

THE

6^D



ETHICAL

RECORD

Vol. 72, No. 4

APRIL 1967

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	3
PSYCHOLOGISTS' AND NOVELISTS' APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY	4
<i>by Prof. T. H. Pear</i>	
THE ORIGINS OF RACIALISM	7
<i>by Dr. John Lewis</i>	
HAPPENINGS	8
REASON IN ETHICS AND SCIENCE	9
<i>by A. Phillips Griffiths</i>	
CONWAY DISCUSSIONS: EDUCATION	11
WHO SAID THAT? AND WHEN?	12
BOOK REVIEWS:	
THE GODS THEY WANT	13
<i>by F. C. Ade</i>	
LORD BIRKETT	14
<i>by Richard Clements</i>	
POP HUMANISM	15
<i>by Barbara Smoker</i>	
TO THE EDITOR	16
OFF THE RECORD	16
SOUTH PLACE NEWS	17

Published by

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

Conway Hall Humanist Centre
Red Lion Square, London, WC1

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS:

Secretary: Mr. H. G. Knight
Hall Manager and Lettings Secretary: Miss E. Palmer
Hon. Registrar: Miss E. Palmer
Hon. Treasurer: Mr. W. Bynner
Editor, "The Ethical Record": Miss Barbara Smoker
Address: Conway Hall Humanist Centre, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1
(Tel.: CHAncery 8032)

SUNDAY MORNING MEETINGS, 11 a.m.

- April 2—**RICHARD CLEMENTS, O.B.E.**
Humanism and Social Work
Soprano solos: Jessie Wooderson
- April 9—**Dr. ERNEST SEELEY**
Scientific Humanism
Baritone solos: Ken Dixon
- April 16—**Dr. STARK MURRAY**
New Ethical Problems in Medicine
Contralto solos: Jean Robertson
- April 23—**Lord SORENSEN**
Aden and the Yemen
Violin and piano solos: Margot MacGibbon
- April 30—**KATHLEEN NOTT**
Humanism and the Novelist
Bass solos: G. C. Dowman

CONWAY DISCUSSIONS — TUESDAYS, 6.30 p.m.

(There will be a refreshment break at 7.30

Admission: members free, non-members 2s.)

Unified theme for the month: The Social Services

- April 4—**Towards a Welfare Society: Richard Clements, O.B.E.**
April 11—**Social Service Volunteers: David Hopman**
April 18—**Poverty and the Child: Tony Lynes**
April 25—**Synthesis on the Social Services**

(This ends the Conway Discussions season, which resumes on October 3, 1967)

SOUTH PLACE SUNDAY CONCERTS, 76th SEASON, 1966/67

Concerts 6.30 p.m. Doors open 6 p.m. Admission 3s.

- April 2—**LONDON STRING TRIO:** Beethoven Serenade, D, Op. 8; Schubert B flat.
NEIL BLACK: Mozart F, K370; William Shield Oboe Quartets.
- April 9—**TUNNELL PIANO TRIO:** Haydn E flat, No. 5 (Peters); William Mathias, Op. 30; Schubert E flat, Op. 100.
- April 16—**AMICI STRING QUARTET:** Haydn B flat, Op. 76, No. 4; Dvorak A mi., Op. 16.
COLIN HORSLEY: Shostakovitch Piano Quintet.
- April 23—**LONDON STRING QUARTET and GWYNNE EDWARDS:** Dittersdorf E flat, String Quartet; Mozart C, K515; Dvorak String Quintets.
- April 30—**VIRTUOSO ENSEMBLE:** Schubert and Ferguson Octets.
(This ends the 76th season of Concerts; the 77th season will open on October 1, 1967)
-

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

Any person in sympathy with these objects is cordially invited to become a Member (minimum annual subscription 12s. 6d.). A membership application form will be found on the back cover.

The Ethical Record is posted free to members. The annual charge to subscribers is 8s. Matter for publication in the May issue should reach the Editor, Miss Barbara Smoker, 6 Stanstead Grove, S.E.6, by April 5.

THE ETHICAL RECORD

(Formerly 'The Monthly Record')

Vol. 72. No. 4

APRIL 1967

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

EDITORIAL

A FEW DAYS after the appearance of our Editorial last month on Mr. David Steel's Bill to liberalise Britain's abortion law, *The Observer* came out with a front-page warning that the Bill is in danger of being so modified during its present committee stage, particularly by the limitation of legal abortions to N.H.S. hospitals, that it could have the effect of reducing rather than increasing the number of abortions legalised, since the Health Service is unlikely to be able to cope with the thousands of "Harley Street" abortions now carried out each year for those able to pay for the existing law to be stretched in their favour, so that many of these abortions will be added to the number now performed illegally, often under bad conditions—the very thing that the reform of the law is mainly intended to eradicate. Another threatened modification to the Bill is the elimination of the hotly contested "social" clause. Whilst there are good arguments both for and against permitting abortions purely "on demand", and abortion should never become an acceptable substitute for contraceptive precautions, social factors must obviously be taken into account if the present situation of problem families is to be remedied.

Meanwhile, arguments based on reason and practicality are at the mercy of opposition motivated by religious dogma, however cleverly disguised with human appeal. Thus, the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children came into being with the subtle suggestion that the foetus may feel pain—an argument which is not only based on doubtful medical evidence (very suddenly and conveniently discovered) but which ignores the fact that any possible pain caused to the foetus would be far outweighed by the lifelong distress that often results from being born of unwilling parents, let alone from serious congenital mental or physical handicaps. The R.C. opponents of the Bill, though even more obviously motivated by religious beliefs, have likewise managed to find human arguments against legalised abortion, always emphasising the "rights" of the unborn foetus rather than those of the mother, the family, and the community, and continually using a quotation, taken out of context and misapplied, from the Declaration of Human Rights.

The Abortion Law Reform Association has been doing its best to counter these emotive arguments with facts and figures culled from countries where liberal abortion laws have been in force for a decade or more. Also, in spite of all the propaganda against reform, nationwide public-opinion polls conducted on behalf of the A.L.R.A. show that public support for legal abortion has risen in less than two years from 61 per cent to 80 per cent in cases of rape, from 58 per cent to

80 per cent where there is serious risk that the child would be born deformed, and from 36 per cent to 65 per cent on social grounds. Those questioned included, of course, Roman Catholics, of whom as many as 63 per cent supported the "rape" clause, 59 per cent the "deformed child" clause, and 44 per cent the "social" clause.

Very much the same controversy is at present raging in the U.S.A. A proposed change of the law in the State of New York, on very similar lines to our own Bill with the exception of the social clause, is being strongly supported by the American Humanist Association and strongly opposed by the R.C. hierarchy. In February, the R.C. bishops of New York's eight dioceses issued their first ever joint pastoral letter (ordered to be read out one Sunday at every mass in the State) saying that "from the moment of its conception, life must be guarded with the greatest care, while abortion and infanticide are unspeakable crimes". Among the signatories was Cardinal Spellman, who, it will be remembered, was at Christmas urging American soldiers on to greater efforts in their maiming and murder of Vietnamese people—human beings already born and quite certainly able to feel pain and wanting the right to live. "Unspeakable crimes" indeed!

STOP PRESS: We have just heard that a committee of the New York State Legislature has thrown out this humanitarian Bill—no doubt partly at least under the influence of the R.C. bishops' denunciation and its inevitable effect on the R.C. vote. Perhaps, too, supporters of the Bill were less vociferous than its heaven-inspired opponents. The similar Bill at Westminster is also in danger; don't let the other side make all the noise!

Psychologists' and Novelists' Approaches to Personality

BY

PROFESSOR T. H. PEAR

THE CHOICE of the above title was precipitated, though not entirely caused, by a half-sentence in International P.E.N.'s notice of the New York Conference in June 1966: ". . . the seeming usurpation by the social sciences and psychology of literature's immemorial rôle as the delincator of the nature of man". I took this to be nailing the flag to the mast, not trailing the coat, though the implication that psychology is not one of the social sciences seemed to invite criticism. Yet it prompted the question, is modern psychology such a pretender?

Distrusting reification, I preferred to inquire specifically of knowledgeable colleagues, here and in America, how many novels in English, written by fully trained psychologists (not psychiatrists or sociologists) had appeared in the last thirty years. Their answer did not surprise me—only one: Professor B. F. Skinner's *Walden Two*, a fictional account of a modern Utopia. Some psychologists, I suspect, may have drafted a novel but never finished it. If so, why? This experience is not unknown to historians; a fact which we may find helpful in a moment.

By specifying "fully trained", I risk being accused of dogmatism, but will record my idea of a course for an honours degree in psychology in the kind of university I know personally or through correspondence. Instruction and practice would be given in self-observation, experiment

on humans and animals, inventing, administering and evaluating tests, using statistics and selecting for research themes amenable to statistical and computer treatment, measuring attitudes, and studying, even constructing, personality-schedules. Courses in social psychology and psychopathology would be included, and the teaching would be affected by recent anthropological research. Most psychologists probably hope that the results of all this might cast some light on "the nature of man".

But "delineate" ("show by drawing or prescription, portray")? Few psychological journals today publish delineations. How many psychologists would wish to focus on delineation in the novel—"fictitious prose narrative . . . portraying characters and actions representative of real life in continuous plot" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*)? I suggest that from a discipline as comprehensive as that described above, a psychologist may emerge "trained out of" ability, even desire, to write imaginative accounts of persons, their behaviour and their inferred mental processes. He may even hesitate to spoil his scientific attitude by publishing a mixture of fact and fantasy.

Personal Note

Since psychologists are not actually forbidden to refer to themselves occasionally, though the impersonality of many scientific papers can be terrifying or amusing, I venture to offer, as a sign of good faith, a personal note or two.

At school, though none of my teachers were Gradgrinds, I was encouraged, even exhorted in the laboratories, to respect facts. For reasons obvious to a schoolboy, sulphuretted hydrogen and potassium iodide were facts; Oberon and Titania were not. The dates of Shakespeare's plays were facts welcomed by examiners, who also assumed his existence. However, at the university I grasped the difference between physical events in the outer world (the barrier between outer and inner seemed as obvious as Hadrian's Wall) and mental "facts" (images, hallucinations, beliefs and attitudes). I doubt if I took these latter seriously until I met Dr. Charles S. Myers. When his students reported (not "confessed") that they did, or didn't, remember in (or with) visual images, he took them seriously, and introduced them to Galton and Binet. But his pupils recognised the advantage of recording external facts as accurately as apparatus could make possible.

So when I describe in words, often with great difficulty, a past experience, my pen is apt to jib at writing imaginary extensions of the facts (of either sort) even if tempting additions are recognised as such—and often they aren't. Doubts may arise concerning physical events (I should make a recalcitrant witness in court). Which station did the man get in at? Chislehurst? Expresses don't usually stop there. Were his remarks really as witty as I am "reproducing" them, or have they been streamlined? Were my own replies quite as snappy as that? Do I wish to add to those thousands of conversations which, as *The New Yorker* would say, "we doubt ever got conversed"?

For many years I have been influenced by Freud's concepts of "dream-work", which may affect all our thinking, writing and speaking. In this the chief processes are symbolism, condensation, displacement, "making presentable", and "secondary revision". So when I write, the psychologist's brakes may come on automatically and unexpectedly. When they are released, doubts may retard the original speed. Would X have done, even thought, that? Would it not have been out of character (a word shunned today by many psychologists, if by nobody else)? Do I believe that such a great man could have behaved so meanly? I never knew him personally (Freud didn't know da Vinci or Woodrow Wilson, but let that pass). "Since the character in my story is partly imaginary, why worry?" thinks the novelist. "Why not drop it?" thinks the psychologist,

since truth, especially today, is stranger than fiction. But his motives for not offering a novel to a publisher might include the praiseworthy one (shared by many members of the medical profession) of secrecy, and the mundane one that an intelligent ex-patient or giver of confidential information might know a little about the processes of imaginative composition and about English law.

Shy?

The psychologist who cannot write a novel may be "shy", for today a shy psychologist is not a contradiction in terms. Some kinds of research may encourage him to avoid mental and physical contact with actual persons. Some personality-schedules seem devised to shield the tester from embarrassing personal encounters.

An American colleague thinks that a fair number of "psychological psychologists" can still be found after careful search. Some of these read, for pleasure or enlightenment, many novels, rifle through scores more in libraries, talk freely, extra-murally, to very different types of person, and are interested in healthy people aged between 20 and 60—until recently the neglected children of psychology. If reasonable tact is employed, some of these may be asked personal questions. (Often they don't wait to be asked.) Such psychologists may have the materials for a shelf of novels.

But the psychologist's mental make-up may play a part. Relevant to the subject of this address is Liam Hudson's *Contrary Imaginations*, with its richly illustrated distinctions between convergent and divergent thinkers. He concludes that the converger concentrates on impersonal aspects of his culture and expresses his feelings cautiously. The diverger is weak in close, impersonal or technical argument, perhaps because he cannot dissociate his intellectual from his personal life. Relatively unprotected by social conventions, his emotional life may become chaotic. (Could one find a more telling example than Scott Fitzgerald?) The novelist's urge to write may stem from a failure to accept everyday life for what it is. As Hudson puts it,

Of the novelist, the very worst one can say is that he is an emotional prostitute, retailing the events of his own private life to please his public, or for money. The psychologist does something considerably more odd, he tries to make sense of human behaviour by reifying it. People are described as though they were mechanisms; their experiences are reduced to numbers. He may even make a virtue of discussing human beings as though they were rats. The physical scientist denies his emotions, the novelist exploits them, the psychologist dismantles them.

The attitude of some novelists towards psychiatrists, and novels about and by psychiatrists were also discussed.

RELEVANT READING

- BANNISTER, D.: "Psychology as an Exercise in Paradox" (*Bulletin of Brit. Psychol. Soc.*, 19, No. 63, 1966, pp. 21-26)
- DAICHES, D.: *The Novel and the Modern World* (Chicago: University Press, 1939)
- HUDSON, LIAM: *Contrary Imaginations* (Methuen, 1966)
- PEAR, T. H.: "Extroverted and Introverted Approaches to Psychology" (*Bulletin of Brit. Psychol. Soc.*, July 1965; and *Monthly Record* of South Place Ethical Society, September 1964)
- REEVES, JOAN WYNN: *Thinking about Thinking* (Secker and Warburg, 1965)
- ROM, P.: "Psychiatry in Modern Novels" (*International Jour. of Social Psychiatry*, 11, 1, 1965)
- SKINNER, B. F.: *Walden Two* (New York, 1948; Macmillan Paperbacks, 1962)
- TURNBULL, A.: *Scott Fitzgerald, A Biography* (Bodley Head: 1962)
- WARDLE, IRVING: "The Fiction of Fact" (*Observer*, 1 January 1967)

(Summary of a lecture given on January 8)

The Origins of Racialism

BY

DR. JOHN LEWIS

THE RACE QUESTION is an urgent one. It takes several different forms, all of them indicating dangerous possibilities. First, there is our own responsibility for the African majority in Rhodesia; the allied problem of apartheid in South Africa; and the most ruthless form of colonialism in Portuguese East Africa and Angola. In the United States, in spite of the extension of some of the rights they claim to the negro population, educational segregation of black and white has by no means disappeared and voting rights have not been made good. What is surprising is the sudden shift of the main centres of negro unrest from the South to Harlem, Chicago and California. Here the problem is one of shocking housing conditions, appalling slums, low wages, unemployment and depressing conditions in the negro quarters of the North and West. Nor must we forget the sad lot of the original aborigines of North America, the Indians. They have been herded into reservations and have almost reached extermination.

In the West Indies and in South America there is also an unhappy story to tell of poverty, malnutrition, disease, and exploitation. The immigration of so many West Indians into this country is a reflection of the bad conditions there. Yet their coming has raised the issue of racial discrimination here, as we all know.

These are problems which can no longer be ignored or left to gradual change to overcome. The coloured races of the whole world from China to Peru are on the march and nothing will hold them back.

One Species

What we have to ask is firstly whether there is any rational or scientific ground for the widespread belief that the white races are inherently superior to the coloured. There is no scientific evidence for this. There are not different species of man, but only one species with varieties, the basis of which extends no farther than very superficial difference of skin colour, hair form, eye colour and the like. These are as unessential as the differences of plumage or fur colour in birds and mammals. There is no correlation with intelligence, moral capacity and the basic characteristics of the normal man. Once conditions have been changed, we find that any human racial type can reach the normal level of the civilised white man. Children brought up in a Western country, even though their parents were coloured, assimilate perfectly to white children.

Shortly after the termination of the Second World War a world conference of anthropologists and geneticists was held under the auspices of UNESCO. Their conclusions were unanimous:

Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development.

Vast social changes have occurred that have not been in any way connected with changes in racial type. Historical and sociological studies thus support the view that genetic differences are of little significance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of men.

The great differences in level of culture are attributed to historical and geographical factors, such as the cutting off of the whole of Southern Africa by the Sahara from the centre of Western civilisation in the Mediterranean. Civilisation developed here because of the fertility of the great river basins of Mesopotamia and Egypt. There are no similar areas in the rest of Africa.

British Barbarism

We sometimes forget that the British Isles were also beyond the range of Western civilisation until a relatively short time ago. Julius Caesar found here conditions of primitive barbarism. Cicero said "Do not obtain your slaves from the Britons, for the Britons are so stupid and so dull that they are not fit to be slaves".

When it was the Arabs rather than the Europeans who were the carriers of culture and civilisation they too had a poor opinion of us. They said of the barbarians of France, Germany and Britain: "Their temper is slow and the humour raw; their hair is long and their complexion pale. The sharpness of their wit, the perspicacity of their intelligence is nil; ignorance and indolence are dominant among them as well as crudeness and lack of judgment." Yet today it is the Arab communities which so often are largely ignorant and poverty-stricken.

Unfortunately it is not scientific facts or cool disinterested examination of the problem that will suffice to overcome racial discrimination. Racial discrimination is always associated with political domination and economic exploitation. There is little evidence that where a white minority profit by the permanent subjection and exploitation as cheap labour of a coloured race they will ever listen to rational argument. What reasons they do advance are no more than rationalisations and therefore cannot be demolished by objective considerations.

It appears to be the case, unfortunately, that it is only when the coloured races take their destinies into their own hands and refuse to be governed and exploited by the white races that they escape servitude. Nevertheless, much can be done to undermine the self-confidence and arrogant assurance of the privileged by the strong and reasoned criticism of the enlightened minority.

Emancipation must be the prize of their own efforts, but we have an important and indeed indispensable rôle to play as their allies in the camp of the enemy. Here we can expose their fallacies and the fact that they are swayed not by reason but by self-interest and prejudice. We can make it more and more difficult for them to secure political and moral support for their privileges from our country. We can mobilise a strong and influential body of public opinion against them. If we do this, and to the extent that we are successful, we shall be making friends of many millions who in the years to come will stand equal with the white races in the universal brotherhood of mankind.

(Summary of a lecture given on January 15)

Happenings

MR. WILSON, forgetting how Charles I finished up, put all the Labour M.P. rebels in the dog-house, threatening that *he* would not renew their licences if they bit again. Father Joseph Christie, who interrupted an address by Archbishop Roberts and accused him of heresy, later had to withdraw the charge. Father Herbert McCabe, until recently editor of the R.C. intellectual journal *New Blackfriars*, published by the Dominican Order, got the sack for being too critical of the Church. A simpler cleric (of the Protestant variety), the Rev. Mr. Robin Howard, preached, according to *The Daily Mirror*, on that "modern morality play", *Batman*: "Whenever I see Batman and Robin tied up and waiting to die," he said, "I always think of Jesus on the cross." More Vietnamese villagers were killed in more accidental raids by American planes, not to mention the deliberate ones. Two American Democratic senators argued as to whether it cost an average of \$350,000 or only \$300,000 to kill one N.L.F. soldier. There was a papal pronouncement that captains who go down with their ships are guilty of the sin of suicide.

Reason in Ethics and Science

BY

A. PHILLIPS GRIFFITHS

To DENY that there is any transcendent basis, natural or supernatural, for practical values seems to leave us with only one possibility: a reliance on our own personal decision and choice. Unlike science, it is thought, ethics provides no interpersonal procedure for reaching agreement.

The contrast so often drawn between scientific and ethical thinking is, however, misleading. It is usually represented in the following way: in science, we have an objective, interpersonal procedure for correcting our hypotheses—that of experiment and observation. This is not available in ethics: we cannot say that ethical policies can be judged by results, because the results themselves will be evaluated differently by people with different ethical attitudes. While this is true, it is not the whole truth. We can put arguments to show that certain sorts of factors are always relevant to the rational assessment of practical policies.

Scientific Values

There are certain practical value which anyone seriously concerned to pursue a science must adopt. Insofar as he does not accept them, then we must say that he is not pursuing science, or is at best very confused about what he is doing.

- (a) His acceptance or rejection of any criticism of his theories must depend not on the source from which they come but on the kind of rational backing they have. He must accept or reject arguments according to the force of the argument and not the status of the arguer. Furthermore, he cannot afford to ignore any criticisms simply because of the source from which they come. If he does, he is no longer concerned to find out what is true, but to protect his own views from adverse criticism. There is thus a kind of impartiality built into science (though individual scientists may sometimes fail to live up to it). In science one must be practically committed, if seriously concerned to pursue the subject, to forming one's views according to the weight of the arguments, not the weight of the arguers.
- (b) Science is necessarily co-operative. Anyone seriously trying to discover what can be rationally accepted by men cannot work alone: he must have the participation of others in the process in order that he can put his hypotheses to public test. He cannot expect this unless his work is connected with the scientific interests of others, or at least unless others can expect that their interests will be forwarded by the process. So far as he wants to pursue seriously, therefore, he must do so with regard to the scientific interests of other scientists.
- (c) Science requires freedom of opinion, at least with regard to scientific matters. A scientist requires the co-operation of others who want to find out why hypotheses are scientifically acceptable, and he cannot expect this co-operation in a common enterprise if he at the same time is trying to impose his views on others. Unless others are allowed to form their views by the use of rational procedures, their objections, conjectures and observations will be of no use to one in determining acceptability of one's theories. (Thus, a dictator like Stalin could ensure that his views on linguistics or genetics commanded general acceptance by threatening the Soviet Academy of Sciences. But this was not a scientific process.)

I suggest then that there are certain *practical* commitments which anyone must make if he is to claim to be pursuing science seriously. These are com-

commitments to impartiality, consideration for the interests of others, and tolerance. Of course a man need accept these commitments only within the practice of science; not necessarily outside this sphere—e.g. insofar as he is a citizen, a footballer, or a grocer.

Ethical Values

But these practical commitments which anyone must accept who is to claim that he is seriously concerned to find out what can be commonly accepted as scientifically true apply also to anyone who is to claim that he is seriously concerned to find out what can be commonly accepted as *ethically* true. And here I perceive the possibility of a breakthrough in ethical theory. For, while practical commitments (statements that impartiality, or the interests of freedom of others, need to be respected) form no part of scientific theories, they *are* ethical statements, and hence can form parts of ethical theories.

- (a) *Impartiality*. So far as anyone is seriously attempting to find out what is ethically sound, he must accept or reject arguments according to the force of the argument rather than the status of the arguer. If what matters is the force of the reasons given, not their source or the time or place in which they are stated, then what counts as good reasons in any one case must count as good reasons in any other case, unless there is some significant difference in the cases. This means that the ethical reasoner must, if he is serious, be committed to impartiality with regard to others. If there are reasons which the arguer accepts for saying that white children ought not to be denied certain educational opportunities, then these will also be reasons for saying that black children should not be denied these opportunities, unless the arguer can point to some significant difference between black and white children. There is obviously *a* difference, colour: the whole question is however, the significance of this difference. What he has to show is that the difference in colour either in itself or by being connected with some other factor such as stupidity is a reason which should be accepted by everyone that educational opportunities should be denied to coloured children. Unless he can show this, he must accept the consequence that his reason for demanding educational opportunity for white children is equally a reason for demanding the same for black ones, or give up pretending to be engaged in a rational argument.
- (b) *Consideration of interests*. The pursuit of ethics, like science, is necessarily co-operative. Anyone trying to discover what can be rationally accepted among men cannot work alone: he must have the participation of others in the process, in order that he can put his hypotheses to public test. He needs then the participation of other rational thinkers, and he cannot arbitrarily exclude the objections of other rational thinkers if he wants to find out what can be publicly accepted as correct.

I must now make two assumptions, which I could argue for if I had more space. These are: (i) It is always rational to be concerned for one's own interests; (ii) Men have an interest in avoiding pain and suffering and in being happy rather than unhappy.

To refuse to consider the interests of others is to act in such a way that no other rational men (unless they are confused) can agree with the courses of action one decides on. If, then, rational men are to be willing to co-operate with one another in deciding on courses of action, they must presuppose that their interests will be taken into account. This requires committing oneself, if seriously pursuing ethics, to the view that the interests of others must be respected.

- (c) *Tolerance*. The point of asking ethical questions is to guide one's actions as rationally as possible. If one requires others to participate

in deciding the most rational way of guiding action, then one must accept that they are concerned to guide their own actions rationally, and not to have them determined in some other way, e.g. by force. Hence, insofar as one is concerned to pursue ethics seriously, one must regard it as an objection to any course of action, or any ethical theory, that it allows people's actions to be determined by force. That is to say, we should respect the liberty of others.

Ethics as an Institution

Science, which I have compared with ethics, is an institution. That is to say, it actually goes on: people do accept these commitments and work more or less in accordance with them, and science progresses. But does ethics exist as an institution, and, if it does not, isn't all I have said a sort of wishful thinking, just pie in the sky?

What I have written may seem to hark back to the eighteenth-century rationalist, with his bland optimism that all human problems can be solved by the orderly exercise of human reason. That is not quite my position: I have no faith that human problems will be solved by reason, but I am sure that they will not be solved by anything else.

There is no doubt whatever that science is a social phenomenon; and that all sorts of socio-economic conditions are necessary for its existence. This must surely be true in the case of any human institution. It is necessary to recognise what rationality is to explain why, in social terms, it is not effective, and to find out how to make it so. One theory which takes full account of this is Marxism. Marx was hardly a bland eighteenth-century optimist; on the other hand, he was a thorough-going rationalist, who wanted to understand and recommend social change on a scientific basis. His theory can be regarded as an attempt to understand the sources of human illusion, and to predict those conditions in which the rational human spirit would be liberated. One could represent one of Marx's central questions as: How is human rationality, as a social reality, possible? And his answer, that in conditions of class conflict it never is.

My qualified optimism is in the belief that the question Marx asked was a good one, even if his answer is not acceptable. It is a question we might one day answer. However, in the meantime I fear the attempt to pursue and live by rational ethical values must be, as it were, loyalty to a kingdom from which we are all exiled.

(Summary of a lecture given on February 5)

Conway Discussions

Education

(Report of February Meetings)

Indoctrination or Moral Education: John White

John White stated that humanist teachers took their stand on the need for moral education in schools without the compulsory bias of religious education. Britain was the only country in the west that had compulsory religious education in all schools and insisted upon a compulsory assembly of the school for religious worship. It was also quite irrational, now that children are taught by doing, to retain one compulsory subject based solely on belief, the truth of which could not be tested by the child or demonstrated by the teacher. The meeting agreed that compulsory R.I. was a throw-back to a past age dominated by the Church and that all support should be given to the Humanist Teachers Association in their attempts to substitute moral education for it.

Social Education: Richard Hauser

Richard Hauser said that Social Education was a system of knowing how to get on with other people. It was not concerned with people's I.Q. or with their technical knowledge or know-how; it was concerned with teaching people how to get on with each other, to live more positive lives, to be creative, to find new things to do and to do them. It was a method of stimulating people to think about themselves and their relationships and obligations to those about them and then to do something about it and create a community group that could help people to stand up against and overcome the strains and stresses of modern life. Question and discussion time was all too short, but Richard Hauser agreed to train members of the Society who had the initiative and perseverance to undertake the arduous work involved. He stressed that such people must be workers, not just talkers.

Plowden Report and Primary Education: Mrs. Winifred Bindley

Mrs. Bindley gave a full and interesting account of the growth of education in this country. In 1530 there were in England 2,000 Chantry Chapels or schools, with priests as teachers, all of which were closed during the Reformation and did not reappear for 150 years. The advent of the Industrial Revolution again closed all the then Charity Schools and drove the children into industry. The present Plowden Report desired the all-round development of the child and wanted the readaptation of primary schools and redesign of new schools to meet this. In its full implementation it would be costly, but there was much that could be done without cost, especially the emphasis upon teaching by doing. Primary education was today an interesting game for children, but in the process they learned through practical experience. Everyone agreed that this was a most interesting and absorbing subject and hoped to hear more about it if Mrs. Bindley could pay us a further visit.

Synthesis on Education

The discussion ranged over the whole field of education, Christian and secular, private and state, comprehensive and primary. No one denied the need for social education as defined by Richard Hauser, but it was felt that the acceptance of its need was an indictment against our present educational methods. It was felt that too much emphasis was placed on acquiring knowledge to earn one's living, and far too little on learning how to live with life. Whilst the mentally robust and balanced individual could cope with the growing stress and strain of modern life, many others were unable to do so and became mental casualties. The right type of education could be a preventive medicine, reducing the number of people who need curative mental treatment in our modern society.

H. G. K.

Who Said That? And When

1. "The French would have no right, after the war, simply to walk back into Indo-China and reclaim that rich land for no reason other than that it had once been their colony."
2. "If the financial programme for re-armament runs beyond the physical resources which can be made available, then re-armament itself becomes the first casualty, the basis of our economy is disrupted and the standard of living, including the social services of our people, is endangered. That I believe to be the position today. Recent statements in the House by the Minister of Supply and myself make it clear that we are not getting enough raw materials to maintain our economy, our essential export trade and the size of the re-armament programme that we have announced."

(Answers on page 19)

Book Reviews

The Gods They Want

The God I Want, edited by James Mitchell (Constable, 1967; 192 pp.; 21s.)

ANYONE who undertakes to write under the title *The God I Want* will certainly be expected to reveal some of his inmost longings, though it might be more difficult to guess what *kinds* of longing, for the word "God" has a vague meaning. The editor has assembled contributions from seven men and two women, all people of recognised achievement. Their essays range from the dignified and impressive to some which will sound to most humanists quite fantastic. Indeed, the editor himself appears a little embarrassed by the variety of the confessions he has let loose. Some of the writers are looking for a god to worship, some for a personal creator, and some for a power which will ensure their security. These terms are also vague, but a choice of one of them would have limited the range of ideas in the book, to its advantage. Some, but not all, of the writers state what degree of objectivity they are seeking and how far they have found or expect to find satisfaction for their wants.

Readers with a taste for the dramatic will enjoy Anthony Burgess's imaginary dialogue between Anthony and Burgess; those who prefer straightforward exposition will feel great respect for the Rev. Stephen Hopkinson's essay; those who like spiritual autobiography will appreciate the contributions of A. S. Byatt and Bernadine Bishop, both women novelists. Perhaps the most effective chapters are the first, by Charles Rycroft, a practising psychoanalyst, and the last by H. A. Williams, Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Dr. Rycroft says that one of his deepest wants is a number of patients who will not expect *him* to be their god who will solve all their difficulties for them. He thinks that deification of ideas is dangerous because it so often leads to "the messianic wish to provide God with worshippers additional to oneself"; but he decides that he has a strong desire for "Continuity" and that this is comparatively harmless. Those of us who deplore the all-too-frequent fragmentation of our own lives will sympathise with this ideal, though it seems a bit formal and lacking in positive content.

Mr. Williams's position is nearer to kinds of Christianity usually regarded as orthodox. He believes he "has discovered a God who is not an illusion . . . He is immanent, yet in His immanence transcendent." He thinks that just as some artists have brought beauty out of squalor, so some religious men have brought great goodness out of great evil, and that this fact should have some bearing on our own thoughts about God. His arguments are subtle and already highly compressed: no summary could do them any justice. The editor supports his attempts to deal with the problem of evil by reminding readers that many men feel the need not only of a god to worship but also of a devil to fight.

Humanists do not want to be shallow, and it is difficult sometimes to distinguish between real insight and mere obscurantism; but many of us will feel that in facing some of the problems of life too much elaboration of thought is out of place: the course of wisdom may be to accept joys and sorrows more simply and to meet the unavoidable challenges which come to us also with more simplicity, instead of wanting to refer back every experience to an all-inclusive theory of living such as is suggested by the creation of a god or the search for a god; should we not often be looking for a happy mean between disconnected thinking and anxious rational systematisation?

F. C. ADE

Lord Birkett

Norman Birkett: The Life of Lord Birkett of Ulverston, by H. Montgomery Hyde (Hamish Hamilton, 1964; 638 pp.; 42s.)

ALMOST EVERY chapter of this book glows with human interest. In its pages the life and work of Birkett—a liberal-minded lawyer, a superb advocate and a wise judge—have been admirably depicted. Its publication (and the fact that it is among the best sellers at this time) when Parliament, press and public opinion are actively concerned with law reform, a new approach to crime and the treatment of criminals, and the safe-guarding of human rights, lends additional interest to this brilliant biography. To humanists, the appeal of the book lies in its being woven of the very stuff of life.

It was with peculiar feelings that I began to read this life of a man I had watched and admired for half a century. For it was, I think, in 1911 that I first set eyes on Norman Birkett. It is not easy to convey the impression the man made upon nearly all who came into touch with him. He impressed me as being an unusual human being. He had left Cambridge with a great reputation as a speaker and debater. Moreover, he had made his way without the influence of family, wealth or patronage; and had achieved his early ambition to be a President of the Union.

His physical appearance was arresting. The picture I formed of him lingers in my mind. Slimly built, long-legged, and with a springy energetic walk, he seemed to come from some world of his own. He was always friendly and seemed rather shy. Then one noticed his fine head with its crop of red hair, the nervous movement of his hands, his northern accent, and the resonance of his voice. He came into life with some of nature's rare gifts. No wonder people took to him, as the saying goes.

Amongst his friends in Bournville was Tom Bryan, the founder-warden of Fircroft College, who, as Mr. Hyde records, "thought Birkett's decision to go to the Bar was a right one. 'You are cut out for great things,' Bryan told him".

Love of Literature

Some other traits of mind and character which gave early indications of his latent talents were also present. From youth to old age he was an ardent lover of the English language and literature. Some of the classics of which he was a devoted reader indicate his catholic taste: for example, King James's *Bible*, Trench's book, *On the Study of Words*, Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, and George Gissing's *Private Papers of Henry Rycraft*. Mr. Hyde says that the last-mentioned work, "with its expressive description of the English countryside, was a particular favourite".

Then, too, few have written or spoken more aptly of Dickens than Birkett. I remember his informal discussion on the radio with Miss Margaret Lane, the novelist and critic. "I've often thought what a wonderful lawyer Dickens would have made," Birkett said. "He had a marvellous use of the English tongue, and moreover, what people don't give him credit for, he had a marvellous knowledge of the law. Lawyers to this day speak with admiration of the trial scene in *Pickwick*, of the *Bardell v. Pickwick* breach-of-promise case. Every detail of the famous case is accurate I think as a speaker, a man with a love of language, a man with a knowledge of law, a man above all with sympathy, and insight and understanding, he would have carried every jury completely away". Readers who are Dickensians will find numerous references to their beloved author in Mr. Hyde's biography.

Another characteristic of the great lawyer was his warm and lifelong attachment to the English countryside. In the brief notes he wrote about his early life, after recalling that he was born on September 6, 1883, at Ulverston, in the county of Lancashire, he added: "The little town of

Ulverston-in-Furness is naturally very dear to me. I spent the first twenty-four years of my life there and the streets and buildings are known to me in the most intimate way". His sense of loneliness and depression, even in days when his fame as an advocate was unchallenged, may have been due to an unconscious longing for the peace and beauty of the hills, lakes and fells where he really felt at home. He chose his peerage title with such thoughts and emotions in mind. His main work as a member of the House of Lords was his advocacy of the preservation of the as yet unspoiled English countryside, and he succeeded in saving Ullswater from the hands of the spoilers.

Finally, it will interest our readers to know that Birkett moved slowly away from the Wesleyan Methodism of his youth and early manhood, when he was an earnest student of theology, to a position much nearer to ethical humanism. In the B.B.C. series *Face to Face*, Birkett was interviewed by John Freeman, in February, 1959. I quote from the text reprinted by Mr. Hyde:

Mr. Freeman now posed a more potent question. "Would you in fact describe yourself as a Christian, or not?"

Birkett paused for a moment or two before replying "I would call myself a Christian," he said, "but, of course, as it was once said, you've got to define your terms. If you mean, do I believe in what are called *Christian* qualities, I most certainly do."

"But not perhaps in the Thirty-Nine Articles?"

"I sometimes would like to say that I called myself a *Christian agnostic*," said Birkett to this question, "but I don't know whether the term is permissible."

"Well it is to me," commented Mr. Freeman, "but I'm not sure whether it would be to many Christians."

A book to read and treasure.

RICHARD CLEMENTS

Pop Humanism

Progressive World (journal published monthly by the United Secularists of America, P.O. Box 5146, Los Angeles, California 90055, U.S.A., at \$5 a year post free).

THOSE who complain that humanist publications are too exclusively intellectual will find that the American monthly journal *Progressive World* has a wide popular appeal, with a satirical flavour and easy-to-read typography.

The February 1967 issue, a special 20th anniversary number, contains three reprinted articles, chosen from issues of 1952 and 1954, to commemorate twenty years of continuous publication. These are "In Praise of Simeon Stylites" by George Seibel who writes in a bright amusing style; "The Saints Go Down to Hell" by our own Joseph McCabe, written shortly before his death and dealing with the fiasco of the French "worker-priests" and other R.C. rearguard actions; and "Converting Sex into Religiosity" by Theodore Schroeder—an interesting psychological study of the relationship of religion and sex. New material, mostly topical and light-hearted, makes up the rest of this 48-page issue, which is marred only by the rather plentiful careless misprints.

BARBARA SMOKER

There are words whose meaning I have never clearly understood, such as the word "sin". I know enough, however, to see that these men have never sinned against life, for if there is a sin against life, it is not perhaps so much to despair of life as to hope for another life and to lose sight of the implacable grandeur of this one.—ALBERT CAMUS: *Summer in Algiers*.

To the Editor

Religion in School

With reference to Mr. J. W. Leslie's letter on the I.T.V. "Dialogue with Doubt" series, we seriously doubt whether collective worship and R.I. in schools have any successful brainwashing effect. Our son seemed to spend most of his time in R.I. lessons at his grammar school in disputing with the teacher the orthodox view of the Bible and Christian practice. What the rest of the class did meantime history does not relate, but the consequent brainwashing must surely have been minimal, and the boy now continues his humanist disputations at university. Our daughter, who attended a Rudolf Steiner school, seems to regard her education as a sort of mental inoculation against belief in any religion. Their mother, the daughter of a freethinking Deist, likewise took part in school worship and what was then called "scripture lesson," and she became an agnostic. Their father, the son of an orthodox Nonconformist, regularly attended church on Sunday as well as participating in school religious activity, and he has become an atheist.

DORIS and DOUGLAS BROUGHTON

Watford, Herts.

People are different: some like a good fight, others just want to conform. For myself I can accept a challenge, but may I ask my child to be different and fight it out? Most children want to "belong." The main thing is not school indoctrination but the way you make your child see reason at home. His school-mates may tell him scriptural stories and invite him to go with them and attend divine service. It happened to my son when he was at school; thanks to his upbringing, he was mature enough to laugh it off as silly. I gave him free rein and asked whether he now wanted to attend R.I. But I know of sad cases where staunch atheistic parents forced their child into their own mould, with the effect that, as a healthy reaction, it developed in opposition and became a Roman Catholic.

O. T. WOLFGANG

London, W.11

Off the Record

Official Secrets

Although designated our obedient servants, Government officials are expected to spy on their supposed masters and to go in for such practices as telephone tapping, letter opening, and cable vetting. When *The Daily Express* disobeyed a D-for-Defence notice by publishing a news story of a G.P.O. employee taking commercial cables to the official snooper, our totalitarian Prime Minister complained — not about the snooping and the waste of money this entails but of the newspaper for letting the public know what goes on.

At one time, when I was active in the Committee of 100, I was well aware that my telephone was being tapped, and on one occasion I asked the G.P.O. to send my next telephone bill to M.I.5 rather than to me. But I simply did not say anything over the phone that I did not want the authorities to know, though I once had a little fun getting the police out for a non-existent demonstration. No one who has any secrets will trust the G.P.O. with them, so the money spent on snoopers reading cables and letters and listening to recorded telephone conversations can hardly buy much worth having, even from the official point of view. Unfortunately, it's your money and mine.

B.S.

South Place News

New Members

We are pleased to welcome the following new members in the Society: A. D. Cooke (Pontardawe, Glam.), F. S. Docherty (S.W.19), D. C. Flint (W.C.1), Mrs. D. H. Gunn (W.6), Miss D. M. Hollingsworth (Potters Bar), A. R. Hopkins (Enfield), Miss May Keyte (Hornchurch), W. G. Longley (Orpington), Miss A. Muller (N.W.5), H. Thomas (Brentford), Frank White (Peterborough). *New Life Members:* Dr. and Mrs. Jennings White.

Obituary

Members will be shocked to hear of the sudden and unexpected death of Miss **Winifred Lily George** on March 8—the more so as she had attended the Sunday morning meeting on March 5, when she appeared to be her usual lively self. But she was taken ill during the Tuesday night and died early next morning.

Miss George, who was 65, joined the Society in 1939 and later became a Life Member. She was principally attracted by the high quality of the Sunday morning lectures and was interested in all the Society's social activities. A member of the Holiday Fellowship and a keen walker, she was soon in demand to lead rambles, and after their temporary suspension during the war the country walks were successfully resumed in 1946 under her keen and energetic secretaryship of the Rambles Committee. The delightful snapshot album of the South Place Ramblers, now in our library, was her loving compilation, and its pleasing record of happy comradeship on country walks and visits to places of interest is a fitting testimony to her. She was first elected to the General Committee in 1945, and served for several three-year periods.

Her early background was nonconformist, and she became a rationalist and freethinker as a result of extensive reading, particularly the scientific publications of the Rationalist Press Association. Having missed full-time education from the age of 14, she more than made up for this by attending evening classes, particularly those of the City Literary Institute. Her "conversion" to a scientific outlook she attributed to the writings of H. G. Wells and Julian Huxley, and when the H. G. Wells Society was inaugurated in 1963 she eagerly joined it and latterly undertook the job of membership secretary and worked for the success of the recent Wells centenary celebrations. She was an ardent propagandist, and, having once discarded theological beliefs, she never looked back but did her utmost to spread rationalist ideas. She broadened her horizon by regular holiday trips abroad—to most continental countries, to Scandinavia, Russia, and the United States—and a small legacy enabled her to spend a year in Australia and New Zealand, where she was a valuable ambassador for the humanist movement in her contacts with members and friends down under. On returning to England, she entered the Office of the Public Trustee as a shorthand-typist, and remained there to the day of her death. She always led a full and active life and endeavoured to keep abreast of present-day affairs. Among the societies of which she was a member were the Rationalist Press Association, the British Humanist Association, the Shaw Society, the H. G. Wells Society, the London Natural History Society, and the National Film Society, and she was also a Labour Party member.

We had come to regard Winifred George as one of the stalwarts of S.P.E.S. She had qualities of the greatest value in a voluntary Society, being never content to remain an onlooker but always anxious to give practical help. Her lively personality and ready smile will be sadly missed at our gatherings.

A humanist service was conducted by the Society's Secretary, Mr. H. G. Knight, at the City of London Crematorium on March 15.

We have also to announce the sudden death of Dr. E. C. Millington, of Bournemouth, at the age of 63. He was married in the Conway Hall library in 1949 by Mr. Fairhall, and had always remained a member of the Society. A senior inspector of schools, he had recently been thinking of retiring. He had a humanist funeral on March 14 at Bournemouth, conducted by Mr. H. G. Knight.

Miss E. M. Wood, of Bedford, who had been a member for some years, died recently, and so did Mrs. Norman, whom many members will have known on the Ethical Union Council and as an active worker for racial unity.

Annual General Meeting

Our A.G.M. will be held in the library at Conway Hall on Wednesday, May 31 (*not* May 24, as erroneously announced in our last issue), at 7 p.m. Any member wishing to have a motion placed on the agenda should submit the motion via the Secretary, so as to reach him by April 4.

There are seven vacancies to be filled on the General Committee, and nominations for these should reach the Secretary by Sunday, April 30, in accordance with the Rules of the Society. Candidates, who must have been members of the Society for a minimum period of twelve months, must be nominated by two members of the Society and must have agreed to serve on the Committee if elected. Nomination forms may be obtained from the Secretary at Conway Hall. The nominees are also requested to provide biographical notes of not more than 50 words.

Clements Memorial Prize

An award of £100 is offered in the Clements Memorial Prize Competition for 1967 for a chamber music work, and if possible the winning work will be played at the South Place Sunday Concerts. This year's adjudicators are Mosco Carner, Colin Mason, and Humphrey Searle, and the closing date is October 1. For full particulars send a stamped addressed envelope to the Secretary, Clements Prize, 20 Earls Court Gardens, S.W.5.

Kew in Springtime

Sunday, April 9—Meet at 2.30 p.m. outside the main gates of Kew Gardens. After walking in Gardens, to proceed by river to Richmond, with tea at Pembroke Lodge in Richmond Park. Leader: Mr. R. Higgins.

Socials

Saturday, April 15—Country Dancing in the library, 3 p.m. - 6 p.m., jointly with the Progressive League, for all over age 14. (No upper age limit, and beginners welcome.) Plimsolls or light pumps to be worn, please. Instructress: Eda Collins. Admission charge 2s. members, 3s. non-members. Tea obtainable.

Sunday, April 16—Sunday Social in the library, 3 p.m. Tea will be served at 3.45, after which Mrs. Rose Warwick will give a talk on "The Unveiling of Tunisia". Members and friends welcome.

Thursday, April 20—Whist Drive in the library at 7 p.m.; light refreshments will be served. Members and friends welcome.

Library Watchdog

Mrs. Altmann-Gold, who, as our librarian, generally attends all Sunday morning and Tuesday evening meetings, after which she checks out books to borrowers and keeps a watchful eye on any strangers handling the books, would like to be relieved of this duty occasionally and asks for a volunteer as a "deputy library watchdog", who would be co-opted on to the Library Committee. She would be pleased to hear from any member who attends our meetings regularly and who would be willing to undertake this responsibility.

Humanism in Colour

Photographers have been busy at Stanton Coit House and Conway Hall in preparation for a feature on humanism in a forthcoming *Observer* colour supplement.

Kindred Organisations

With the change in structure of the British Humanist Association, it was decided to enter the field of law reform and other broadly political activity, and the work formerly done by the independent **Humanist Lobby** has been taken over by the B.H.A. Those on the Humanist Lobby mailing-list receive circulars giving information on current Westminster affairs of concern to humanists and are asked to write to their M.P. and others and sometimes to take constitutional action.

A **Scottish Humanist Conference** is being held during the weekend April 29-30 at the David Hume Tower, Edinburgh University, on the theme "Towards a Humanist Society". Speakers will include Professor G. M. Carstairs. (Further details from W. T. Farrer, 59 Fox Covert Avenue, Edinburgh 12.) Another **Weekend Course** will be held at Urchfont Manor, near Devizes, from May 19-21, on "The Open Society", with Professor Bernard Crick, H. J. Blackham, and Peter Draper.

There may just be time to book for the 61st Annual Dinner of the **National Secular Society** to be held at the Hanover Grand, W.1, on Saturday, April 8, at 6 p.m. for 6.30, when the after-dinner speakers will be Baroness Wootton, Lord Willis, and Margaret Knight. Tickets at 1 gn. from 103 Borough High Street, S.E.1. A final reminder, too, that entries for the N.S.S. prize essay competition on "How to Promote the International Freethought and Humanist Movement" must reach the same address by May 1.

The amazingly energetic N.S.S. has also recently formed a **Humanist Film Society**, the first presentation of which is to be at the Asquith Room, 2 Soho Square, W.1, on Sunday, April 16, at 7 p.m., when the film will be *Jan Hus*, which was made in Czechoslovakia and received the Edinburgh Diploma of Merit in 1954. Those who want to know a little beforehand about Jan Hus (or John Huss) should re-read the article on him by Richard Clements in *The Ethical Record* of November 1966.

The **Sutton Humanist Group** is holding a bring-and-buy sale in aid of Swaneng Hill School on Saturday, April 22, for which goods and help will be welcome. Contact Miss E. Haslam, 67 Jasmin Road, West Ewell, Surrey.

The seventh annual "Under Thirty-Fives" weekend conference arranged by the **National Peace Council** is to take place from April 14 to 16 inclusive at Spode House, Hawkesyard Priory, Rugeley, Staffs. (the Dominican centre recently in the news because of the sacking of their editor for daring to criticise Rome), the theme of the conference being "A New Role for 'Voluntary Service'?" Details from the N.P.C., 29 Great James Street, W.1.

The **Progressive League** is holding a weekend conference from April 21 to 23 at Plaw Hatch, East Grinstead, on "Is the Labour Party Progressive?", with Hugh Jenkins, M.P., and Reg Freeson, M.P., among the speakers. Bookings to Tom Graham, 33 Dickens Close, St. Albans, Herts. Among the many other activities of the P.L., the monthly meetings of their Man-Woman Relationship Group continue on Sunday, April 23, with a talk by Dr. Margaret Cormack on "Adolescent Fantasy" at 109 Lancaster Gate, W.2, at 7.30 p.m.

Answers to quiz ("Who Said That? And When?") on page 12: - 1. Franklin D. Roosevelt (as reported by his son, Elliott Roosevelt, in *As He Saw It*); 2. Harold Wilson (on his resignation from the Board of Trade, April 1951).

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 the Naming Ceremony of Welcome to Children, the Solemnisation of Marriage, and 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.

Minimum subscriptions are: Members, 12s. 6d. p.a.; Life Members, £13 2s. 6d. It helps 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, W.C.1

Being in sympathy with the aims of South Place Ethical Society, I desire to become a Member 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
.....

OCCUPATION (disclosure optional)

HOW DID YOU HEAR OF THE SOCIETY?

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