIGH PRESS LTD. (T.U.). Beechwood Works. Beechwood Rise. Watford. Herts.