

# The MONTHLY RECORD

Vol. 66 No. 10

OCTOBER 1961

Sixpence

**Editorial**

**Notes by Custos**

**Seventy-Five Years**

*Archibald Robertson*

**The Contemporary Situation of Divorce Law Reform**

*F. H. A. Micklewright*

**Frank Buchman**

*Custos*

**Correspondence**

**South Place News**

---

**Society's Other Activities**

---

Published by

**SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY**

**Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London WC1**

**Chancery 8032**

# SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

SUNDAY MORNING MEETINGS AT ELEVEN O'CLOCK

---

- October 1—DR. HELEN ROSENAU** (University of Manchester).  
Recently returned from a visit to Sweden  
**Chaos, Coercion or Co-operation?**  
**A Problem in Town Planning**  
Bass Solos by G. C. DOWMAN (accompanied by Edward Mandel)
- October 8—H. J. BLACKHAM, B.A.**  
**Moral Re-Armament Examined**  
Piano Solos by JOYCE LANGLEY
- October 15—DONALD G. MACRAE, M.A.** (dept. Sociology, L.S.E.)  
**Culture and a Mass Society**  
Contralto Solos by MURIEL DIETERLEE
- October 22—R. S. SCHENK, B.Sc.(Econ.),** Research Sociologist  
**Violence and the Intellectuals**  
Bass Solos by G. C. DOWMAN
- October 29—DR. JOHN LEWIS** (Morley College)  
**Who are the Materialists Today?**  
Violin and Piano Solos by MARGCT MACGIBBON and FREDERICK JACKSON
- November 5—MAURICE CRANSTON, M.A., B.Litt.**  
**The Moral Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre**

**SOUTH PLACE SUNDAY CONCERTS, 71st Season, 1961-62**  
Concerts 6.30 p.m. (Doors open 6 p.m.) Admission 2s.

- October 1—ALLEGRI STRING QUARTET.**  
Haydn in C, Op. 76, No. 3; Beethoven in C minor, Op. 18, No. 4;  
Schubert in D minor, Op. Posth.
- October 8—GRUENBERG-REIZENSTEIN DUO**  
Mozart in A, K526; Reizenstein. Beethoven in A, Op. 47  
Violin and Piano Sonatas.
- October 15—AEOLIAN STRING QUARTET. ROGER LORD**  
Mozart in B flat, K456; Beethoven in E flat, Op. 127  
String quartets; Bliss Oboe Quintet.
- October 22—QUARTET PRO MUSICA**  
Mozart in D minor, K421; Beethoven in F minor, Op. 95  
String quartets. CELIA ARIELI. Brahms Piano Quintet.
- October 29—HARRY ISAACS PIANO TRIO**  
Mozart in C, K548; Tchaikowsky in A minor, Op. 50;  
Brahms in C, Op. 87.

---

*The Monthly Record* is posted free to members and Associates. The Annual charge to subscribers is 8s. Matter for publication in the November issue should reach the Editor, G. C. Dowman, Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1, by October 6.

---

**Secretary:** J. HUTTON HYND  
**Hon. Treasurer:** A. FENTON  
**Hon. Registrar:** Mrs. T. C. LINDSAY  
**Asst. Hon. Registrar:** Miss W. L. GEORGE  
**Executive Secretary:** Miss E. PALMER

**Officers**

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

# The MONTHLY RECORD

---

Vol. 66 No. 10. OCTOBER 1961. Sixpence

---

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	3
NOTES BY <i>Custos</i>	5
SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS, <i>Archibald Robertson</i>	8
THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION AND DIVORCE LAW REFORM, <i>F. H. A. Micklewright</i>	11
FRANK BUCHMAN, <i>Custos</i>	13
CORRESPONDENCE	15
SOUTH PLACE NEWS	17
SOCIETY'S OTHER ACTIVITIES	19

---

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

---

## EDITORIAL

IT IS WITH GREAT REGRET that Conway Hall has lost the services of Dr. W. E. Swinton, who sailed for Canada on September 17 to take up an appointment as head of the Life Sciences Division of the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto. An attractive writer and speaker, as well as a kindly friend, he will be almost irreplaceable at Conway Hall, yet he carries our best wishes for his future. We are pleased to print the following account of his career taken from the *Guardian* of August 30. It is headed "Dinosaur Expert":

*Extracts from the "Guardian"—August 30, 1961*  
*Dinosaur Expert*

London is to lose its "dinosaur man". Dr. W. E. Swinton is retiring from his post as curator of fossil reptiles at the Natural History Museum and is leaving for Canada on September 17. Dr. Swinton, who has been at the museum for thirty-seven years, is one of the outstanding authorities on dinosaurs and related reptiles in the world. In a more intimate field, he is known to many thousands who have been to the Christmas lectures at the museum as a lecturer who manages to make ancient subjects both amusing and fascinating.

In sound and television broadcasting in this country Dr. Swinton has built up a reputation as a brilliant speaker and in many countries overseas his lecture tours have established him as one of the most sought after. In 1950 he used the proceeds from his lectures to buy for his museum a fossilised dinosaur from Canada. Now he is to become head of the Life Sciences Division of the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto. The Canadians are rejoicing, but he will be missed here not only by the Natural History Museum but by the British Association and the Museums' Associations, all of which he holds in deep regard.

### **The Humanist Frame**

The *Observer* on September 3 printed an extract from the opening chapter of *The Humanist Frame*, edited by Julian Huxley (Allen and Unwin, 37s. 6d.) and we should like to quote from this extract. Sir Julian points out that an American writer has said that our economy depends on persuading more people to believe that they want to consume more products. This is called consumption-explosion and like population-explosion cannot continue much longer.

#### **Self-defeating Process**

It is a self-defeating process, says Sir Julian: "Sooner than later we shall be forced to get away from a system based on artificially increasing the number of human wants, and set about constructing one aimed at the qualitative satisfaction of real human needs, spiritual and mental as well as material and physiological.

Where does Conway Hall stand here? It is certain that the South Place Ethical Society has always used the right speakers and debaters to confront the problems of our time and this is one of the most urgent of them. It is surely necessary to persuade the broadcasting authorities to allow Humanist speakers to have more time on "the air".

### **Castro on Humanism**

In the *New Zealand Rationalist* is printed a paragraph which underlines the urgent perplexities of today "... the tremendous problem faced by the world is that it has been placed in a position where it must choose between capitalism, which starves people, and communism, which resolves economic problems but suppresses the liberties so cherished by man. Both Cubans and Latin Americans cherish and foster a revolution that may meet their material needs without sacrificing those liberties. . . . That is why we have said that we are one step ahead of the right and of the left. . . . Capitalism sacrifices men; the communist state, by its totalitarian concept, sacrifices the rights of man. That is why we do not agree with any of them. Each people must develop its own political organisation out of its own needs, not forced upon them or copied; and ours is an autonomous Cuban revolution."

Could we agree more? It is quite possible, however, that with a considerable Humanistic watering down of capitalism, the need for a totalitarian communism would not exist.

### **Fritjof Nansen (1861-1930)**

The great explorer and humanitarian, severed his religious ties at an early age.

"Our inherent faculty of reasoning," he wrote, "does not induce anybody to accept the Christian dogma. If, none the less, we yield to believe in conceptions contrary to our logic, and if we allow our reason to be violated by order, this is the opposite of ethics; for this is an attitude not adopted

from conviction, but from fear. I can think of nothing more immoral than accepting a command or an opinion to avoid punishment or, vice-versa, to be rewarded."

### **A German League of Humanist**

In a circular letter, Dr. Gerhard Szczesny, well-known author of the book *The Future of Disbelief* (and Departmental Director of Programme with the Munich Radio!), drew public attention to the tendency in Adenauer-Germany to gag anybody not conforming to Christian *Gleichschaltung*. The trend to put the whole population under the tutelage of the Church (and the Roman Catholic in particular) runs counter to the basic freedoms in a democratic community. In order to counteract this totalitarian "integralism" by the Ecclesia militants and their pious political arm in the Federal Republic, Dr. Szczesny proposed the setting up of an organisation.

His suggestion was taken up and on August 26 the League of German Humanists came into being.

(Culled from *Der Kirchenfreie*, Graz)  
O.W.

### **A New Season at Conway Hall**

The Sunday morning meeting, October 1, will open another season of meetings and activities at Conway Hall. Recently returned from a visit to Sweden, where considerable planning is being done, Dr. Helen Rosenau, of the History of Art Department, University of Manchester, will discuss some of the problems which arise when attempt is made to make human life an affair of large-scale planning.

The Tuesday evening meeting, October 3, will introduce the new series under Conway Discussions. Members will receive copies of the programme, and are asked to help in the distribution of the syllabus. It is hoped that a goodly proportion of our members will attend the meetings and take part in the discussions. It is a special privilege to have as our opening speaker Mr. Anthony Brooke, whose family has had a long and distinguished association with Sarawak. He is devoting a considerable part of his time to world-wide travel in order to bring the *peoples* of the world to a more active and co-operative participation in the making of peace. In 1960 Mr. Brooke initiated and convened a "World People's Conference". He recently visited the Middle East, India, Asia, and America, and has just returned from a visit to Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Scandinavian countries. At our opening meeting he will give his views on "The Revolutionary Individual in a Cosmic Age".

## **Notes by Custos**

ON A PREVIOUS OCCASION we congratulated the Mermaid Theatre upon its production and we should like to do so again for its enterprise in providing the London premiere of Sean O'Casey's play *The Bishop's Bonfire*. In the play, the talented author takes us back to the Irish scene as it exists today. One by one, the characters symbolise for us the background of a picture of the fantastic preparations made in the small town for the visit of the bishop thus providing symbols of a Roman Catholic and clericalist society. The local councillor transformed into a Papal Count is symbolic of the petit-bourgeois link between church and state which is indicated by Catholic sociology at the local level. He is supported by the parish priest who has just attained the purple stock of a monseigneur. Few characters could portray better the grasp of the church over such material

assets as might be available as well as the repressive Puritanism which is the major weapon of a Catholicism of this kind. His assistant, human and liberal-minded, is crushed by the system in which this creed is embodied. The Protestant workman and his Catholic co-worker afford a strange contrast between a desire for freedom and abject superstition at the crudest level. An old farm-hand, the Codger, is an example of a native paganism which keeps hope alive in a heart disillusioned by the effects of emigration upon a dying Ireland. We see two love-affairs, which are killed by snobbery and Puritanism. They have been stifled by the framework of a Puritan view of chastity seeking to repress and deny the human body. A marriage which the monseigneur tries to arrange symbolises what marriage has become in terms of the Catholic-Puritan economics of modern Ireland. The play ends in an atmosphere of misery and with a grim tragedy behind which lies the failure of a local attempt to force a young man of natural instincts into the priesthood. Sean O'Casey has produced a scathing indictment of a society reactionary in its economics and clericalist in its administration. As he watched the stage production, *Custos* indeed felt proud that he never ceases in season and out of season to proclaim his anti-clericalism whether it be in the form in which O'Casey has known in Ireland or in the attenuated Anglicanism of contemporary England! It is too late now to tell our readers to go and view the production at the 'Mermaid' but they should seize any opportunity to see it if a further chance should arise. In the meanwhile, the free-thinker can buy the text (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) and sample it for himself. It is well worth doing.

### Church and State

Episcopal-rearrangers of ecclesiastical establishment seem to be arising thick and fast for the present set-up is clearly cracking under stress of criticism and there is a very real danger that its final sweeping away is in sight through the force of a disgruntled public opinion. The latest to arise is the Bishop of Southwark who deals with the subject in his August *Diocesan Leaflet*. In his view, the present arrangement of church and state should continue save that such doctrinal matters as the revision of the Prayer Book should be taken out of the hands of Parliament. At first sight, this proposal seems reasonable enough. But it is worth asking why doctrinal matters got into parliamentary hands in the first place. The Church of England is endowed with vast sums from national property. This property was set aside in past centuries for church purposes and is now used for the isolated enrichment of a minority sect in the nation. An arrangement which suited the Middle Ages or Elizabethan England when only one sect possessed legality lacks all reality within a vastly changed society. But, if Parliament has allowed the church considerable national endowments, it is only fitting that the teaching and practice of the church should be under the strictest parliamentary control. Much cause for complaint has arisen over the modern Church of England. An outcry at Guildford revealed the unsatisfactory manner in which high appointments are made. The Bryn Thomas case, which took place in the Bishop of Southwark's own diocese, has led to a widespread clamour for a drastic revision or abolition of the existing church courts. Tithe, education, poor-relief are alike subjects which underline the demand for the sweeping away of ecclesiastical establishment as an anomaly in the modern world. The Bishop of Southwark cannot have it both ways and claim that the rightful heirs to the property enjoyed in isolation by the Church of England should have no voice in the ends to which this property is used. Parliamentary control, when suitably exercised as a living and decisive voice, would seem to be the proper medium. On the

other hand, Parliament is not a satisfactory body for discussing such matters as the theological content of a Prayer Book or the nature of a religious creed. A strong case exists for a freedom in which the church may decide its own doctrines and worship. But, if this is what the Bishop of Southwark feels, then let him take the natural course and ask for a complete severance of church and state with the very proper disendowment which, as in Ireland or Wales, would accompany this constitutional step.

### Hymn-singing

The abandonment of *Hymns of Modern Thought* by the South Place Ethical Society affords a suitable opportunity to discuss the appropriateness of any form of hymn at an ethical meeting. The custom goes back to the early days of the movement although at South Place it was a Unitarian inheritance. Indeed, one of the weaker points of the earlier secularist and ethical movements was that both possessed too much of the character of an inverted religion. It is often forgotten that the earlier Secularist movement possessed hymn-books, one of which was edited by Charles Watts and another by Annie Besant, whilst it also indulged in naming and funeral ceremonies. But, apart from the failure to make a clean break with church tradition, it misunderstood the character of a hymn quite as much as did its ethical counterpart at the same period. A hymn is not just a song. If it were, an ethical hymnal would merely be on a level with a Fabian or other song-book. In the churches, it is a specific act of prayer or praise rendered by singing rather than by speech. Actually, few of the recognised groups of Christian hymns reach a high literary merit. The late Latin hymns of the Breviary, some of which are well translated in the *English Hymnal*, possess the chastened and restrained merit of high liturgy when measured from a purely literary standpoint. They stand high within the traditions embodied in Helen Waddell's *Mediæval Latin Lyrics*. A pure theism was the inspiration of the well-known Harvard school of hymnology as represented by Chadwick, Hosmer and others who are represented in both the Unitarian books and in *Songs of Praise*. With a few outstanding exceptions, Evangelical Protestantism was not a source of good hymn-writing. A noisy atmosphere allied its hymns too closely with sheer rant and emotionalism whilst it was apt, even in so famous an example as "Rock of Ages", to fall into pure sentimentalism and mixed metaphors. But all alike of the varied hymn writers wrote a good hymn when they did so because it was more than a song or a poem. It was a definite act of prayer and praise in a theistic sense. Rationalism and humanism generally have broken with this theological tradition and, whilst they may have a definite and specific place for poem, song or music in their formal meetings, would seem to have no place for the traditional hymn. A hymn bowdlerised of all theology is something which lacks meaning and purpose and this obvious lack was only too clear at South Place in the last days of *Hymns of Modern Thought*. Some excellent poems and lyrics were buried in a mass of Victorian minor poetry of "uplift". The book contained a few good songs of the character of Edward Carpenter's "England, arise!" or Addington Symonds' "These things shall be!" But it was obsolete in many ways and it is to be hoped that nobody will try to produce a modern substitute. As a glance at the biography of Percy Dearmer, the talented editor of *Songs of Praise*, shows, the compilation of an adequate hymnal is a most difficult and expert matter. But above all, the book failed at the last because modern humanism needs its own modes of expression and, in a non-ecclesiastical age, will only fail whenever it tries to be an alternative church. The wider lessons of the failure of the ethical hymn are well worth pondering. Outside orthodox ranks, modern man has

finished with ecclesiasticalism. He may be prepared to listen to the evangel of a constructive humanism. But he is not prepared to accept an alternative church with a non-supernatural basis. The tempestuous retort which T. H. Huxley made to the Positivists, "Catholicism without Christianity", is a retort which may well apply in spirit over a far wider field. Humanism may need its badges and symbols but they will arise naturally out of its own background. Faced with hymns and other symbolic reminders of bowdlerised ecclesiastical type, modern man will merely reply, "Let the dead bury their dead". The failure of *Hymns of Modern Thought* after some fifty years of existence is not an indictment of the book itself but of the attempt to translate the older church orders into a non-supernatural context and then to utilise them within the framework of the scientific civilisation which has grown up and which has come to define contemporary humanism.

## Seventy-Five Years

BY

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON

WHEN THIS ARTICLE appears I shall be within a few days of my seventy-fifth birthday. I am one of a dwindling remnant who can remember the reign of Victoria and the last premiership of Gladstone. (Children of that day were told to bite their food well because Mr. Gladstone owed his longevity to taking thirty bites at every mouthful!) Not that my background was otherwise Gladstonian. My family were Tories—indeed, we had a tradition that a Robertson ancestor had died in gaol at Carlisle while waiting trial for his share in the Jacobite rising of 1745. However, though my father spent much trouble trying to establish descent from this worthy, he never succeeded. Be that as it might, we were of the Establishment. All normally good people were Tories: to be anything else marked you as peculiar. In religion we were Church of England without any "high", "low" or "broad" label, though my youthful reading of English history made me definitely a Protestant. I swallowed the Bible, hell-fire and all, and until my fifteenth year never had the slightest doubt of the truth of all that I had been taught. I remember picking up one of the cheap reprints of the R.P.A. (Laing's *Human Origins*) and putting it down in horror on discovering the infidel nature of its contents.

Picking up one day an open book in my school library, I found it was a history of the French Revolution (I completely forgot whose). Well-written history has always attracted me: I fell for the Revolution at once and was soon dipping into Carlyle, Lamartine, Mignet and Morse Stephens. The effect was to make me realise that the ideals on which I had been brought up were not the only ones for which men could live and die. You cannot suddenly discover that people whom you thought to be enemies of God and man are human beings, and rather fine fellows at that, without a considerable shock to your original beliefs. So it befell that in the light of my new faith my old faith melted away. What put the lid on it was my reading about the same time of Shelley's *Queen Mab* (with its devastating notes) and Draper's *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. I became at the same time a democrat and republican in politics and an atheist and humanist in philosophy. Finally, in my last months at school, I read Belfort Bax's book of essays, *The Ethics of Socialism*. Here I found the thread which tied up republicanism, atheism and humanism into a consistent whole.

It was an exciting time to get interested in politics. The general election of 1906 (soon after I had gone to the university) swept the Liberals into power with a bumper majority and returned a Labour Party of thirty Members independent of both the older parties. I plunged into Blatchford's *Clarion* (the first Socialist organ I had ever seen), the *Labour Leader*, *Justice* and the *New Age*, and made the rather bewildering discovery that the Labour and Socialist movement was deeply divided against itself. This was strange to me. To the Tory Anglicans among whom my boyhood was spent it was bad enough to be a Liberal: to be Labour stamped you, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, as an ignorant and raucous denizen of the gutter. Surely in going Labour I had gone as far to the left as I could go! But no: to the left of the Labour Party was the old Social Democratic Federation and its organ, *Justice*; and to their left again was the self-styled Socialist Party of Great Britain; the direct actionists and the anarchists. It was all very odd. To me at that time it seemed silly, if you were a Socialist, not to be in the Labour Party. If organised labour could not be led in the direction of Socialism, how much less could the unorganised mass outside? In reasoning thus I was nearer Marxism than I knew. Long before my time Engels had censured the S.D.F. on exactly that ground.

I would not have it thought that I ignored the case against Socialism. I read *Socialism: Its Fallacies and Dangers*, by Frederick Millar, a member of the R.P.A.; many of the writings of W. H. Mallock; and later the writings of Nietzsche. Millar indulged too much in malicious misrepresentation and vulgar abuse to impress me; Mallock completely failed to understand what he set out to attack (he attributed to Marx an ignorance of the function of management in industry, of which a patient reading of *Capital* acquits him); and Nietzsche, though interesting as a coiner of aphorisms, was too brimful of self-contradictions to be treated as a serious thinker.

On leaving the university I entered the Civil Service, not from any fervent wish to serve the state, but because I had to earn a living, and the Civil Service, while safe, seemed likely to leave me leisure and opportunity to follow my real interests in life. Had not Webb and Olivier written their Fabian Essays while in the Colonial Office? Actually I condemned myself for twenty-one years and more to lead a double life. A Civil Servant must not expose himself by any public action to the suspicion of insincerity in the discharge of his official duties. Otherwise he has considerable latitude. I remained in the Fabian Society, joined the I.L.P. and sailed so near the wind as to speak at open-air meetings in London until pulled up by my official superiors. Among my personal acquaintance of those days were Mrs. Bridges Adams, an indefatigable but, alas! sadly sectarian worker for popular education; J. F. Green of the Peace and Arbitration League, who kept open house for Socialist friends and regaled them with good cheer, good music and good conversation; and, through Green, Dan Irving, later M.P. for Burnley, and Herbert Morrison, a canny little man in whom no one then saw the future leader of the L.C.C. and Labour Minister.

My position at the Admiralty exempted me from active service in 1914. None the less I had to think hard as to the attitude which Socialists as such should take to the war. I had no ready-made suit of ideas to put on. Ultimately it was the invasion of Belgium that decided me. Even if the worst construction were put on Britain's policy and the best on Germany's, Belgium at least (so I argued) was engaged in a war of self-defence. If that were conceded, it followed that Britain, even had there been no "scrap of paper", was entitled to help Belgium. Only a hundred per cent Marxist could have seen through the casuistry. But in 1914 few outside Russia had heard of Lenin. I resigned from the I.L.P. in 1915, as I could not subscribe to their unqualified pacifism; and I let my membership of the Fabian

Society lapse, as their silence on the war issue seemed to me a confession of bankruptcy.

One illusion, which it took a dozen years of post-war experience to knock on the head, was the belief that this was a war to end war. The phrase was coined in all sincerity by Wells, and did more than any other catchword to keep those progressives, whom the invasion of Belgium had rallied to the Allied cause, of the same opinion to the end. Hence our bitterness at the time with the Bolsheviks. We thought the "war to end war" more important than the socialisation of Russia, little dreaming of years to come when the "war to end war" would be a ghastly joke, while the Soviet Union would go from strength to strength.

For some years after 1918, I tried to pursue the same impossible middle line. I found myself in general agreement with Belfort Bax, whose personal acquaintance I made in 1919 and continued until his death in 1926. It was my misfortune that I met him too late. When I wish to picture Bax at his best I think, not of the decrepit figure I knew, but of the boy of sixteen who in 1871 wept over the fall of the Paris Commune and dedicated himself to the religion of humanity, of the historian who showed that historical sense was not a monopoly of reactionaries; of the social critic who predicted Bolshevism thirty years before it came; of the man, in short, who made me a Socialist.

And then in 1930, like a roll of distant thunder, came the German elections which gave 5 million votes to the Nazis and showed the Second World War already on the horizon. When in 1931, after my father's death, I resigned from the Admiralty, I went out into a world already drifting to war. The "war to end war" had been a lie; the Bolsheviks, therefore, had been right. I decided to visit the Soviet Union.

I was well aware of the stock objections—"they will only show you what they want you to see," etc. I had used them myself in my Social Democratic days of the few enthusiasts who visited the Soviet Union at that early period. But they did not deter me from going. They merely ensured that I should visit Russia as far as possible without illusions. As it turned out, it was nonsense to say that you were allowed to see only what you were shown. Any tourist was free, if he liked, to wander on his own instead of joining a conducted party; and some did.

I have paid, in all, seven visits to the U.S.S.R.—four before the Second World War and three since. Of the making of many books about the Soviet Union there is no end; so I will say little here. I recorded my first impressions in a philosophical dialogue published in 1933 and entitled *Philosophers on Holiday*. The disputants include pro-Soviet, anti-Soviet and neutral tourists, who after much argument return with the same opinions with which they started.

Meanwhile the world situation approximated more and more to a nightmare. When I returned in 1938 from my fourth visit to Russia, the clouds were gathering round Czechoslovakia. The ovation that greeted Neville Chamberlain on return from Munich nauseated me. I felt ashamed and unclean. Only one thing remained to do—have at long last the courage of my convictions. Little by little I had pieced together a creed. It remained for me to implement it in practice. At the age of fifty-two I joined the Communist Party. In my seventy-fifth year I am in it still; and that is that.

In 1944 I was invited to lecture to South Place Ethical Society, and in 1945 was appointed a regular lecturer. No one asked me my politics; and I do not feel bound to answer questions that are unasked. I remained on the panel fifteen years. I suppose this is what some people call unscrupulous Communist infiltration. Actually on the Ethical platform I avoid propa-

ganda for any party. But I never conceal my opinion that the real conflict of our day is between pre-scientific institutions, politely labelled "Christian civilisation" and scientific humanism, which on the political plane takes the form of international Socialism.

## The Contemporary Situation and Divorce Law Reform

BY F. H. AMPHLETT-MICKLEWRIGHT, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

FOR MANY YEARS humanists have been concerned with the study of such questions concerning marriage and divorce as are created by existing circumstances in modern England. In part, these questions have been brought about by the confusions which English law has embodied into the subject. From the coming of Christianity as the official religion, marriage in England has been more and more subjected to the sway of the Christian Church. Here the conception of the man-woman relationship was shaped by theological ideas rooted in Judaism and modified by the oriental asceticism of Paul. The basic abstract conception was one of a monogamous relationship existing in the mind of God, and defined by his will. All sexual acts were "under sin," although marital relationships were tolerated owing to man's weakness. But chastity and celibacy were ranked in virtue above sexual intercourse within marriage. As it evolved from a wider theological background, Canon Law defined a strict monogamy along these lines: All marriage must be lifelong and indissoluble so that no provision could be made for divorce. Yet a complicated series of affinities in kinship might provide ground for nullifying a so-called marriage, a very practical issue in the small, isolated communities envisaged in the twelfth century by the Canon Law, where there were more actual grounds for nullity than there are for divorce in modern England. A strictly ascetic viewpoint was emphasised by the Benedictine revival, but it called for too great an effort and the later Middle Ages were notoriously unchaste. The Canon Law on marriage survived the English Reformation and provided the background of modern English marriage law. Ecclesiastical lawyers reigned supreme in this field until the divorce law reforms of 1857. Indeed, the new divorce legislation of that year was heavily influenced in Parliament by the traditionalistic Church party, with the result that it included the idea of marriage as a sacrament, an indissoluble outward manifestation of the final indissolubility existing within the mind of God. But the pressure on the legislation which demanded divorce law reform emanated from the utilitarian disciples of Jeremy Bentham, for whom the Christian view lacked all reality and whose efforts were in part inspired by notorious contemporary practical abuses. Divorce could only be obtained by a private Act of Parliament after an ecclesiastical court had granted a decree which amounted to no more than a modern judicial separation. The legal costs were prohibitive with the result that bigamy was an extremely prevalent crime. For the utilitarians, marriage was a changed status, a social contract, and this status could be voided by breakdown. This aspect of the matter was widely canvassed with the result that the reforming legislation of 1857 was in the nature of a compromise. Marriage is a lifelong and indissoluble union; any lesser demand would nullify a reputed marriage. If one partner should commit a matrimonial offence, the offended partner might carry the grievance to the Divorce Court. It must be a genuine

grievance and not one obtained by "collusion, connivance or condonation." Divorce *a vinculo* might be imposed by the court as a penalty upon the offending partner. If both parties have offended, the court can exercise its discretion or the parallel offences can cancel each other out and a divorce be refused. Under the Act of 1857, adultery in the wife or adultery with cruelty or desertion in the husband was the sole ground for divorce, although in 1923 this was modified under feminist influences to permit of simple adultery in the husband as an offence. Apart from certain administrative reforms, the sole later major reform in divorce was that of the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1938, sponsored by A. P. Herbert, which extended the grounds of divorce to cruelty, desertion for a period of over three years and certified insanity uncured at the end of five years. Thus, English law remains a code which desires to regard marriage as an indissoluble sacrament and which tends to seek to enforce the future cohabitation of temporarily estranged partners. Apart from the illogical inclusion of the non-offending ground of insanity, the sacramental basis of a marriage can only be disrupted by wanton offence.

The practical results of this legal background do not make for a healthy state in society at large. Legal traditionalism functions without noticing in any way modern scientific advances in the sphere of sex, such as in contraceptive techniques or in eugenic science generally. The grounds of divorce are restricted and only exist with a few other grounds which permit a suit for nullity; whilst freedom of choice whether or not to take action is laid exclusively upon the offended partner. Nothing further can be done if he refuses to proceed or contents himself with a judicial separation. There is no parallel to the codes of some other countries where such a separation matures or ripens naturally into divorce. In legal theory the petitioner is the innocent party and any court will only concern itself with a restricted range of facts. Illicit unions are the natural result of this legal situation, and it has been computed that somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 such unions have been created in contemporary England by the divorce laws. This state of affairs is not socially helpful and places the legitimacy of future offspring into serious jeopardy. Proof of desertion makes for collusive adultery, in that it demands a three-year time span; with the result that such abuses as those portrayed in 1934 by A. P. Herbert in his novel, *Holy Deadlock*, have not been entirely wiped away. Offence on both sides is a matter for the discretion of the court and it must not be assumed that it will be exercised on demand. For example, in recent divorce proceedings between the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury, where the trial judge refused to exercise his discretion, it was clear that the marriage had broken down hopelessly. Yet, although the perpetuation of marital ties under such circumstances could well become a social liability, the fact does not of necessity mean that the court will consider it a good ground for exercising its discretion, or will grant divorce, which it will insist is penalty and not relief, available to people who have offended against the old Equity rule and have not petitioned "with clean hands." Under an Act of 1926 it is illegal to report divorce evidence in newspapers and what is claimed for public decency is lost to the reforming interests by a lack of publicity for the manner in which divorce law works or the anomalies which it creates. Both public wellbeing and private morality are outraged again and again by the law itself. In 1950 an attempt was made to cut through these difficulties by Mrs. Eirene White, M.P., who sought to promote legislation in the House of Commons which would have taken the practical step of substituting divorce by mutual consent in cases where the original marriage had broken down. A Royal Commission, the Morton Commission, was appointed and took exhaustive evidence both from individuals and various interested

bodies. Expert testimony was given to the effect of divorce on children, and that in many cases the children would benefit where the existing home was factually broken. But the churches mobilised and pressure was exerted by Roman Catholic and Anglican alike with the result that the final report shelved the basic problem. In divorce law reform a grim moment had been reached. It seemed as if the case for reform had been set back by a whole generation, and that little more could be done. Divorce by consent had been rejected emphatically in favour of the sacramental Christian belief in life-long indissolubility. In taking this line, the Morton Report did not seem to notice the inherent absurdity that, in modern England, the only guaranteed time-span of a marriage is not life, but three years, the length of time required to establish legal desertion.

Such are the circumstances of the background against which contemporary humanism is compelled to put forward the case for reform. Actually, the nature of its approach must be coloured by its whole attitude towards sexual problems. Sexology has made vast advances within recent years and psychological research has thrown a great deal of light upon the sexual impulses and motives of the individual. In the same way it has come to be recognised that frustration created by social and legal anomalies has brought into being many personal psychiatric problems. Safe processes of contraception have altered the whole background of relationship between the sexes with the result that both pre- and extra-marital relations have become extremely common and widely accepted socially. This empirical set of circumstances has caused various reactions among humanists at large. Some have accepted the position maintained by René Guyon, and to a limited extent by Dr. Norman Haire, with the result that they have advocated a promiscuity of relationships commonly known as "free love." Others, such as Bertrand Russell, have combined a demand for sexual freedom with a strong sense of personal and social responsibility. All would, however, insist that sex relationships exist for mutual happiness and enjoyment by denying the historic Christian assertion that the true end of marriage is the procreation of children. Possibly all humanists would likewise agree with Havelock Ellis in his wise diagnosis, which stressed the fact of the monogamous ideal as the highest point reached in this regard by Western civilisation, but which went on to remark that human nature varies in outward form from individual to individual. At the level of reality in marriage there must be the widest variants in practical monogamous interpretation. In Ellis's view, it is possible to maintain monogamy and yet to permit of socially acceptable extra-marital relationships. For the humanist the problem is still further complicated by some devastating social facts. Something like 90 per cent of known illegal abortions in this country have been performed upon married women wearied with overmuch child-bearing. In many of these cases there has been a clear breakdown of anything like a man-woman relationship based upon mutual love and respect and a merely worn-out woman has remained a marital wreck. But causes or considerations of this kind give no grounds for any legal relief by divorce.

*(To be concluded)*

## **Frank Buchman**

BY

CUSTOS

ON AUGUST 8, at Freudenstadt, West Germany, a leader died who was probably one of the most prominent in contemporary religious propaganda. Frank Buchman was an American Lutheran minister who, some fifty years

ago, underwent an emotional conversion upon listening to a woman preacher at a church near Keswick. Buchman at once accepted the idea of a sensible presence of the Holy Spirit as the source of the emotional response which he felt. But he developed this idea somewhat further than did most of his many predecessors in this field. The presence should be met with a response of quiet listening and the guidance of God in daily life would follow. Buchman and his disciples carried this idea over to extraordinary lengths in shaping the details of their daily lives and, as might be expected, it led on to the excesses of fanaticism paralleled in American quietist movements of over a century ago or outlined within modern life by Marjorie Harrison in her contemporary study, *Saints Run Mad*. The Oxford Group Movement arose out of this background and became associated with a technique of house-parties at which "quiet times" for guidance and common "sin-sharing" were of the order of the day. After a relatively inconspicuous start, the Group Movement attained wide note some thirty years ago. Always at root an essentially middle-class movement with interests lying outside the economic struggles marking the period, Buchmanism became a storm-centre of controversy. Its supporters brought forward story after story of emotional life-changing, a coinage common to every evangelistic movement in its generation. Criticism ranged from the serious warnings of eminent scholars to attacks of a more trenchant kind. Bishop Hensley Henson, of Durham, devoted a famous volume to its dissection, whilst A. P. Herbert described the movement as having, about as much to do with the University of Oxford as Eiffel Tower Lemonade has to do with Paris. At one stage, he sought to render illegal its using the name of the university. But times were changing and the war clouds gathered over Europe. Like many of his social class, Buchman was attracted more and more to the conception of an anti-communist front. In 1936, he could permit himself to say: "I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler, who built a front line of defence against the anti-Christ of communism. My barber in London told me that Hitler saved all Europe from communism. That's how he felt. . . . It is not surprising that, shortly afterwards, he could find words of praise for Goebbels. A cynical comment might be made about Buchman's self-confessed source of authority, but a deeper criticism is apparent. As the *New Statesman* pointed out at the time, God-guidance is a form of dictatorship and it is a short step from a God-guided dictator to one of more secular impetus. From this time, Buchman became obsessed with the war against communism. It is not surprising that a man of his social background, who was already receiving large sums of money from high capitalist sources, should have diagnosed the troubles of his time in this misleading way or should have thrown his energies into the maintenance of the economic and social *status quo*. At a conference in the Black Forest area, held in 1938, Buchman and his followers took a momentous decision. The Oxford Group Movement was already waning as a force within the Christian Churches and was heavily challenged by its opponents. It now became transformed into the Moral Re-Armament Movement, which based its violently anti-communist front upon a sub-Christian ideology. During the war years, the movement had none too enviable a name as, in 1939, some of its more prominent British supporters withdrew to the calmer air of neutral America. But it revived in post-war Europe where it has been heavily supported by American finance. A glance at its ideology reveals its character. Moral Re-Armament is rearmament into the competitive and cut-throat morality sanctioned by high industrial capitalism and a developed justification. When it talks of abolishing class-war, it deliberately perverts the term as any economist would understand or use it. In short, the movement is resplendent in glossy literature possessing an emotional appeal to those undeterred by irrationality,

became one of the more prominent among the reactionary forces of the time. Buchman spent more and more of his efforts in the cause of West Germany, where Chancellor Adenauer was among his outstanding supporters. In view of the issues embedded in the partition of Germany, Buchman's support was not surprising or out of character. As a statesman, he was essentially fourth-rate with little or no conception of the development of the underlying forces which go to the making of history. But this was hidden from his followers by the manner in which their private avatar was able to cloak the simplicity and lack of authority in his thinking by talk of morality, anti-communism and God-guidance although, of late, not a few have been disgusted by the dubious veracity of Moral Re-Armament propaganda. However, Buchman is dead and his mortal foe in thought still reigns as a practical force over the U.S.S.R., China, and Europe east of the iron curtain. Doubtless, the battle between communist and anti-communist will continue for a great many years yet. But, will the Moral Re-Armament Movement play much part in the future now that its founder and leader has gone? We doubt it.

## Correspondence

To the Editor, *The Monthly Record*

### Anti-Clericalism

Dear Sir,

In his notes in your issue of August/September *Custos* recalls the old traditions of the pioneers of the Rationalist movement. In this connection I suggest that behind the battles of that time the real issue was the vested interests of the Church in perpetuation of a social order long overdue for change by endeavouring to stifle the flood of new knowledge brought to light by the rapid advance of science.

Today, fifty years later, the Church still occupies some entrenched positions. I agree with *Custos* that the Christian attitude to sex is an obstacle to the salutary amendment of some of our laws, whilst his criticisms of the proceedings of the Consistory Courts are entirely relevant. This latter does, however, prompt the thought, as a side issue, that the objectionable features of these courts are not confined to the Church and that there are other institutions which merit a critical glance, such as the statutory powers of the B.M.A. and the unrestricted freedom of the trade unions to deprive a man of his job.

Nevertheless, since the days of Bradlaugh and Holyoake a radical change has occurred in the position and influence of the Church and it is the purpose of this letter to suggest that the traditional attitudes of a past generation of Rationalists have little relevance to current conditions. The free dissemination of the findings of science is no longer obstructed by clerical interference, whilst ordination is no longer a passport to a comfortable living. On the contrary, for the majority of the clergy their calling involves a sacrifice of the material rewards they might have hoped to secure in other walks of life.

In a Gallup Poll carried out some few years ago by the *News Chronicle*, the result disclosed that some 70 per cent of those questioned, though nominally Christians, do not attend church except on formal occasions such as marriage and burial. Only 10 per cent professed themselves to be practising Christians. Indeed, the decline in church attendance is a matter of common knowledge. Against such a background of apathy, resuscitation

of the battles of the past is like taking a sledge-hammer to crack a nut, and, with respect, I suggest to *Custos* his attitude is unlikely to gain many recruits to Humanism.

Yours faithfully,  
G. ANDREWS.

### Custos Replies

To the Editor, the *Monthly Record*

Dear Sir,

May I ask space to reply to both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Lloyd in order to request them to re-read the original note by *Custos*? It dealt with the journalism of Mr. Driberg in the Bryn Thomas case, made some critical comments upon the ethics of Christian writing, and then suggested that Christians would take a less tolerant view of sexual promiscuity than would humanists. Messrs. Bennett and Lloyd object to the last statement. Against their attempts to equate humanism with a strict sexual monogamy opposed to promiscuity *per se*, it may be pointed out that the statement of *Custos* was in accord with a tradition stated by George Drysdale in the last century and by Bertrand Russell in this and that it includes such notable humanist names as Norman Haire, Havelock Ellis or V. F. Calverton whilst it would not be out of accord with the opinion of at least some members of the "Man-Woman Group" of the Progressive League, a representative body. It was open to anybody of the views of Messrs. Bennett and Lloyd to debate the matter with *Custos*. Instead, they prefer the manner of protest and give a typical example of outraged reaction. *Custos* had used the journalistic "we" in reference to himself. Any reasonable man (I use the term as does Lord Justice Devlin!) reading the magazine properly would notice that *Custos* does not write editorially or as speaking for the humanist movement as a whole. It was this fact which astounded me at the pretence put up by Mr. Lloyd that he does in fact do so. It is futile to blame *Custos* for the careless way in which some people read magazines. But to accept their mistake and then blame *Custos* is in the best manner of the less scrupulous newspapers.

I can only suggest that it is not *Custos* who is harming the humanist movement but people who sink to devices of this kind. Whether or not the comments of *Custos* are merely anti-ecclesiastical abuse, I am well content to leave to the judgement of the unprejudiced reader whilst I can only express some measure of satisfaction when he does harm to reactionary views whether they parade themselves as humanistic or anything else. But I would wish to underline the point that, whilst the pro-religious humanism of the school of Bennett and Lloyd may well be an apt position for them to hold, it is far from representing the humanistic, rationalist and free-thought movements as a whole and that it can claim no greater place than that of a tolerated minority in the general movement. Certainly, it has no right to set itself forward as an axiomatic exemplar from whose standpoint any humanistic statement is to be judged, the position of censorship which Mr. Lloyd seems to desire for himself. But, in any case, may I suggest that in future he reads *Custos* carefully before rushing into print to do battle or before condemning *Custos* for caring little how far his remarks may "offend the vicar"? It is always better when a remark is studied and criticised in its full context than when it is put into isolation and made an Aunt Sally for the ventilation of general grievances.

Yours faithfully,  
CUSTOS.

## South Place News

### Waltham Abbey—A South Place Holiday Reflection

It was a warm Sunday afternoon in August when a small party from Conway Hall entered the old abbey church at Waltham and joined the mass of sightseers who were looking around. As it still stands after a 1,000 years, the church is a magnificent fragment. In 1540, the great abbey suffered the fate of so many of the monastic houses at the Dissolution. All of the buildings were pulled down and dispersed save for the nave of the vast abbey church. This fragment had long served the parishioners. It was now bricked up at the steps to the chancel, a new tower built on to its west end and the old building refurbished as a parish church to house the new Protestantism which was making its way. But even today, the signs of ordinary Church of England worship could not entirely cloak the remoter past. The roof is still supported by great Norman pillars as fine as those of Durham or Dunfermline. Rounded arches to windows and doorways remind the sightseer that it was the Normans who built this church shortly after the Conquest. An empty matrix outlines the mitre on the head of the figure which formed the centre-piece of a splendid brass once lying there and it still reminds that this stone covers the tomb of one who was once the mighty Abbot of Waltham but whose very name is now forgotten. Outside, an archway is all that remains of the old monastery whilst within there are signs of the new social orders which have spanned the intervening centuries. A Jacobean nobleman and his lady resplendent in colouring occupy a great tomb on the south wall. Various memorials recall the powerful Essex families of the district whose descendants are now scattered over the face of the earth far away from native estates long ago split up and dispersed. The list of previous incumbents contains names of clergymen who were there for a long while, one for thirty and another for forty-six years, reigning over a town which must have been a small country place regarding itself as far by coach from the great capital. The sightseers streamed down into the crypt to look at the varied exhibits in a small museum. Perhaps it was significant that they should do so. To those from South Place, a vivid reminder came to mind of Froude's ill-fated novel, the *Nemesis of Faith*, which Dr. Conway once edited. In it, the young clergyman is musing in the ruins of an old abbey whose voice seems to speak with him. It recalls that the monks have left for centuries and that the old faith is now no more. It is becoming obliterated by the new knowledge of the nineteenth century in which evolutionary ideas are replacing the old supernaturalism. Seen through the eyes of South Place, the scene imagined by Froude was witnessed in Waltham Abbey which the sightseers were looking upon as a museum. Over 400 years have gone by since the monks chanted their office in the church or fished in the nearby River Lea. In due course, they went at the behest of the king's officers and the old faith departed with them. Their place was taken by the new incumbent and the Latin hymns were replaced by the magnificent English prose of Cranmer's *Book of Common Prayer*. For four more centuries, the decorous language of the Church of England has echoed around the walls. But this faith is likewise now in dissolution and it is sightseers looking idly at relics of the past rather than a great worshipping congregation which affords the regular daily stream of visitors to the old abbey church. Outside, lies a corner of Essex adjoining a part of Middlesex which modern industry is busily covering and the old Waltham which the clergy of the past would have known is now no more. Perhaps the industry

typifies far more than does the abbey church the signs of a contemporary scientific age learning to live by technology. Many of the sightseers looked puzzled as they pondered on what might be the meaning of the various traditional religious signs, both of the remote and the nearer past. To some they may have been entirely alien, to others they may recall half-forgotten childish memories of a creed long since abandoned as a practical reality. A voice speaking in tones like that of the old abbey, which Froude imagined, seemed to speak of them to the visitors from South Place. The old faith had gone as really as had the old monks. But for some, the void has never been filled and life easily becomes without meaning or purpose. The faith of the humanist is a positive thing, seeking in its rejections to stress the more a moral sense of social obligation. Just as it did, to Froude's young clergyman, this voice reminded the South Place visitors that they have a dutiful part to play in seeking to call the passer-by to a faith as real as once was their belief to the old monks of Waltham but, unlike the faith of the past, integrated into a positive yet naturalistic approach towards life and human well-being as it is lived out and sought in the scientific civilisation shaping the world of today. F.H.A.M.

### Fifteenth Annual Conference of the Rationalist Press Association

There were about ninety people attending this Conference at Girton College, Cambridge, on *The African Revolution: A Challenge to Humanists*. The speakers, on the whole, did justice to a vast subject, and the discussions which followed were in accordance with Humanist tradition—an amalgam of truth and justice.

Enoch Dumbutshena opened the Conference on Friday, August 4, making a comprehensive contribution on *The African Revolution*, dealing mainly with the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

The next day provided one of the most brilliant lectures that we had heard for some time: H. Lionel Elvin, M.A., Director of the University of London Institute of Education, who spoke on *Educational Problems in Africa*, was most enlightening and made us aware of the tremendous difficulties that confronted the authorities. Many Africans were illiterate and still, under the domination of the witch-doctors, apart from this, there was a great shortage of capital available for education, which coupled with the variety of language and religion made the problems stupendous. One might add that here, surely, is where Humanism, with its potentiality of common sense, could be used to advantage.

Giving the address on Sunday, August 6, Preston King spoke optimistically on the question of *African Unity*, a *dénouement* which did not reflect the general consensus of opinion. It was generally thought, and perhaps by Mr. King himself, as not being likely to occur for centuries to come. The subject made us realise what an immense theme had been undertaken by the R.P.A. If Europe with its long history of civilisation found difficulty in achieving unity, what prospect was there in the much more complex situation obtaining in the vastly larger continent of Africa?

Joao Cabral's talk on *Portuguese Colonialism* confined the African theme in perhaps too narrow a limit, and the subsequent discussions were centred inevitably on the atrocities committed by both sides in Angola, but his remarks were redolent of the desire to find the way to a peaceful settlement of a problem which has so recently troubled even our own citizens.

The final meeting on Tuesday morning pin-pointed much of what had been discussed. Several young university students who attended stressed, quite rightly, the need for action and made suggestions that were vital if, at times, impracticable.

An excursion during the week-end was made to Bury St. Edmunds which

proved popular because of its historical and archaeological associations. At the same time a few other members of the Conference paid a visit to Cambridge's Botanic Garden where they were agreeably entertained by Mr. and Mrs. J. S. L. Gilmour. Mr. Gilmour, himself a leading figure in the Cambridge Humanists, possesses one of the finest collections of Humanist literature in the country.

We were pleased to greet several Conway Hall members of the Conference.

### Committees

We regret that in the last issue of *The Monthly Record* the name of Miss Rose Halls was omitted from the Conway Discussions Committee.

## Society's Other Activities

### Conway Discussions. Tuesdays at 7.30 p.m.

- October 3—"The Revolutionary Individual in the Cosmic Age." Anthony Brooke, Rajah Muda of Sarawak.
- " 10—"Authority versus Freedom in Moral Behaviour." Major G. Adcock and F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, M.A., F.R.Hist.Soc.
- " 17—"Moral Problems in a Space-Travel Age." Norman R. Smith, B.Sc., A.M.I.Mech.E., F.B.E.A.
- " 24—"Old Age in the New World." Discussing the Groombridge Report on *Education in Retirement*. Richard Clements, J.P., O.B.E.
- " 31—Paul Crellin (Secretary, Young Humanists, S.P.E.S.). Attitudes to Youth and its Problems: Has it changed?

### Sunday Social

In the Library at 3 p.m. Miss Gladys Farrell, "Egypt's Glory" with colour slides.

### Thursday Evening Social

October 15, in the Library at 7 p.m. Whist Drive.

### Country Dances

We have again been fortunate in securing the co-operation of the Progressive League in a series of country dance afternoons on Saturdays, monthly, throughout the winter. The instructress will be Eda Collins. Soft shoes must be worn. The next party will be on October 21, from 3 to 6 p.m., in the library. Everybody welcome.

### Young Humanists. In the Library at 7.30 p.m.

- October 16—An evening of Indian music, presented by Gaur Gopal Ray, with songs, guitar and recordings.
- " 23—"Freedom from Hunger." Comments on a Geneva Conference, by B. O. Warwick.
- " 30—"Voluntary Action and the Welfare State." Discussion introduced by Elspeth McLeish.

### Ramble Round London

Sunday, October 8, 2.30 p.m., meet at St. Martin's steps, Trafalgar Square, to explore "a bit of London". Leader: Mr. F. G. Thurgood.

# SOUTH PLACE

THE South Place Ethical Society is a progressive movement dating from 1793 which today advocates an ethical humanism, the study and dissemination of ethical principles and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment, and believes that the moral life may stand independently in its own right.

We invite to membership all those who have abandoned 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 Library is available and all members receive the Society's journal, *The Monthly Record*, free. The Sunday Evening Chamber Music Concerts founded in 1887 have achieved international renown.

The minimum subscriptions are: Members, 12s. 6d. p.a.; Associate Members (ineligible to vote or hold office), 7s. 6d. p.a.; Life Members, £13 2s. 6d.

Services available to Members and Associates include: The Naming Ceremony of Welcome to Children, the Solemnisation of Marriage, Memorial and Funeral Services.

*The Story of South Place*, by S. K. Ratcliffe (5s. from Conway Hall) is a history of the Society and its interesting development within liberal thought.

## OFFICERS:

Secretary: J. Hutton Hynd

Hon. Registrar: Mrs. T. C. Lindsay

Hon. Treasurer: A. Fenton

Hon. Asst. Registrar: Miss W. L. George

Executive Secretary: Miss E. Palmer

Editor, "The Monthly Record": G. C. Dowman

Address: Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1. (Tel.: CHAncery 8032)

---

## MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

To THE HON. REGISTRAR,

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

I desire to become a \*Member/Associate Member of South Place Ethical Society and enclose ..... entitling me (according to the Rules of the Society) to membership for one year from the date of enrolment.

NAME .....  
(BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE)

ADDRESS.....  
.....

DATE..... SIGNATURE.....

\*Cross out where inapplicable.