

THE



ETHICAL

RECORD



Vol. 80, No. 8

SEPTEMBER 1975

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL: TERMS OF FREEDOM	3
THE NATURE OF HUMAN NATURE <i>by Peter Cadogan</i>	4
SIR JULIAN HUXLEY, FRS <i>by Harold Blackham</i>	8
FOR THE RECORD <i>by the General Secretary</i>	11
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 1975/6	14
DISCUSSION: SCHIZOPHRENIA	15
FORUM: THE FUTURE OF SOUTH PLACE	18
BOOK REVIEW: PROPHETS OF FREEDOM AND ENTERPRISE	20
VIEWPOINT	21
SOUTH PLACE NEWS	22
COMING AT CONWAY HALL	2, 23

Published by

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

Conway Hall Humanist Centre

Red Lion Square, London, WC1R 4RL

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS:

General Secretary: Peter Cadogan
Lettings Secretary/Hall Manager: Robyn Miles
Hon Registrar: Rose Bush
Hon. Treasurer: C. E. Barralet
Editor, "The Ethical Record": Eric Willoughby
Address: Conway Hall Humanist Centre
Red Lion Square, London WC1R 4RL. (Tel: 01-242 8032)

Coming at Conway Hall

Sunday, October 5

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: T. F. EVANS on Power and Responsibility—Problems of the Press**

6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice and Scrabble in the Library**

Tuesday, October 7

7.00 pm—**Discussion: Science and Society** introduced by **Dr J. R. Ravetz**

Sunday, October 12

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: AUDREY WILLIAMSON on Thomas Paine and the Age of Reason**

3.00 pm—**Forum: The Future of the Black Englishman** with **Ken Forge**

6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice and Scrabble**

(Continued on page 23)

CURRENT SPES PUBLICATIONS

THE SECULAR RESPONSIBILITY	Marghanita Laski	10p
THE ALTERNATIVE SOCIETY	James Hemming	10p
THE BREAKDOWN OF GREAT BRITAIN	Leopold Kohr	10p
MAN AND THE SHADOW	Laurens van der Post	10p
WHAT ARE EUROPEANS?	G. K. Young, CB, CMG, MBE	10p
THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY FROM PAGAN AND JEWISH BACKGROUNDS	G. A. Wells	20p
HUMANITY AND ANIMALITY	Edmund Leach	10p
THE USES OF PAIN	Jonathan Miller	10p

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

THE ETHICAL RECORD

Vol. 80 No. 8

SEPTEMBER 1975

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

EDITORIAL

Terms of Freedom

DOES FREEDOM have limits, and if so, what are they? These are questions we would do well to ask ourselves in these dark days.

Almost daily we hear of insurrections, coups, oppression on the one hand and the abuse of freedoms—trading tricks, inconsiderate or wilfully malicious squatting, disruption of “normal” life-styles etc., on the other.

Any organised society must have a code of ethics to live by, but is it possible to have a system of ethics which does not impinge on freedom? Perhaps we could have a series of discussions on this theme during the coming year’s programme.

Regularly, we see people and large groups causing all sorts of problems in the name of freedom. Strikes are good examples of this. Who would support the abolition of strikes? Far-off lands (and not so far-off) go through uprisings caused by the freedom of the people to express their distaste with the government or system, the Irish bombers carry out their appalling deeds with the conviction that they are fighting for freedom, and even Hitler was motivated in part by a wish to gain freedom for his people. Conversely, we in Britain fought off Hitler in the belief that we were killing for freedom.

The freedom of firms to make a profit justifies plenty of gimmicks, advertising extravagances and downright tricks. On the sports fields, we see violence, disruption, and even murder, in the name of the freedom to watch events unimpeded. British Rail knows all about the freedoms enjoyed by football fans, too.

The freedom of “squatters” to enter anyone’s house and claim “squatters” rights, whether the occupier of the house is on holiday, away at work or out at the pub, is unchallenged, thanks to a centuries-old statute.

There must be a happy medium between these freedoms and the only available alternative—the police state.

In an ideal world, nobody would want more nor less freedom than anyone else. We would all have the freedom to live as freely as each other.

But we live in the only world we know. It is by no means ideal, and the notions of freedom vary almost from family to family, never mind nations.

Now, as never before, those whose actions are propagated in the name of freedom must be watched. Most are genuine, most care about the world. Others care only about extending their own freedoms, or those of pressure groups. That usually means at the expense of the freedom of the rest of us.

The Nature of Human Nature

BY

PETER CADOGAN

ARE WE the products of our genetic programmes and so capable of being wholly understood by the methods of science? Are we the embodiments of an Idea that makes science irrelevant? Are we blank sheets or empty vessels to be filled or written up solely by our conditioning? All three views prevail simultaneously, yet as they stand they are irreconcilable. Our understanding of ourselves is inhibited accordingly.

What are we really about? Under the customs, forms, veneers and restraints of civilised society what is it that makes us tick? If we dig deeply into ourselves do we find the noble savage, the beast or what? Do we need to be afraid of our real selves or might we be glad of them? Is there something long lost within us that we might welcome back? And what more is there in us that we have yet to discover?

When the established rules of society break down (as they are now beginning to do) it is time to ask these very difficult questions and try to answer them. This makes the book 'The Imperial Animal' by Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox a very important work. What follows largely stems from that source.

They have introduced a new word to our vocabulary—animal biogrammar—the repertoire of signals, postures, gestures and movements by which animals of a given species convey their feelings and intentions to other animals of the same species. We, as unique primates, have such a biogrammar, different in that by virtue of the use of an enlarged brain we alone can use language (strictly defined as the use of words and verbal syntax).

Homo sapiens and his proto-hominid ancestors (erect, bi-pedal and large brained) date back for some five million years. It was over that period as a whole that our nature was formed. It was *not* formed, as our contemporary culture has been, by the mere 10,000 years of civilised life, i.e. life in towns that we have enjoyed, or suffered to date. And agriculture is not much older than civilisation.

How it Began

In the beginning we left the forests, where we had been herbivores, to become the omnivorous hunters of the plains. We invented ritual and language in order to make it possible to remember, assess, project and plan, to act together, to achieve and make possible the division of labour of hunting (by the men) and gathering (by the women). Since this happened very slowly over millions of years we developed a genetic propensity for language, so much so that each healthy baby in the first three years of its life, quite without formal instruction, performs the most extraordinary exercise produced by the whole story of evolution—it masters the essentials of a spoken tongue.

There has been no significant change in human nature over the period since agriculture was invented. *Biographically we remain stone age hunter-gatherers*. Our bodies and brains were designed specifically for the efficient pursuit of game and for a supporting social system that makes that possible. We are designed, that is to say, to live in groups about 50 strong.

For about 99 per cent of our past the total population of the world numbered about one million; agriculture and civilisation led to a population explosion that boosted the figure to 100 million. Since the industrial revolution of modern times the population has risen to its present 3,700,000m and is climbing fast. Yet we are essentially the same people who lived in tiny groups in a tiny total.

A herd or a flock is not a society. A society, as such, begins when there are complementary roles within the group, starting from the male/female pair; and the politics of a group is the way a group governs itself in relation to its own members internally, to its resources and its enemies.

There are four animal incentives—food, sex, nesting or base-making, and power. Some kind of hierarchy is essential in a group; there is no other way by which, with its divisions of function, it can stay together. This is why, since hierarchy is endemic, that everyone in human society must subserve or claim to subserve something higher. The worst dictators of our time have proclaimed their own submission to a 'higher' purpose—the role of a master race, the revolution, the historic role of the working class, and the rest.

Social primates and early human societies featured fighting continually *but war was unknown*. Fighting takes place over who gets the females, in defence of hunting territories, in feuding raids and prestigial exercise but there is comparatively little killing, and no conquest. War is what civilisation is about—conquests between trained, professional troops in order to conquer, loot and enslave. Fighting is of our nature biogramatically, war is not. War is a morbid recent invention made worthwhile for the first time when cattle, crops and fixed assets were there for the taking.

Dominance systems are of the greatest antiquity and aristocracy is its oldest form. But even aristocracy only survives if it provides for challenge, competition, replacement and recruitment. The classic case in this country was the rise of the Tudor gentry, led by the Cecils, into the ranks of the aristocracy where they remained supreme until 1886. Today we face a new aristocracy, that of the systems-managers: the administrators, lawyers, accountants, financiers, officers, directors and media men. Those who fail to make this aristocracy, the doctors, dentists, nurses, teachers and local government officers are the ones who are rebelling, quitting or emigrating.

There is no case for equality in the sense of uniformity. We need diversity because that is the way we are wired up as human beings. "In theory, the perfect system would be a true democracy, not because it renders all men equal, but because it gives them an equal chance to become unequal."

A New Situation

The young will always challenge the old—that is how we are made. We structure and work our societies to contain the challenge, and the containment usually works. But today we have a situation without precedent. We have *mature people without power* confronting mature people with power. This means not only the breakdown of aristocracy, it means the breakdown of community itself. If and when the traditional challengers, the young, ally with the new mature-powerless then we are in *terra incognita* and obliged to rethink everything from first principles.

Dominant humans, like dominant primates, work through attention-structures i.e. all eyes are continually on them. They are expected to lead and get results, others expect to follow and so benefit. When the leadership for any reason at all—age, sickness, inadequacy—fails then nature provides its own recovery mechanism, the alternative power of the charismatic challenger. Against all the rules he captures the attention-structure and if he handles his situation well can win against the most impossible odds—his name is Napoleon, Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler, Gandhi. This says nothing about his moral character or his political programme, he can be the greatest villain or the greatest saint, nature doesn't seem to care. He is the social log-jam breaker, for good or for ill.

Bureaucracy, on the other hand, stands at the pole opposite to charisma and the hereditary systems are somewhere in between. The bureaucrat is important not because of his person but because of his office.

We are trapped because we are structured to work in face-to-face relationships with about 50 other people and we have created social structures that work on an unnaturally large scale. We try to make it possible by labelling institutions rather like individuals—firms, teams, schools, regiments, factories, shops, and identify them with their named leaders; and we then set the whole thing in a vast complex of rules, laws and procedures; otherwise we would be lost.

We have lost sight too, of the political function of sex, although the Women's Lib movement is starting to restore the balance. The political nature of the original hunter-gatherer group was based on dominance and consent patterns, and on mating. It all worked through the interaction of a complex of bonding processes. In no particular order they were, and essentially remain.

The male-male bond upon which the group was entirely dependent for its supply of protein, meat. Hunting is an exclusively male activity, we live against a background of millions of years of male-male association without which the species would not have survived. Biographically the male-male bond stays with us. It cannot be 'civilised' away. It came out in classical antiquity as the Roman Army, in the Middle Ages as Chivalry, monastic orders and a celibate priesthood and in our time we see it in the Armed Forces, Public Schools, Oxford, Cambridge and the Inns of Court, prisons, most sports, business partnerships, trade unions, masonic orders, hunting, shooting, fishing, exploring, rock-climbing—even 'retreats'.

The female-female bond, by way of contrast, is based on collecting, consolidating, preparing, base-building and perpetuating. The male-male bond and the female-female bond were not, in their original state, in any kind of conflict. They were equally indispensable to the survival of society, and they are complementary. It was war, and the consequent elevation of violence and power, that was responsible for the imbalance. There will be, therefore, no restitution of the proper balance possible without the final resolution of the problem of war—and it is just this (in the Western world at least) that is now on the agenda for the first time since the beginning of civilisation. Today it is the very development of weapon technology that renders war a non-feasible exercise. The precondition for Women's Lib has arrived.

The mating bond (which may or may not be the same thing as the pair bond) is concerned with the social recognition and regulation of sex from the point of view of procreation. It is the means by which protection and food are provided for mother and child at the time of their vulnerability. It does not depend upon sex as such, for sex can and does take place quite easily outside the mating bond.

The mother-child bond in a sense is the most important of all, in as much as it is based initially on a situation of total dependency and is the foundation of all other bonds. If the mother-child bond goes wrong no subsequent bonds can go quite right. "The mother-child bond is the basic instruction in the human bonding programme."

The father-child bond is rooted in protection, delight, initiation and integration. The father looks to his sons as future hunters and sustainers and to his daughters as bonds with neighbours (since all wives must come from a group that is not their own).

Is there a family bond? The answer is—No! The family has no biographic base. "What the family does, as a unit, is to artificially cement together, with social conventions and legal rules, one subset of the possible sets of bonds that can be used as the envelope for the mother-child unit."

There are lesser bonds, like that of brother-sister. In many African societies today this is extremely important. The children are not brought up by their father but by the mother's brother. They have therefore two fathers, one biological and the other social. This protects the children against

the sexual hazards and vagaries of the mother for whoever is the father the children are looked after. Since it seems that all human societies are adulterous (the Hutterians possibly excepted) it is important that the children be protected in that respect also.

Thus sex, love and marriage are different things and need to be seen for what they are. They can and do coincide but there is no biogrammatical necessity for them to do so. Sex is a physical appetite; love is a condition of deep personal rapport between two people; marriage is a socially recognised relationship designed essentially for the protection and sustenance of mother and child, further complicated by lineage (perpetuation of dominance) and later by the inheritance of property.

Giving and Receiving

Human beings give and receive, we exchange—primates do not. We spent millions of years in a face-to-face economy based on reciprocal personal obligations. We are therefore programmed to give and receive without any means of exchange. The hunters gave meat, their wives gave roots, fruit grubs and the service of food preparation. Men and women gave each other sex. The women gave the men children and the men gave the women and children protection. Neighbouring groups gave each other their daughters. It all worked. There were no surpluses, no profits, no loot, no exploitation and no master-slave relationships. It was all done by working to give and receive.

Part of the tragedy, on this reading of the human situation, is the debasement of human kind by the discovery and practise of agriculture. It chained the once-free hunter to the tiny plot of land and made him into first a peasant, then a slave and then an alienated worker or a bureaucrat. It was a disaster "for an animal that had carefully and beautifully prepared itself through millions of years of natural selection to range and gamble, lounge and play, feast and forage."

Thus the restiveness of the young and the not so young, the willingness of people to fight wars, crusade for lost causes and endlessly rebel. We revolt against our patch of acres (our 'semi-detached' or our council flat) because we are not made that way. Deep down we are otherwise designed.

One reason for the peculiar successfulness of Victorian England was that the small enterprising company had a field-day—the hunting band was recreated by the industrial revolution. And the prey was 'brass'.

Implications for Education

Education was just as important to the hunter-gatherers as it is to us. It was not concerned with change. Change, if it has to come, is an adult responsibility. The purpose of education is to put young people in the picture, to let them know how things are in the world they are growing up to, so that they can effectively integrate with it. The job of the educator is guidance. "Dominance and attention are political devices, not instructional ones. Children learn best when their attention is on what they are doing rather than on the teacher." And nature suspends sexual differences and programmes us for curiosity in the latency period before puberty. The scene is set for the learning of skills.

Tiger and Fox reject the post-Renaissance view that man is born without evil or wicked propensities and that these are learnt from bad social conditioning. This makes us out to be dull teachable blanks. They urge a return to the medieval view that "goodness does not consist of being non-sexual or non-violent, but of being sexual and violent in socially approved ways." There is no problem of aggression as such. Men are hunters, they are diverse, they are competitive, they are given to dominance—but they are

only aggressive as a morbid expression of these qualities. Socially acceptable expressions can well be worked out instead.

What we have lost under the megamachine (Mumford's word for the organisation of vast numbers of people by the few) is that individual and group autonomy we used to have in our bands of 50, where every individual had a deep and lasting sense of the practice of power and responsibility. It happened of course, in the contexts of myth, magic, ignorance and taboos; but it was real for all that and we need to find ways to recreate it.

If we cannot personally contribute to the community of which we are part, we are denied the expression of our own natures. We need to restructure our society accordingly "to affirm the absolute value of intimacies no more extensive than the reach of an unarmed arm."

(Summary of a lecture given on March 2 under the title Individuality Status and Hierarchy)

Sir Julian Huxley, FRS

BY

HAROLD BLACKHAM

EVERYBODY knows that Julian was the grandson of Thomas Henry Huxley, champion of Darwin's theory of the biological evolution of species and the one who did most for scientific education in this country. Not everybody knows that on his mother's side he descended from Thomas Arnold of Rugby. From Eton he went to Balliol, where he read zoology and won the Newdigate poetry prize. He stayed on as a don till he went to the Rice Institute in Texas (1912-16), where he met Hermann Muller who became a lifelong friend (and fellow Humanist) and whose work in genetics convinced him early of its central importance in biology.

After service in the war, he was back at Oxford in 1919 until he went as Professor of Zoology to King's College London University (1925-27). By that time he had become involved with H. G. Wells and his son G. P. Wells in work on a projected *Science of Life*. Wells had had encouraging success with his *Outline of History*, and as a graduate in biology was eager to bring out a popular exposition of the subject, and as an old student of TH he especially wanted to enlist a Huxley on the job. The work of synthesizing and presenting a vast mass of material coherently and intelligibly was an exacting discipline, and since Huxley had undertaken the main share of the work he resigned his chair and left academic life (like Russell after the war) to work as a freelance intellectual.

Science of Life was published in three volumes in 1930. In 1942 Huxley produced *Evolution: the Modern Synthesis*, a conspectus for a more informed readership, but with references to the earlier work for fuller discussion of several topics. A revised edition came out some 20 years later, and he regarded this as the most influential of all his many books, and his main claim to scientific reputation.

From 1935-42 he was Secretary of the Zoo, a most congenial job. During the war he was generally regarded as the most knowledgeable and wisest head on the popular BBC Brains Trust.

He was appointed secretary of the preparatory commission for UNESCO, and later was elected as first Director-General, for a period of two years. Nothing could have better suited the range of his interests and

activities, and his flair for comprehension and synthesis which kept them interrelated.

Basically he was a zoologist who had specialised in marine biology, but he was always a keen ornithologist and in 1914 had published a paper on the courtship of the Great Crested Grebe, the first scientific description of its kind and a pioneer work in ethology. This was recognised 50 years later by the Royal Society when they invited him to organise a public symposium on Ritualisation of Behaviour in Animals and Man, at which some 36 papers were read and discussed during several days. Konrad Lorenz and Desmond Morris were among the contributors. All the material, with illustrations, was published by the Royal Society, and has been much in demand throughout the world.

The event took place at the Zoo, and at lunch one day Huxley described how a chimpanzee would respond to a simulation of his dance, and took us out afterwards to demonstrate this. To see him with his black Homburg pulled down over his brows and his shoulders hunched capering in front of the cage whilst the great animal inside bounded about hitting the sides with terrific force was unforgettably awesome and comic.

His interest in genetics extended to eugenics and population questions. He returned again and again to eugenics, whose main advocate, Dr Blacker, was an old pupil, and he was in correspondence on the subject with many around the world. He gave his full support to pioneers of the international movement for family planning, who had to endure obloquy and worse as late as the 1950s. Because of his roots in natural history he was a conservationist and ecologist long before these matters were on the popular agenda, and was active and influential in the policies and agencies concerned, in Africa as well as here and in America. The TVA project as a model of planning ecology excited his admiration, and he wrote a little book to describe and commend it.

Poetic Response

He wrote poetry as part of his response to nature, and he appreciated and responded to all the arts inevitably because they flowed from the same source as science and religion. This was the most fundamental synthesis of all, which in its primitive beginning was expressed in religion.

Just because religion is so powerful and universal, just because it can embrace all human faculties and actions and all aspects of the world about us, therefore it can be a potent and violent force for evil as much as for good. . . . A developed religion is one which is so organised that it helps to unify the diverse human faculties, and to give each of them the fullest play in a common task (*Religion without Revelation* p. 149).

A developed religion would have Evolutionary Humanism as a comprehensive and powerful ideas system, synthesizing knowledge to guide the action of man as the responsible agent for human fulfilment and for all life on the planet. He used to speak of a remarkable Jesuit priest, a palaeontologist, with similar ideas whom he had met at international conferences. In due course he introduced Teilhard de Chardin to the British public with the English translation of *The Phenomenon of Man* (1959).

It was he who introduced the "science" component in the UNESCO title, and in a pamphlet when he was elected Director-General he proposed a global scientific and evolutionary humanism as the ideological basis for its work. He saw cultural development as a continuation of biological evolution, as a psycho-social process based on cumulative trans-

mission of experience and its results, working through an organised system of awareness, a combined operation of knowing, feeling and willing. This had been the age-old function of religion and this was its new function in a scientific age. Knowledge was basic, and provided guidance to opportunities of fulfilment still open.

When I first came to London in 1933, Lord Snell was chairman of the Ethical Union, and very keen to get a Huxley as President. Julian had been invited twice, and had refused. After the war, he wrote to me about *The Plain View*, a humanist quarterly I had started with which he was impressed; and he then agreed to be President. Later I persuaded him to open the inaugural Congress of the International Humanist and Ethical Union in Amsterdam in 1952. He worked with me in setting up the Humanist Broadcasting Council, and he was the first President of the BHA. Among the later encyclopaedic enterprises in which he was involved was the Macdonald Illustrated Library. He was on the editorial board with Bronowski, James Fisher and Gerald Barry, a humanist group of superior talent who planned ten volumes addressed to "the intelligent adolescent" covering the range of human knowledge, and translated into several languages. Huxley himself was responsible for the last volume, *The Growth of Ideas*, and got me to help. He played a leading part on the International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind, and insisted on a chapter on "Modern Humanism", which he asked me to write. *The Humanist Frame* was a self-made opportunity to bring together some 30 contributions on different aspects or applications of Humanism. In his very last years, I brought to his attention Mitchell Beazley's great *Atlas of the Earth*, which abundantly and cleverly illustrated all his own interests, to which he contributed an admiring Introduction.

Broad Outlook

Huxley seemed always involved in restless activity, doing or getting done or standing where something was being done. This total extroversion belied the deep sensibilities; as the endless travel which seemed like running away was an investment of the capital of his interests which brought returns. He was the last of the *philosophes*, and he called himself a generalist rather than a scientist. If Russell had more than a touch of Voltaire, Huxley resembled Diderot: the same zestful temperament and omnivorous curiosity, focused in a lifelong programme of popular enlightenment under the banner of human progress. In some of his interests and activities he was riding the wave of the future, as in ethology and ecology and family planning, but not with his global ideas-system, which enjoyed a vogue of the hour with Teilhard de Chardin, but did not catch on with the scientific community. All the same, he was given the respect due to an elder statesman at scientific gatherings, and was a distinguished scientific public presence among intellectuals. What he stood for in terms of an ideas-system is anyhow coming about in practice through necessary inter-disciplinary collaboration and under the pressure of global problems.

If the essential task of Humanism is to sustain nerve and inspire confidence by creating through secular faith and hope a climate of action, he more than anyone in our time diligently fulfilled that task by dedicating to it like the pioneers before him exceptional knowledge and conviction. He believed in and cared and laboured for the future of mankind on this planet.

(Summary of a lecture given on April 13)

For the Record

BY

THE GENERAL SECRETARY

THE DEBATE about religious humanism has been taken up in the pages of *The New Humanist* and *The Freethinker*. Some kind of meeting of minds is taking place. This doesn't mean that we agree but it does mean that we are talking about the same subject and communicating, more or less! And this is an advance! There have been many occasions in recent years when, in discussion with fellow humanists, I have wondered by what right we presumed to acknowledge the same label.

Margaret Knight in the July *New Humanist* admits that there are two kinds of humanist and says: "it is basically just a difference in temperament, and can be crudely expressed by saying that secular Humanists have a predominantly intellectual, and religious Humanists a predominantly emotional, approach to life".

That is interesting but not, in my opinion, good enough. It assumes a necessary conflict between the intellectual and the emotional with one "predominating" over the other. But life is not like that. Writing these lines is an intellectual exercise; if I do it well I communicate, if I do it badly I fail to get through. It is just *not* an emotional problem although there are feelings, value judgments, involved at a deeper level. Inventing a conflict does not help. Ideas and feelings have their separate places and ideally the balance between them should be a just one according to the needs of the situation, given that we have to live with our temperaments. Greek psychology was based on a theory of temperaments but they did *not* include the forms given to them by Margaret Knight. They were as follows: sanguine, phlegmatic, choleric and melancholic. I'll settle for the Greeks! The question of religion is something else.

A Humanist Credo

Religion is a combination of beliefs and rituals concerned with the sacred, as distinct from the profane. The sacred has no necessary connection with the supernatural or any revealed personal deity. The sacred is that which we set apart, revere, have faith in. It is beyond criticism (although one might be fiercely critical *en route* to it). When we have arrived, that's it.

The difference between orthodox Christian religion and humanist religion is the difference between beliefs in original sin and human autonomy. I say "orthodox Christian religion" because the tradition of humanist religion has always existed *inside* Christianity in much of the Gospels, in Pelagius, Origen, the Albigensians, Erasmus and More—and in countless heretics whose names have not survived. It is no accident that many, if not most of us, began as devout Christians. Being within Christianity, religious humanism quite properly emerges from it. It is in this sense that South Place is described (in our Trust Deed) as a "Society of protestant dissenters". "Universalism", our original doctrine, is older than the church of Rome. It signified a faith in the power of human brotherhood and the rejection of hell-fire, a revolutionary idea in 1793 and for many years thereafter.

What then is sacred to us? The answer is written up in great length in the history of the Society, especially in the works of Fox and Conway. What I did in the August *New Humanist* was to condense it:

We believe:

in caring and caring relationships;
in the importance of people against things, possessions, power;
in imaginative vision;
in reasonable enquiry and plain speaking;
in unity with nature;
in belonging and in solitariness;
in civil and religious liberty;
and that these, being sacred, give meaning to life.

We reject:

cruelty;
the pursuit of money and power as ends in themselves;
dullness, ignorance and ugliness;
the closed mind and evasiveness;
separation from nature;
social isolation;
all forms of tyranny;
and the reduction of life to the uniform level of the profane.

Philosophy and Human Progress: the Idea of Perfectibility

This is the title of the new course of study to be tutored by Peter Cronin starting on Monday 22nd September. It is a University of London Sessional Course undertaken jointly with the Society. There will be 24 meetings from 7.0 pm to 9.0 pm weekly and the fee for the whole course is £3 payable to the office, or directly to the Dept of Extramural Studies, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AD. We shall meet in the Library. Peter Cronin writes:

"We will examine and discuss what philosophers, theologians, social reformers and humanists have said on the subject of human betterment, using as a basic text John Passmore's *The Perfectibility of Man* (Duckworth 1970, £1.95), with supplementary reading as required.

"Is the pursuit of 'human perfection' a false goal? Passmore comments: Men, almost certainly, are capable of more than they have ever so far achieved. But what they achieve . . . will be a consequence of their remaining anxious, passionate, discontented human beings. From Plato to Satre, philosophers have argued as to what kind of *society* would best contain the restless human enterprise, self-defeating at it may be".

I expect to be on the course myself. The last one went well with about 18 students from the jointly sponsoring bodies.

The Parkinson's Disease Society

Bill Home, the Chairman of the General Committee, is in touch with this Society and they are badly in need of some volunteers to (a) help patients and their relatives, (b) collect and disseminate information, (c) raise funds for research. If you feel you can help yourself, or pass the word on to someone else who might be able to help, the address of the Secretary is: Susan E. Ritson, Parkinson's Disease Society, Central London Branch, 1 Clarion House, 330 Roam Road, London E3 5QL.

Mrs Perry

Mrs Perry, the wife of Mr Perry our Head Caretaker for so many years, has died. Mrs Booker writes:

Mrs Perry worked at Conway Hall even before Mr Perry and gave staunch support in difficult times, and the same degree of devotion and

loyalty to the Society. She presided over the refreshments at social functions for many years, took a lively interest in the Members and would reminisce about earlier days. In spite of ill-health during the later years she was courageous and uncomplaining. Mrs Perry had a friendly and hospitable nature, always agreeable and pleasant in conversation and showing a sense of fitness, justice and understanding.

Humanist Housing Association—Sunhill Place opens

The HHA announces that the new scheme at Sunhill Place, High Street, Pembury, near Tunbridge Wells will be opened at a Garden Party on Sunday 21 September at 3.0 pm. I have been asked to perform the opening ceremony. Coaches will leave both Rose Bush Court, 35 Parkhill Road, NW3, and Conway Hall at 11.0 am. Return fare £1. Send money with booking to Mora Burnet, 131 Greenhill, Prince Arthur Road, NW3, stating where you wish to join the coach. Bring packed lunch. Those making their own transport arrangements, please advise. Tel: 435 8946. Evelyn Brown is the Warden of Sunhill Place; conducting the wedding ceremony for her and Bill was my first act as an Officiant at South Place five years ago.

AROUND THE SOCIETY

- I shall do the write-up for the October meetings in the *October Record*, suffice it to say here that Tom Evans leads off on our first Sunday, October 5th, on *Power and Responsibility—Problems of the Press*; the theme for Tuesdays will be *Science and Social Responsibility* and Jerry Ravetz will introduce the first discussion on the 7th. The first Forum will be on *The Future of the Black Englishman* with Ken Forge and one of the black community yet to be named—on the 12th.
- Some months ago we helped to publicise an appeal for a Memorial Prize in memory of the late Frederic Jackson. We have just had a letter from Mr J. J. Juliver, who organised the appeal, with the news that the total sum received amounted to a very substantial sum: £1,532.50.
- In a previous *Record* I wrote about the last Universalist Church, in Clapham, and thanks to the Editor of the Unitarian fortnightly *The Inquirer* I was able to locate the widow of the Church's last minister Mr Peacock. She writes, sadly; "I am sorry to say all its records and contents were destroyed during World War II. My husband did intend writing a short history of the movement in England but unfortunately he never achieved this, and all the other folk connected with the Church are now dead". Ironically in our fire-proof safe at the Hall, I have since located a pamphlet written by Mr Peacock, perhaps the only one to survive?
- We made an appointment of an Assistant Caretaker but it didn't work out. The job was readvertised and Mr Charles Wicks appointed. We wish him well.
- Victor Rose has taken his paintings from the corridor but left those that hang on the stairs. His was a very popular exhibition and our thanks to Victor!
- The *Record* was founded in 1895 which makes 1975 its eightieth anniversary. The Editor, Eric Willoughby, proposed to the General Committee that we produce an anniversary pamphlet recording the outline of the *Record* over those years and the work is now in hand. Dr Lovecy,

Victor Rose, John Brown and Eric himself are at work on the four quarters of the period and, all being well, the finished product should be in your hands in December. It will take the place of the Conway Memorial Lecture which we decided to "rest" this year.

PETER CADOGAN

GENERAL COMMITTEE / SUB-COMMITTEES

(Conveners shown in bold type)

Executive Committee

General Secretary, Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer, Lettings Secretary, Hon Registrar, Hon Editor.

General Committee

Mr C. E. Barralet, Mrs L. L. Booker, Mr J. D. Brown, Mr W. H. Brown, Miss R. Bush, Mr J. Byrne, **Mr P. Cadogan**, Mrs C. Dowman, Mrs M. Fowler, Mr J. Hargreaves, Miss V. Hassid, Mr F. V. Hawkins, Mr W. Home, Mr G. Hutchinson, Dr A. Lovecy, Miss R. Miles, Mr D. Reidy, Mr V. Rose, Mr G. Salmon, Mr J. Warwick, Mr J. Willmin, Mr E. Willoughby.

Trustees

Mr C. E. Barralet, Mr D. C. Campbell, Mr J. Stewart Cook, Mrs C. Dowman, Mr G. Hutchinson, Mr G. Salmon, Mrs M. Sinha, Mr B. O. Warwick.

Finance Committee

Mr P. Cadogan, Mrs L. Booker (Chairman), Mr C. Barralet, Mr D. Campbell, Mrs C. Dowman, Dr A. Lovecy, Mrs L. Lovecy, Mr G. Hutchinson, Miss R. Miles, Mr N. Home.

Lectures and Discussions Committee

Mr P. Cadogan, Miss E. Palmer, Mr E. Willoughby, Mrs M. Sinha, Mr R. Hall, Miss B. Smoker, Dr A. Lovecy, Mrs L. Lovecy, Mrs M. Fowler, Miss V. Hassid, Mr J. Willmin, Mr V. Rose, Mr P. Lumsden.

Editorial Board

Mr E. Willoughby, Mr J. Brown, Dr A. Lovecy, Mr V. Rose, Mr P. Cadogan.

Decor Committee

Miss R. Miles, Mr P. Cadogan, Mrs E. Washbrook, Mrs K. Males, Mr V. Rose, Mr W. H. Brown, Mr J. Brown, Mrs M. Fowler, Mrs G. Salmon.

Building Committee

Mr P. Cadogan, Mr W. Home, Mr C. Barralet, Miss R. Miles, Mr G. Salmon, Mr J. Brown, Mr G. Hutchinson.

Social Committee

Miss R. Bush, Mrs T. Delius, Mr P. Cadogan, Miss E. Palmer, Mr J. Hargreaves, Miss C. Davis, Mrs M. Sinha, Mr J. Brown, Mrs E. Monks, Mr P. Cadogan.

Library Committee

Dr A. Lovecy, Mr C. Morey (Librarian), Mrs A. Lovecy, Mrs T. Delius, Mr P. Cadogan, Miss M. McGill, Mrs M. Fowler, Mr D. Reidy, Miss E. Palmer.

Bookstall Committee

Mr J. Hargreaves, Miss E. Palmer, Miss R. Bush, Mr P. Cadogan.

Fine Arts Committee

Mr P. Cadogan, Mr and Mrs Faure Walker, Mr V. Rose.

Sunday Morning Music

Mr G. Hutchinson, Mr F. Hawkins, Miss J. Langley.

Concert Committee

Mr G. Hutchinson, Mr F. Hawkins, Mr and Mrs C. Barralet, Mr C. Brown, Miss V. Hassid, Mr and Mrs A. Hooper, Mr M. Goldesgyne, Mr and Mrs L. Lince, Miss P. Sowter, Dr J. Brebner, Mrs Burrell.

Hawkins Chamber Music Library

Mr F. Hawkins, Mr and Mrs L. Lince.

Clements Memorial Prize Committee

Mr F. Hawkins, Mr C. Barralet, Mr G. Hutchinson, Mr and Mrs L. Lince.

DISCUSSION

Schizophrenia and Society

SCHIZOPHRENIA is a disease suffered by at least 1 per cent of the world's population. If sub-clinical cases of the illness are also considered the figure may be as high as 10 per cent or 300 million suffered throughout the world. This is a staggering figure and we might imagine that a vast amount of money must be spent on finding the medical solution to such a disease. This is not the case. So terrifying is madness even in this day and age that practically no work is done to solve its problems or to find its cure. Instead of living truly human and fulfilled lives sufferers and frightened non-sufferers co-exist in our frigid non-human present day "civilised" society. Research is minimal. The mad cannot help themselves. The non-mad are too frightened to help or to be involved. A treatise on insanity published in 1835 says "Insanity belongs almost exclusively to civilised races of men, it scarcely exists among savages and is rare in barbarous countries". Today most of the world is civilised and many of its inhabitants are mad. The rate of schizophrenia is going up, as because of improved medication, more patients can now marry and pass on the defective gene to a proportion of their children. The effects of schizophrenia on the world are so devastating that they must certainly affect the political climate as well as inter-personal relationships in society generally.

All the evidence points to schizophrenia being a genetically inherited disease. Such diseases can only be mediated biochemically. The Medical Research Council's annual report published last July mentions the genetic aspects of schizophrenia thus: "Results of family studies are consistent

with two different genetic models. Dr Salter of the Institute of Psychiatry proposed that there is a single dominant gene determining the disease, with only partial penetration—that is, it is not expressed in all those carrying it. Other workers at the MRC Psychiatric Genetics Unit, Dr J. Gottesman and Dr J. Shields, proposed the multi-gene hypothesis suggesting the involvement of numerous genes. It can be predicted from the multi-gene hypothesis that the relatives of people with clear-cut schizophrenia will tend to show a spectrum of traits not all of which will necessarily be adverse.” Dr Slater’s hypothesis has recently received support from a Chinese source. Professor E. Eisenberg, Professor of Psychiatry in the Harvard Medical School, wrote recently that “In schizophrenia and manic depression the growing evidence for an underlying genetic basis for both these mental illnesses reinforces the expectation that such patients would have some chemical abnormality for which a chemical remedy could be found.” The evidence indicates that if one parent has the gene for schizophrenia there is a 12 per cent risk for the children. If both parents have the gene the risk goes up to 50 per cent, and schizophrenics apparently tend to marry each other.

It is highly likely that exceptionally clever people will have sufferers from schizophrenia in their families. The geneticist Karlsson in a genetic study of schizophrenia studied a closely knit Icelandic family. He found the near relatives of schizophrenics often exceptionally creative. Schizophrenia sufferers have themselves the potential of remarkable creativity. They are the stuff of genius.

The symptoms of schizophrenia are many and diverse. They include exhaustion, loss of concentration and memory, anger, depression, apathy, hallucinations, irrationality, delusions, obsessions and pedantic phraseology. Physical symptoms include loss of weight, increased skin colouration, profuse perspiration with an aromatic smell, poor circulation, stiff walk, and a low metabolic rate. Not all patients suffer all these symptoms. Thus schizophrenia is a physical disease in which the brain is one of the organs affected by the disease process. Disordered brain chemistry leads to disordered thought and behaviour and these are the symptoms which evoke fear in society at all levels, particularly if the aberrant behaviour is violent.

Chemical Reactions

It is important always to remember the biochemical basis of our emotions. An experiment was done in which rats were turned into killers when the enzyme cholinesterase, which breaks down the brain transmitter acetyl choline, was artificially inhibited. It could well be inhibited by disease processes in Man.

Unless and until there is proof to the contrary we should regard all violence as being symptomatic of madness. Hitler, the Kennedy murderers, the high-jackers, the people who put bombs in cars and letters and buildings are or were probably all schizophrenics. There is a much higher incidence than usual in schizophrenia in males between the ages of 20-35 in Southern Ireland and a three year study on this is being carried out now in Dublin. It seems possible and even probable that the current horrors in Ireland stem from the high rate of schizophrenia of its inhabitants. We really have no need to look further for a cause. It seems likely that both Catholics and Protestants use their religion as a peg on which to hang their paranoia.

The political dissidents of the world often appear, from newspaper reports, to be suffering from schizophrenia. The visionary schizophrenic may easily become the violent schizophrenic. In the USSR obviously ill schizophrenics who are also dissidents are sent to special hospitals. Despite

the furore in the West about the hospitalisation of these dissidents it would seem the Russians are acting fairly rationally in sending obviously ill dissidents who have committed crimes according to Russian law to hospital rather than to prison. Natalya Gorbanevskaya for example is one such dissident, obviously a seriously ill schizophrenic. In Germany Ulrika Meinhof, a West German dissident, has recently been subjected to brutal treatment in prison although she also shows obvious schizophrenic symptoms. In this country many schizophrenics are sent to prison instead of to hospital. Many schizophrenics are charged with both major and minor offences against the law which they have committed because of their illness, and yet the number of hospital orders made by the Courts has fallen year by year. Many psychiatric hospitals are unwilling to accept offender patients and do not make arrangements to provide for them. Hence our schizophrenics have to suffer the double burden of sickness and punishment. It seems that fear of mental illness is so widespread and so enmeshed in the fabric of life that our natural humanity has been overlaid. It should be easy to understand that a man with an ill mind cannot consider ethical principles before he acts and speaks, and non-sufferers from schizophrenia have become so petrified with fear that they seem unable to look at the mentally ill criminal offender and say "He (or she) needs to go to hospital".

Treatment or Punishment?

Thus it would appear that ethical principles and ideological arguments cannot help frightened men to help sick men. Instead punitive measures are tightened up and prison sentences made more severe. The Scarman report on last year's riots in Red Lion Square says, "It is a serious offence to depreciate the currency of freedom by resorting to violence and public disorder thereby encouraging a move to introduce into the law a greater restriction upon the rights of us all." But it is *fear* of the violence which will curtail our liberty, not the violence itself, the violence, being symptomatic of illness, can be treated without repressive measures or the curtailment of our individual liberties. It is certainly true that at the same time we adopt harsher retributive punitive measures toward the violent and criminal offenders we also erode the freedom of the rest of the population and hasten the coming of the police state. Even little things we once took for granted, like being able to leave our luggage in the left luggage office we can no longer do, and this can constitute a big burden on the old and ill. We are searched and cannot take our bags into public buildings. We are all made to feel like criminals. Fear is now world wide.

Young offenders come increasingly into the hands of the police. Arrests of young people between ten and 16 were up 15 per cent to 32,000 according to the February 1975 figures. Young children are held in remand in prison. Many of these children are obviously ill but society is even afraid of its young. It also still scorns all the mentally ill even if they are not criminal offenders. Thus even in 1975 most people are afraid to admit openly that they or their relatives suffer from the devastating disease of schizophrenia. Most of us are so conditioned in childhood not to break the rigid rules of our society that we become dull, uncreative and "Good". We become "good" because we are afraid we will be punished if we are not. However, schizophrenics often have poor memories. They do not easily learn the rigid rules, and so they break them. They are not afraid of punishment. They have no conditioning strait jackets. They are our creative free thinkers. Our creative schizophrenics should have their illness controlled by medication and diet so that their non-conformity does not deteriorate to the point of irrationality.

The really very mentally ill will probably eventually get treatment as their symptoms become overt, but the ones who are missed so often are the sub-clinical cases, those who never quite break down, and as we have seen their numbers are probably legion, the hippies, the lonely bed sitter folk, the squatters finding comradeship in their isolating illness, the unemployed, the baby batterers, the wife beaters, those on social security, the tramps and vagabonds, the baby snatchers, the trouble makers, the quarrelsome. All these groups will contain almost certainly many sub-clinical schizophrenics. Many schizophrenics, depressed, commit suicide in their desperate desolation, and this is a very tragic and heart-breaking aspect of schizophrenia. We must not let people be lonely and alone. Let us learn to recognise mental illness, conquer our fear of it and then see that our mentally ill are never punished but are always properly medically treated, always with the utmost humanity. Only thus can we hope to become a happy world and a truly civilised one.

(Report by Gwynneth Hemmings of her talk on March 11)

THE HUMANIST COUNSELLING SERVICE

Concern Themselves with
Your Personal Problems . . .

. . . Whatever they are

Write or phone in Confidence

13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London W8 5PG

Telephone: 01-937 2341

FORUM

The Future of South Place

THE SUBJECT was introduced by a panel of speakers—Mr George Hutchinson, Dr Albert Lovecy and Mr Peter Cadogan.

Mr George Hutchinson

What about the future of the Society? To my mind it will go on as before—even after the High Court case—though several thousand pounds poorer. Apart from the money loss, I won't mind, though I'd like less talk for talking's sake and more non-controversial and constructive things done. I would like SPES to keep on attracting the agnostics, the do-gooders, social workers—tolerant people who live and let live.

We should consider using the *Ethical Record* to advertise more boldly. Our programme and facilities at Conway Hall make for a more active membership; we should endeavour to recruit the business, professional and craft skills of the members for the betterment of South Place and Conway Hall and encourage the development of social activities which are therapeutic, innocent and non-bloody.

The membership fee in 1974 was 50p. We now pay £1. It should be at least £4. We should advertise this fact prominently and permanently in the *Record*. Apart from the pensioners, I sometimes wonder if the amount members donate to the Society indicates the value they place on its activities. If we had to depend on members' subscriptions to run the Society we'd get nowhere. Income from Conway Hall lets is the lifeblood of South Place, so Conway Hall must be looked after, kept clean, warm and well decorated, and broken-down furnishings replaced. I also think we should try to avoid lets and publicity that might be damaging to the fabric and reputation of the Hall. I believe that expenditure should be scrutinised for maximum efficiency and while essential staff must be properly paid, the use of voluntary workers in many ways should be sought.

I look forward to hearing about and discussing the real purpose of SPES in the future, in furthering the new version of its study and dissemination of ethical principals and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment.

Dr Albert Lovecy

Dr Lovecy appealed for the future of the Society to be worthy of its past. Trying to offset the trivialising article in the *Radio Times* about our Open Door programme, he had written: "The article misses the whole point of SPES. Most, and probably the worst, of the world's problems are rooted in conflicts of interest, clashes of opinion about rights and wrongs. Either we perpetuate these by constant restatement of past errors and evils, or else we work for present and future remedies that only forbearance, understanding, and humaneness can possibly bring. To anyone who favours the latter course, *ethics* has a real significance because it concerns *conduct*, the practical evidence of our beliefs, especially about the rights of others. For SPES as a body, the traditional creeds and their priesthoods no longer serve the ethical need, because they seem divisive, anti-empirical, often myopic in their disregard for sober realism and objective knowledge. Our members know of no entity to "worship", so how could we pray? Nevertheless, we share with others the awareness of our human obligations and of the ethical judgment we all *ought* to apply in shaping our decisions. As yet, we have found no better way to foster these feelings than by inviting many viewpoints to be heard and discussed frankly. We find that the wise may sometimes turn out otherwise . . . It is my hope that this letter may draw attention away from cardigans, haircuts and perms to hearts and minds and purposes."

Can we feel satisfied when such a letter was ignored and space given to the excuses of the journalist concerned? An Open Door, but really No Entry as yet.

Referring to Mr Hutchinson's involvement with our musical activities, Dr Lovecy said that we do not call on violinists to play the piano, and we must use our own judgment to appreciate the score. Whether playing our own instruments, or helping in other ways, or just listening, we could all take pleasure in harmony.

Mr Peter Cadogan

Given that we have good meetings and concerts I think there is still a lot more we might do on the sides of 'joy' and constructive activity! On the joy side we have our Annual Reunion, Socials and Rambles and have recently added the Christmas Party and the Annual Dinner, both of which have been highly successful. The Fine Arts exhibitions are a new dimension but where is our own orchestra, choir and drama group? We have Bridge but no Chess. We have no young people's group, and the Sunday group for young people (partly to enable the parents to come to meetings) is still in

a very tentative stage. The poetry evenings did not survive the loss of Margaret Pearce.

We have recently been able to help Dr Alick Elithorn with his interesting project to help the separated and divorced to make amicable settlements over their children without recourse to lawyers and the courts. This is now happening in the Library. I think we might seek to perform a suitable service for non-readers—that is the kind of thing that members and friends might do making the best possible use of our remarkable premises. Co-counselling is the coming thing and in someone like Mark Moskowitz amongst us we have an expert in our ranks. Can we branch out in that direction? I look forward to the day when our legal troubles are over and we can take steps to transform the room under the stage into a club room for the Society (not as another public room). But the use of such a room, as with all the activities mentioned above, depends on people, on individuals, who will take and sustain new initiatives.

In Fox's day there was something called the Fox Circle, i.e. a group of influential people (influential in the best sense) who were close to the Society but not identified with it. There are signs that this might happen again, lecturers meeting lecturers to spark new ideas and make new contacts, a Conway Hall Circle.

Note: In fairness to the *Radio Times* and the BBC it should be pointed out that several members (I know of at least three) wrote in, in protest against the things that Dr Lovecy mentions. They chose to publish my letter and some amends were therefore made. Apart from the one blemish the BBC did great things for us.

(*Report of a Forum on April 13*)

BOOK REVIEW

Prophets of Freedom and Enterprise. Ed. Michael Ivens, Pub. Kogan Page for Aims of Industry 1975. £2.95.

THERE are far too many Socialists in the Ethical and Humanist movements. That is at least a tenable view and those who hold it will be pleased by the publication of this book. Those who disagree would do well to read it and see if they can meet its challenge. It is a collection of essays by eight modern writers of distinction and authority and the theme is the organic relationship between freedom of expression and freedom of action.

From the many famous names available, eight have been selected, arbitrarily perhaps—Smith, Mill, Marshall, Keynes, Hayek, Friedman, Mises, Popper,—and the role of prophet here ascribed is to interpret, to expound, to inspire, rather than to foretell. It is evident enough that events, whether foreseen by them or not, have been greatly influenced in certain phases by the expositions of doctrine of these prophets. Now, in our many and grievous difficulties it is right that we should be reminded of them.

Of course this slim volume of 80 pages can hardly do much more than touch on the great issues involved. Still, it is interesting and likely to be impressive in the modern context, to learn (again) that . . . Adam Smith did not wish to limit Governmental action to anything like the extent he is commonly held to have done; or that . . . J. S. Mill so beloved by Fabian Socialists, believed simply 'that a centralized Socialist State was impossible'; or that . . . the founder of the Keynesianism by which we have lived through these 30 years of approach to a ruinous inflation 'would have altered his views had he lived'; and so on.

The question must be squarely faced—Where did we go wrong? How is it that with guides of this kind, and of course the many others mentioned in the introduction, we have so conducted our affairs that mere survival is itself at stake and in doubt? Was the advice from our guides not good advice? or was it not followed faithfully enough? or was other advice heeded too much, e.g. from that new recruit to Humanism, Karl Marx? Is it just possible that well-intentioned actions were contrary to purpose? On this theme the theoretical critique developed by Ludwig von Mises might have something to contribute.

Punch Pulled

It is a possible view that in this book the case against Socialism is not pressed as hard as it might well have been. One is reminded of the mathematics examinee who claimed for his answer that 'if he had not exactly proved the proposition to be true, he had made it seem extremely probable'. Perhaps more emphasis might have been laid on the problem of Economic Calculation, which is central to the devastating examination of Socialism by von Mises. Is there in fact, anywhere, a comprehensive adequate answer to the problem posed by von Mises in his book **Human Action** Chapter XXVI, pages 694 et seq. and, earlier, in Part II on his book on **Socialism**? If there is one, public attention might with advantage be directed towards it. This whole question was surveyed, very competently, by Trygve Hoff in his book published in this country by Hodge in 1949 (**Economic Calculation in the Socialist Society**). Can any advance on that survey be shown now? If not, the case for Freedom, and against Socialism, stands, as impregnable as ever, without aid from the other lesser points, valid though these may be. Nevertheless any Socialist reader of the book can be assured of adequate and varied exercise for his defensive faculties.

It is to be hoped that all the contributors to this symposium will regard it as high among their priorities to take a full part in the the anxious disputations that now seem to be inevitable, and at this date, alas! seem likely to be of very uncertain effectiveness.

L. S. BUSH

Viewpoint

George Dowman memorial

The wrought iron flower stands in remembrance of my husband George have now been placed in the Library at Conway Hall. I think they form a most attractive memorial and I would like to express my grateful thanks to the General Committee and to all the members and friends of the Society who subscribed to the fund.

London N1

CONSTANCE DOWMAN

The Root Of All . . .

I have felt for some time that as things are to-day in Britain SPES has a particularly important role to play, since basically ethics, or the lack of them, are the root cause of the Country's troubles. It was thus with keen anticipation that I read James Robertson's "The Social Role of Money" in the April **Record**: but alas, although few can object to his thesis concerning "socially responsible enterprise", financially responsible government" (one that refrains from printing more money than the assets warrant?)—and "honest money", nowhere was there any practical suggestion detailing the

type of reforms required to bring these things about. Should not SPES now be concentrating on such matters, and in the event of anything useful emerging, airing it in the National Press per the correspondence columns? This would not only introduce much needed 'fresh air' into Britain, but also it might even put SPES where it belongs, i.e., in the forefront of an ethical revival, without which things can only get worse.

J. W. BLUNDELL

Malta

Free Speech

I am aware that there may have been moments of discrimination against people like Sir Oswald Mosley and others (although I gather that even he was never actually turned away since he never tried to book the Hall) but I do not know the details of past decisions and don't propose to sit in judgment on them. But there is no mistaking the main burden of the 1929/1975 tradition—in 17,790 booking days!

John Stuart Mill said that the maximum amount of liberty that a man can have is the amount which does not interfere with the liberty of another. I have been called a communist, a fascist, an anarchist and a Trotskyist in my time, in public and in private, because I have upheld the liberties of the people and called for an equalitarian society.

The fact that I have been oppressed by others does not give me the right to suppress my opponents even though some power might come my way. I do not think there is a single racist in SPES. And what is a race? Albert Lovecy (*July/August Record*) knows full well that the races are so mixed up that it is impossible to draw an exact line one from another.

What the National Front is looking for is a scapegoat (other political groups do the same thing) with which to rouse hatred and turn one section of society against another as a means of seizing power. Others have bastardised Marx and been responsible for all kinds of iniquities on the grounds that the end justifies the means. But a nettle by any other name stings the same! And perishes in the garden of freedom!

VICTOR S. ROSE

Bromley, Kent

South Place News

New Members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members: Ms J. M. Neville, IOW; Mr B. Nicholson, N16; Ms E. Elinson, WC1; Mrs V. A. Laver, IOW; Ms C. A. Milton, E2; Mr M. J. Howard, E2; Mr L. C. Ainsbury, Worcester; Ms R. Gratrex, East Retford; Mr M. Lucas, East Retford; Mr S. Mehra, Twickenham; Ms J. D. Myers, Twickenham; Mrs T. L. Stone, Dover and Mr J. E. Park, W14.

Obituary

We regret to report the death of Mr A. J. Rowe, SE3.

Rambles

Sunday, September 7. Jointly with Forest Group, visit to Waltham Abbey, Essex, a gem of 11th century Norman architecture. Meet at the Abbey at 12 noon, with packed lunch. Bus 279 from Finsbury Park, or

Liverpool Street to Waltham Cross, then by bus 242. Alternatively, train to Waltham Cross from Liverpool Street. Tea at Chingford, by invitation of Edwina Palmer, followed by discussion led by Mr F. Veryard.

Sunday, September 7. Bring packed lunch for a round walk from Sevenoaks, through Kentish orchards (approximately nine miles). Meet at Charing Cross Station to board the fast train 10.40 am to Sevenoaks, (cheap day return 86p), where the Leader, Mrs Sophie Randall will be waiting. (Tel: 830 2733.)

Kindred Organisations

The new **Humanist Housing Association** scheme at Sunhill Place, High Street, Pembury, Tunbridge Wells, will be opened by Peter Cadogan at a garden party on Sunday, 21 September at 3 pm. Coaches leave Conway Hall and Rose Bush Court at 11 am. Return fare £1. Those providing own transport are asked to notify Mora Burnet, 131 Greenhill, Prince Arthur Road, NW3, with whom coach bookings can be made. A packed lunch should be taken.

The annual excursion of the **National Secular Society** will take place on Sunday, September 7. Coach leaves central London for Thetford, Norfolk, birthplace of Thomas Paine. There will also be a visit to Anglesey Abbey, near Cambridge, founded in 1135. The house is now owned by the National Trust and its contents include paintings by Constable and Landseer. There is also a 100-acre garden. Fare and admission to Anglesey Abbey £2. Details and bookings from NSS, 698 Holloway Road, London N19. (Tel: 272 1266.)

The Annual Conference of the **Rationalist Press Association** is to be held at Churchill College, Cambridge from 12 to 14 September. The subject of the conference is Science and the Paranormal. The fee for the weekend is £15, full board for RPA members, £18 non-members. Lectures and meals only £9, lectures only £2.

(Continued from page 2)

Tuesday, October 14

7.00 pm—**Discussion: The Social Responsibility of Science** introduced by **Prof. M. H. F. Wilkins**

Sunday, October 19

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: HAROLD BLACKHAM on The Gap Between Theory and Practice**

6.00 pm—**Bridge Practice and Scrabble**

Tuesday, October 21

7.00 pm—**Discussion** to be arranged

Sunday, October 26

11.00 am—**Sunday Meeting: DAVID McLELLAN on The Humanism of Karl Marx**

3.00 pm—**Forum: Capital London (film) with William Home**

6.00 pm—**Bridge and Scrabble**

Tuesday, October 28

7.00 pm—**Discussion** to the motion that: "**Science is for Science's Sake**"

South Place Ethical Society

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

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

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

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

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

Minimum subscriptions are: Members, £1 p.a.; Life Members, £21 (Life membership is available only to members of at least one year's standing). It is of help to the Society's officers if members pay their subscriptions by Bankers' Order, and it is of further financial benefit to the Society if Deeds of Covenant are entered into. Members are urged to pay more than the minimum subscription whenever possible, as the present amount is not sufficient to cover the cost of this journal.

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

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

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

Being in sympathy with the aims of South Place Ethical Society, I desire to become a Member and I enclose as my annual subscription the sum of £..... (minimum £1) entitling me (according to the Rules of the Society) to membership for one year from the date of enrolment.

NAME
(BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE)

ADDRESS
.....

OCCUPATION (disclosure optional)

HOW DID YOU HEAR OF THE SOCIETY?

DATE SIGNATURE

The Ethical Record is posted free to members. The annual charge to subscribers is £1. Matter for publication should reach the Editor, Eric Willoughby, 46 Springfield Road, London E17 8DD, by the 5th of the preceding month.