

# Freethinker

Registered at the GPO as a Newspaper

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

VOLUME 89, No. 8

Saturdays, February 22, 1969

Sixpence Weekly

## MORAL EDUCATION

THE FIRST PUBLIC MEETING of the newly-formed Campaign for Moral Education took place at Caxton Hall on February 12. The campaign is sponsored by a council, which is made up of Christians as well as Humanists, and which amongst others includes Sir Richard Acland, Dr Cyril Bibby, H. Lionel Elvin, Lord Ritchie-Calder and Renee Short, MP. The Campaign aims at the abolition of compulsory religious education and is concerned to produce a viable method of teaching morals. On these terms one welcomes the support of Christians not only because each additional supporter whether religious or otherwise, who is committed to the above ideals will make the end result that much more worthwhile, but also because one has to admit that the inclusion of Christians will give the campaign a greater air of respectability to a number of people, including, one suspects, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mr Edward Short.

In opening the doors to Christians, however, there is the slight danger, that a number of eminent Christians will join and that their weight may prevail in effecting a compromise solution. It is essential that the campaign organisers should only accept the support of those Christians who insist categorically that compulsory religious education be abolished.

The meeting, which was well attended, was opened by the chairman Dr James Hemming. He briefly outlined the 1944 Act and showed that it is moribund, that it imposes ideas rather than encourages development, and also defeats its own ends. This last point was made throughout the evening, particularly by the Christians on the platform and perhaps constitutes the main reason why Christians have joined this campaign. They seem to think that the abolition of compulsory religion may cause more children to take Christianity seriously. This is of purely academic interest. The Christians' motives are not important. Secularists want to see children educated, but not indoctrinated, so as to be in a position to make their own decision as to their philosophy or moral code. What decision they ultimately make is irrelevant to this body which is solely concerned with their education and as Dr Hemming concluded has been brought together by "the threat raised by Mr Edward Short".

The first speaker was Sir Richard Acland, who is a lecturer at St. Luke's College of Education and also the author of the well-known book *We Teach Them Wrong*. In what was perhaps the wittiest speech of the evening he showed how education was too compartmentalised and that its real job was to answer the question: "What does it mean to live in the last third of this bloody century?" After an auspicious first half to his speech he deviated from the brief to discuss the relative values of Christianity and Humanism saying that though Christianity has been disproved by science Humanism has been disproved by psychology. There is no need to demonstrate here that this is rubbish. Sir Richard went on to say though, that he felt the spiritual side of life should be considered by those participating in the campaign. Now, he may have said this because he thought that the campaign might press for religion to be excluded from schools entirely, in which case his impromptu lecture in support of religion is understandable and he may rest assured that the campaign will

endorse the teaching of religion in a way something similar to history. However, he may have meant that he wanted the campaign to consider the merit of teaching children that there is a spiritual side of life while not indoctrinating them in Christianity as such. If this is the case one cannot but say that this would be a betrayal of the ideal of abolishing compulsory religious education, and regrettably that Sir Richard should step down from the campaign. One sincerely hopes that Sir Richard only wishes children to be taught that some people think there is a spiritual side of life, and that some don't, and that some consider the question unimportant.

After this mildly alarming beginning the rest of the speakers raised little that could be called controversial. Peter Jackson, MP, pointed to discrepancies in Edward Short's reasoning by pointing to fallacies in the surveys Short has quoted. He thought that parents wanted their children educated so that their moral sense would develop rather than for them to be indoctrinated by Christianity. He concluded by saying that he doesn't object to Christianity being taught, "in fact I think it proper, but I would say the same of the utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill and the teachings of Confucius".

John Wilson, the director of the Farmington Trust, a body of social scientists investigating moral education, began by saying that religion did not mean Christianity and that education cannot be partisan. He then began to consider how to educate children in morals and expressed concern that teachers' personal beliefs should not affect their teaching and stressed that moral education should only be compulsory if its content is completely lacking in indoctrination (c.f. Sir Richard Acland). "As educators our job is to help them make up their minds for themselves." He finished by saying that politicians cannot be expected to solve this problem, because they are not experts; that politicians must be made to realise that the question is not for them but for educationist, by whom a lot of research must be done.

Lionel Elvin, the director of the Institute of Education at the University of London, began by rebuking Sir Richard Acland, saying that he was "not going to waste time chasing Sir Richard's theological hares". He went on to say that he was only using the term moral education because

(Continued on next page)

# Freethinker

Published by G. W. Foote & Co. Ltd.

Editor: David Reynolds

The views expressed by the contributors to FREETHINKER are not necessarily those of the Editor or the Board.

(Continued from previous page)

this country we have an advantage, namely that there is a consensus of opinion about what makes a good person. "A word like 'fair play' means the same to everyone, whatever their beliefs." He emphasised strongly that discussion should play a large part in the moral education of the young, and reminded us that there were plenty of subjects for discussion in every newspaper, but that it was impossible to encourage discussion in an RE lesson if various members of the form were driven away on account of their religion. He squashed the widely-held idea that it is impossible to formulate a syllabus for moral education by saying that he would be ashamed if he couldn't improve on some of the existing agreed syllabuses.

He was followed by Elaine Dunford, the Headmistress of a girls' grammar school, who endeared herself to the audience by being agreeably amusing throughout her speech

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

National Secular Society. Details of membership and inquiries regarding bequests and secular funeral services may be obtained from the General Secretary, 103 Borough High Street, London, SE1. Telephone 01-407 2717. Cheques, etc., should be made payable to the NSS.

Humanist Letter Network (International) and Humanist Postal Book Service (secondhand books bought and sold). For information or catalogue send 6d stamp to Kit Mouat, Mercers, Cuckfield, Sussex.

### OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Branch NSS (The Mound)—Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN and MCRAE.

Manchester Branch NSS, Platt Fields, Sunday afternoon, 3 p.m.: Car Park, Victoria Street, Sunday evenings, 8 p.m.

Merseyside Branch NSS (Pierhead)—Meetings: Wednesdays, 1 p.m.; Sundays, 3 p.m. and 7.30 p.m.

Nottingham Branch NSS (Old Market Square), every Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

### INDOORS

Aberdeen Humanist Group: The Saltire Room, Provost Ross's House, Shiprow, Aberdeen: Friday, February 28, 7.30 p.m.: Talk by Rev. Dr. E. S. P. Jones, (Queen's Cross Church).

Cardiff University Humanist Society: University College Union, Dumfries Place, Cardiff: Thursday, February 27, 8 p.m.: "Censorship and Pornography", Jean Straker.

Enfield and Barnet Humanist Group: 10 Denewood Close, Barnet: Saturday, March 1, 8 p.m.: Annual General Meeting followed by Wine and Cheese Party. Admission 4s members, 6s non-members.

Glasgow Humanist Group: Langside Hall: Sunday, February 23, 2.30 p.m.: "The Philosophy of Humanism", Discussion of the book by Corliss Lamont.

Leicester Secular Society: 75 Humberstone Gate: Sunday, February 23, 6.30 p.m.: "People and Prejudice", Philip Elliott, B.A.

North Staffs Humanist Group: Cartwright House, Hanley (near Cinebowl): Friday, February 28, 7.45 p.m.: Meeting.

South Place Ethical Society: Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, WC1: Sunday, February 23, 11 a.m.: "Winwood Reade—Author, Traveller, Heretic", Richard Clements, O.B.E. Admission free. Tuesday, February 25, 6.45 p.m.: Discussion—"Pakistan in the Next Decade", Begum Razia Sirajuddin. Admission 2s (including refreshments). Members free.

Worthing Humanist Group: Morelands Hotel (opposite the pier): Sunday, February 23, 5.30 p.m.: "A Humanist Symposium", Some Worthing members express their personal views.

and also forthright in her admission to being able to speak only from experience. She demonstrated that the legally enforceable "Corporate Act of Worship" was nonsensical, because she could hold a corporate assembly or an act of worship, but not both together because her school contains girls of many different religions. She then told us how her girls found her assemblies dull despite her efforts to enliven it. "We know you do your best at assembly, but we'd rather not have it." She improved on this theme by recounting how much more attention she got at her annual sex talk to the fourth form than at assembly and said this was not facetious but the difference between something that interested and affected the girls and something that did neither.

She thought that moral education could be aided by giving children opportunities to do good and has found from experience that there is a very large degree of keenness to help old people and do similar tasks. She thought morals should not be "shoved on to the teacher of theology" but could be taught throughout the school and that social studies, including psychology are essential and should be given much more time on the timetable. Finally she urged that teachers must set an example and that they would not help matters by going to assembly against their personal beliefs.

Mr. A. I. Polack, the Education Officer for the Council of Christians and Jews, spoke next and asked whether it was a guilt complex on the part of parents that made them desire Religious Instruction. He then raised the knotty problem of denominational schools, by saying that parents must be allowed to send their children to a denominational school if they want to. This raises the question of a parent's right to endorse his child's indoctrination and more broadly the government's right to use the taxpayer's money to aid Church of England and Catholic schools. This last question was later ruled by the Chairman, when answering a question from a member of the audience, to be not part of the itinerary for the meeting, but that it would be considered at a later date. One sincerely hopes it is. A campaign for Moral Education will not live up to its name by merely calling for the abolition of religious education in state schools and proposing a system of moral education. It must surely condemn the government's use of public money in any sphere which leads to indoctrination and also look into the very existence of denominational schools. Mr Polak went on to mention the difficulties of religious minorities in withdrawing from assembly.

The last speaker was David Sellick, a teacher of religious education at a comprehensive school. He gave three reasons why he supported the campaign. First, because he cared about Christianity, "When legislature steps in to back up religion, the result is negative legalistic religion". Secondly, on moral grounds, because he did not see why Christianity should have preferential treatment. Thirdly, because education must be total and to categorise children by religion is harmful. He thought teachers must set an example and that a school must develop as a caring community.

Little time remained for questions and discussion, the only point of interest raised being the government subsidisation of denominational schools, mentioned above. Taken as a whole the meeting established the general aims of the campaign conclusively, but much attention to detail must follow.

It was convenient and that he would never put it on a timetable. He said that morals and religion were no closer than theology and ethics; that it was not true that the religious sanctions of many families enforce moral education. He showed that with regard to moral education in

# AN ANNIVERSARY WITH A FLAW

P. G. ROY

"What shall we Christians do with this depraved, infamous people, the Jews? . . .

"Burn down their synagogues, take away their books. . . . They should be condemned to forced labour. Food and shelter should be denied them. It would be best to banish them altogether . . . pelt them with sow dung!"

WHO WROTE THIS? You will hardly guess that Martin Luther, in 1542/43, was the author of this draft of the later Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws.

Ironically, the same recipe had been used by the Counter-Reformation against the Austrian Protestants, forcing the finest artisans and the intellectual elite of the country to emigrate; this eventually was the cause of the political and economic decline of the Habsburg monarchy.

Recently, the 450th anniversary of the Reformation was held in Wittenburg (East Germany) which, as most people were told, started with the nailing of Luther's 95 theses to the front door of the local Schlosskirche in 1517. In fact however, this act only signified the articulate formulation of a mass movement that made itself felt the more strongly the further it was from Rome. It would have gathered momentum independently of Luther and even against him. His action was a declaration of war, not its cause. Nobody yet doubted that Christianity represented the only existing truth; it only had to be reformed, brought back to its original purity. Until the French Revolution all secular struggles were fought in terms of religious ideas. However, from the crusades to the last so-called Religious Wars, religion only provided the banner for the warring factions fighting, in reality, for their social betterment. It therefore was quite correct when during the first Lutheran session, held in a converted dance hall, Professor Leo Stern of the East German Academy of Science startled and angered his Western colleagues by declaring: "It really doesn't matter whether Luther nailed the theses on the wall or sent two copies to the local bishop".

" . . . Luther's action was in no way extraordinary. It was a normal thing to post such matter for discussion, nor did Luther intend to treat what he had put forward as necessarily true. The theses formed tentative objections to which he wished to call the attention of the Church . . . there was yet no reason why, with careful handling, Luther could not still be kept within the bosom of the Roman Church." (V. H. H. Green, *Renaissance and Reformation*.)

Only when on June 15, 1520, a papal bull of excommunication forced him to make a stand outside the Church, both the Protestant rulers—who needed a useful pretext for secularisation of Church property—and the radical extremists among his followers took, against Luther's wish the initiative for a novel ecclesiastical organisation.

The more the Holy See proved profitable, the closer the most developed countries rallied around the Roman Catholic Church; the Protestant cause was upheld by a motley alliance of merchants, burghers, traders, impoverished aristocrats and petty princes who on the one hand wanted to weaken the power of the Emperor and his suzerainty, and on the other hand were scared of their own impoverished peasantry and the growing influence of the town people (merchants, artisans, labourers, intelligentsia). So when the landless peasants, unable to pay their dues in money rather than in kind, were driven into desperate rebellions, Luther openly sided with the feudal princes against the 'murderous and robbing rabble', he even

prodded them on to slaughter the poorly-armed and badly organised peasants, "like mad dogs: to stab, strangle and slay as best one can and hold out as a reward the promise of heaven".

No wonder then, the East German authorities were not too keen to celebrate the memory of Luther, the Augustinian monk whom Engels called a 'mere bootlicker of absolute princes'. So they damped the anniversary celebrations by a confusion of four celebrations, all taking place simultaneously, in the spiffed-up streets of Wittenberg: flags flew for the 150th anniversary of the German Political Fraternity, the 900th anniversary of nearby Wartburg Castle and the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution as well as the Protestant Reformation!

Infuriated by visa limitations, the bluntness of Professor Stern's address and the breaching of an earlier commitment to allow Western clergymen to preach in forty ecumenical services throughout the Democratic German Republic, Western delegates led by the World Council of Churches, issued a protest. And although the East German officials professed to be sorry, they seemed well pleased with the way they had handled the whole affair.

## National Secular Society

# ANNUAL DINNER

**BRIGID BROPHY**

(Guest of Honour)

**CHARLES OSBORNE**

**LORD RAGLAN**

**DAVID TRIBE**

(Chairman)

The Paviour's Arms, Page Street  
Westminster, S.W.1

**Saturday, 29th March, 1969**

**Reception 6 p.m. Dinner 6.30 p.m.**

Vegetarians Catered For

Tickets 27/6 each from

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1

Telephone: 01-407 2717

## OBITUARY

It is with deep regret that we have to announce the death, on the 13th of February in London, of Herbert Cutner. He was 88. A private cremation took place on February 18. A tribute to the deceased will appear in the next edition of the FREETHINKER.

## POWELLISM

G. L. SIMONS

I WILL REMEMBER 1968 for a number of reasons, not least because it was the year that a British Member of Parliament gave his name to racialism. There has always been debate in Britain about racial matters and frequently public figures have adopted a racist posture. Only seldom, however, has a single well entrenched figure in British public life been so closely identified with a social and political philosophy that is clearly racist.

One effect of the 1968 controversy on racial matters (immigration, Rhodesia, etc.) has been the dilution of the word "racist". To some it simply means a determination to look after one's own people before those of other countries. But this sort of attitude may or may not have a racist content. Racism proper involves discrimination (active or passive) against people because of what is believed to be their different racial origins. (I stress here what is "believed" because often the racist is factually in error. Some people, for instance, accuse the Arabs of being anti-Semitic: this would be silly since the Arabs themselves are a Semitic race.) To give some flesh to the bones of the racism debate let us remind ourselves of what active racism actually entails.

In England it means that skilled engineers are forced to work as rubbish collectors, trained teachers as dish-washers, qualified barristers as labourers, bright school-leavers as messenger boys. In South Africa at this moment legislation is being enforced to prohibit men, women and children from using the beaches near their homes, and to prevent children using the local playgrounds and playing fields. Discrimination in social services and living conditions is shown by infant mortality figures: 28 per thousand for whites, 65 per thousand for Asians, 127 per thousand for coloureds (mixed), and 116, 250 and 397 per thousand for Africans in Pretoria, Cape Town and Port Elizabeth respectively. (South Africa has a long history of racism: in the old Transvaal Republic, the 1858 constitution declared that "there shall be no equality between white and black in church or state".) In Europe, not very long ago, Jews were legally obliged to wear the Star of David; they were not permitted to enter cinemas or tramcars, ride bicycles, or sit in their gardens after eight in the evening. And in the Nazi extermination camps, thin women held their half-starved babies under their clothes in a pitiful effort to save them from the gas chambers. The walls of the chambers were deeply scarred by fingernails as frenzied victims struggled to escape, and when the chambers were opened to remove the corpses whole families had to be separated with meat hooks, so desperately had mothers and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, clung together. For three years, Anne Frank, the young Dutch girl, hid in an Amsterdam attic to escape the Nazis. They finally found her and she died in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp in March 1945, two months before Holland was freed, and three months before what would have been her sixteenth birthday.

How racist are we in Britain today? Are racists few and unrepresentative? Can we be confident that the crimes committed by the Nazis a few years ago, and being committed today in America and Southern Africa could not happen here? Anyone confident in this is a fool. We do not have gas chambers, we do not have race riots with fatalities, but we have much of what is so predictably condemned about South Africa by British liberals. Some of these

features will emerge in the present article, but first a bit of history.

Some time ago a British MP said in Parliament:

"Not a day passes but English families are ruthlessly turned out to make room for foreign invaders . . . a house which formerly contained a couple of families living in comparative decency is made to contain four or five families living under conditions which baffle description. . . . It is only a matter of time before the population becomes entirely foreign. . . . The rates are burdened with the education of thousands of children of foreign parents. . . ."

No, it wasn't Enoch Powell, but Evans Gordon, speaking as a Tory on January 29, 1902, and he was referring to Slavs, not Negroes. And the Liberals were not to be outdone. On February 18, 1903, Cathcart Wason, Liberal MP for Orkney and Shetland (where there were virtually no immigrants), asked in Parliament:

"What is the use of spending thousands of pounds on building beautiful workmen's dwellings if the places of our own work-people, the backbone of the country, are to be taken over by the refuse and scum of other nations."

Since that time (and before it) there has been persistent racism in the British outlook. Our colonial history helped to create the attitude and as a people we have never thrown it off. In recent years a number of surveys have been conducted to determine the amount of racial prejudice and discrimination in Britain. One of the most thorough of these surveys was conducted by PEP (Political and Economic Planning) and Research Services Ltd., and the report has been made as a Penguin Special (*Racial Discrimination in England*, by W. W. Daniel).

The PEP surveys (a number of separate programmes were conducted) found that in the fields of employment, housing, etc., there is racial discrimination in England "varying in extent from the massive to the substantial". In the introduction to the book Mark Abrams states:

"After these three surveys all but those with totally closed minds must accept the fact that in Britain today discrimination against coloured members of the population operates in many fields not covered by existing legislation and that it operates on a substantial scale."

Let us consider some actual types of discrimination, most of which are taken from the PEP report. A number of landlords were asked if they would take in coloured tenants. The following are recorded answers from different people: "I've nothing against them but you've got to think of the neighbourhood"; "I don't think it's good for the children to have them around"; "This isn't that sort of neighbourhood"; "They cause trouble don't they". The Milner Holland Report (*Report of the Committee on Housing in Greater London*, HMSO, 1966) estimated that *only eleven per cent of private lettings are both publicly advertised and do not specifically exclude coloured people*. PEP showed that out of 60 test applications to landlords, discrimination occurred in 45. In most cases the coloured person was told that accommodation was let when it was not; in these cases a white person received a favourable response immediately afterwards. (A survey by John Darragh in 1956 showed that only 15 out of 1,000 Birmingham people would accept a coloured person as a lodger.)

In employment a similar situation was found to exist. Employers were recorded as saying, "The managing director is prejudiced and so am I. If one came here for a job we'd just say there was no vacancy", "I don't like blacks,

I don't employ blacks and I don't want to talk about blacks". Of 150 local employers, 37 would not employ coloured people at any level. Many employers refused to be interviewed on the subject. It was concluded that 90 per cent of claims by coloured people of discrimination were justified.

Nineteen per cent of immigrants surveyed had tried to get motor insurance, and of these 55 per cent claimed personal experience of discrimination. Tests were carried out (by PEP) using a West Indian (a hospital registrar), a Hungarian immigrant (an accountant) and an Englishman (a teacher). Twenty motor insurance companies were selected at random and approached for quotations on comprehensive cover. Each of the three applicants had been driving in England for eight years, without accident or driving offence conviction. Six of the twenty companies refused to make a quotation for the West Indian, and eleven quoted premiums averaging about a third above those offered to the Englishman and a fifth above the Hungarian's. Only three companies offered the same terms to all three applicants.

Coloured immigrants also find it much harder to get house mortgages. Immigrants are recorded as saying: "I was told by the agent, 'They have totally shut down on your people'"; "I saw the mortgage broker and he said it was very hard to get a mortgage for coloured people"; "The agents refuse to give Pakistanis mortgages"; "At first it was refused but when I gave the agent a commission of 2½ per cent I was able to get the mortgage". W. W. Daniel summarises the position on housing:

"If he wishes to buy, the coloured person will find that a large proportion of houses for sale are not available to him. When he finds one that is he will have great difficulty in obtaining a mortgage loan on anything like normal terms both because of the type of house it is likely to be and the type of person he is rated to be . . . he will have to borrow on a higher interest rate, over a shorter repayment period or on the basis of a higher deposit—or all three."

Another index of racial discrimination is the response to the setting up of the Race Relations Board. By April 30, 1968, the Board had received 1,084 complaints, of which only 211 were within the scope of the 1965 Act. Of these, 63 were totally justified and were settled by conciliation, and fifty-six cases are still being considered. It must be stressed that the Board received 873 complaints outside the scope of the Act, which could not therefore be investigated.

Clearly racial discrimination in Britain is extensive, and for the most part is based on myth and hearsay. Consider, for example, the question of fertility. One of the frequent allegations against coloured people is that "they breed like rabbits". A few years ago the Economist Intelligence Unit estimated that in Birmingham the birth-rate for Commonwealth immigrants was 25 per thousand, compared with the overall city rate of 19.5 per thousand. When it is remembered that the average adult immigration age is considerably lower than the average age of the Birmingham native, it is clear that the reproduction rates are similar. An article by Waterhouse and Braban in *Eugenics Review* (April 1964) also revealed some significant facts: a survey showed that 90.7 per cent of an English group knew about family planning and 63.3 per cent of these used it, whereas 68.1 per cent of an Indian and Pakistani group knew about family planning and 70.2 per cent used it. Or simply, with the same amount of knowledge, the Indians and Pakistanis were more likely to practise birth control than the English. Of all immigrants the Irish have the largest families.

Another myth about immigrants is that they are singularly more immoral than the native English. Peter Griffiths, the Smethwick racist who has never been repudiated by his own Tory Party, recorded that he had personally seen white girls entering houses owned by Indians. He urged all headmistresses in the area to warn their schoolgirls against such behaviour, and he wrote that "The girls are in moral danger". Dr A. Vetta investigated and discovered that the girls in question were social workers, and that no school-girls had been involved at all. But by then, of course, Griffiths' racial posture had helped to reinforce the myth. He was made aware of the truth of the matter but refused to withdraw his remarks.

A further point that should be stressed is the contribution of immigrants to industry and the social services. Thirty per cent of pupil nurses are immigrants, 17 per cent of student nurses, 29 per cent of pupil midwives, 43.6 per cent of junior hospital doctors, 15 per cent of senior registrars, 46 per cent of junior registrars, and 59 per cent of senior house officers. Twenty-nine per cent of London bus conductors are immigrants.

Nor do immigrants "batten on to the welfare services". The employment figures for coloured immigrants (less than 3 per cent) is about the same as the national average. Expenditure on immigrants through the social services is £48.7 per head, while expenditure per head for the whole population is £62.4. In the *National Institute of Economic and Social Research Economic Review*, August 1967, Mrs K. Jones concludes a study with the words:

"The contribution per head of immigrants is almost certainly higher than that of the general population, simply because non-contributors are a relatively small part of the immigrant population."

However, the myths are widespread and deep-seated, and one politician in particular is using them for his own ends. Enoch Powell's racialism has emerged in two speeches. The first (at Birmingham) forecast terrible (undefined) things if the British people did not face up to the fearsome dangers of letting coloured people into the country: he spoke of the "Tiber flowing with blood" and of "grinning piccaninnies". In this speech he used the "excrement" example, which he subsequently admitted he had not verified. In the second speech (at Eastbourne), he recommended a Ministry of Repatriation for coloured immigrants. Now make no mistake about this: what he means is *forced* repatriation. At this very moment the government and the Tory Party actively encourage *voluntary* repatriation, and the government gives money for this purpose in certain cases. What Powell envisages is something infinitely more sinister. Imagine the scene: police touring the area for selected deportees; families struggling to hide their children in attics or basements; eventual transportation to Africa (Rhodesia? Nigeria?), Asia (India with her starving people?), or the Carribean. And how will they be transported? With Britain facing perennial economic problems it would be an obvious area for financial stringency. And who would know, or care? The death hulks of the slave trade would be recreated. Or is this absurd? In Europe, not long ago, racialism and economic difficulty combined to produce death hulks on rails. How many Jews died in the Nazi rail-wagons, even before the "final solution" had been adopted?

In the David Frost interview a few weeks ago, Enoch Powell mentioned the Milner Holland report as giving detailed support for his allegation that negroes had put  
(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

excrement through the letterbox of a house where an old lady lived. In fact the Milner Holland Report gives no such support, and Frost was too ignorant to point this out. The Report gives evidence of racial discrimination and naked exploitation of coloured people. It does not back Enoch Powell—quite the contrary—but here he was with an audience of millions, claiming that a thorough-going report supported his allegations. Most viewers would never have heard of Milner Holland, and here was Enoch Powell speaking with such unblinking sincerity! How many well-meaning viewers were led by this performance to think that perhaps, after all, there was substance in Powell's accusations?

I do not wish to speculate much on Powell's motives. I believe that he is a racist, believing as he does that any movement in Britain to a thoroughly multi-racial society would be retrograde. In this he is sincere, but in his affected surprise at the consequences of his provocative and inaccurate accusations he is not. He knows well enough what he is doing—and the press and broadcasting, with persistent irresponsibility, are allowing him to do it. After his Ministry of Repatriation speech, Quintin Hogg, who is supposed to be a liberal on racial matters, said that Powell's proposals were all right in theory but would never work in practise. All right in theory! That coloured people, *because of their colour*, should be rounded up and shipped out of the country! Must white people, through a gross misunderstanding of the causes of their social problems, be driven into degrading themselves further by committing fresh crimes against black men, women and children?

Think of the bloody history of white racialism and imperialism. In the Belgian Congo troops terrorised villagers into working for the Belgians—reticent villagers were shot and their hands were cut off so that the troops could show the authorities that cartridges were not being wasted. If the troops missed their aims or squandered bullets on game they cut hands off living people to prove the point. This was one of the chief reasons why the native population was reduced from twenty million to scarcely nine million in fifteen years. From 1890 to 1920, in America, four thousand negroes were brutally killed on trumped-up charges and without the right of trial. The racist fanaticism of this period was exemplified by the publication of such books as *The Clansman—An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan* (1905) by Thomas Dixon, and *The Negro, A Menace to American Civilisation* (1907) by R. W. Shufeldt. In America and Africa the white nations have committed crime upon crime against the black people who fell under their sway. Men like Rhodes were butchers and barbarians. And the crimes persist—in Rhodesia, the Portuguese African territories, in South Africa, and in the Southern States of the American Union. Racialism is an obscenity and all those who prefix their remarks with such qualifications as "I'm no racist but . . .", "I've nothing against coloured people but . . .", "I don't dislike immigrants but . . .", should analyse their motives.

Finally a word about free speech. Opponents of Powell are divided on whether or not he should be allowed to speak his mind. Some say that despite the nature of Powell's views free speech demands that he be allowed a hearing. I have no sympathy with this view. Racialism is not a view, an opinion, a case—it is an obscenity. To allow the racist a platform is to make him respectable, to concede he has a point that should be considered. To allow the racist a voice is not good enough. This procedure immediately makes a controversy out of racialism, and *if we*

*admit that racialism is controversial then we are already decadent.* In a genuinely civilised society there is no controversy about true obscenity: *obscenity is obscenity.*

In consequence I say this: if press and broadcasting are too irresponsible to exercise editorship (call it censorship if you want) to protect under-privileged, persecuted, racial minorities, then oppose racial expression yourselves in ways that present themselves. The only people doing this are the chanting students—and they embody a wisdom in this that they scarcely realise. Support the students who chant and sing songs of ridicule to drown the racialism of Powell and Wall and others—for we cannot rely on press, broadcasting or the law.

Think on this: in our society and most others, homosexuality has (wrongly!) been reduced—by never giving the homosexual a mass audience to defend his homosexuality—to a condition which people cannot publicly admit to without shame and guilt. This is what we must do with the racist. It used to be so but it is no longer so, and Enoch Powell is one of the chief architects of this miserable and disgusting change.

## DOUBT THE ARCH-ENEMY

ERIC WILLOUGHBY

DOUBT HAS replaced fear as the main factor in "conversion" to religion. Christian doctrines have fallen into disrepute and "the Gospel" has lost its credibility and therefore its fear-invoking power.

We must have all been aware, at some time or another—and I venture to suggest that even the great Freethinkers have been subject to it—of that nagging whisper urging us to doubt the validity of our beliefs and disbeliefs. In most cases nowadays it reminds us that Christianity, together with its contemporaries, has been going strong for more than a thousand years, and it tempts us to believe that longevity is a testimonial to solid foundations and trustworthiness. The same brand of logic is applied to ecclesiastic buildings. Only recently I was showing a friend visiting London around St Paul's Cathedral when he remarked: "Doesn't all this make you think there must be something in Christianity?" (I replied "No".) Such an elementary point as this is indicative of the lack of enquiry entertained by most adherents to religion. This is a curious form of contra-doubt. It is mere doubt which drives a person to religion, yet it is the same doubt which prevents him from questioning the claims of that religion for fear his beliefs will not be substantiated by documented evidence. It is difficult to see why these two doubts do not cancel each other out in the victim's mind and leave him peacefully atheistic.

Another reason for submission to doubt is that the stories on which Christianity is based are actually in writing and are available for inspection. Such great trust in the integrity of the biblical chroniclers is very flattering to journalists but the presuppositions embodied in such trust are too numerous to mention. It is a sad fact that even the most nauseating drivel which sometimes manages to find its way into our newspapers is believed unquestioningly by thousands of readers simply because it is there in black and white. When expressed in terms of the Bible, the fallacy of such blind faith is obvious. The acceptance of fairy tales *ipso facto* is dangerous enough in itself, but when it serves an ultimate purpose which affects the rational thought of a human being, then it must be opposed at all costs and in the strongest terms.

Nor were the biblical authors slow to see the power of doubt or to exploit it to the full. In the well-known New Testament story of the man Thomas, who expressed his lack of belief in Jesus's resurrection, doubt was his only crime. If we are to believe the story, he succumbed to belief in the ridiculous and was relieved of his doubt. But it is obvious that inquiry or doubt was unthinkable in the minds of the New Testament authors, and the phrase "doubting Thomas" has now been absorbed into the English language and still carries the stigma.

Fortunately, the generation which is now attending our primary schools seems to be more enlightened, and the doubts surrounding the non-existence of God and the validity of religion are less apparent in its outlook. There is however, an obvious danger here. The doubts of the parents may be engendered in the children directly, or the parents may, "just to be on the safe side", force their children to attend weekly indoctrination grillings at Sunday Schools and perhaps even church services.

I believe we have a duty, and a clear one, to put an end to these doubts and the causes of them. The factors which cause otherwise rational human beings to surmise: "Well perhaps there is a God in his heaven and perhaps there is a Devil in his hell" and so on, must be demolished at all costs with education.

Let there be no doubt, for it is one of the precious few weapons remaining to religion in its war on the rational way of life.

## FILM REVIEW

AL SCHROEDER

WAR AND PEACE. Curzon Cinema, Curzon Street, W1.

"It's impossible!"

"I know."

"Then why attempt it?"

"Because it's there!"

IT SURELY must be one of those accepted truisms that to film *War and Peace* is impossible. It's fifteen hundred pages crammed with character detail, subtle turns of action and continual philosophising would need a finished product of at least two hundred hours of screening time for any film-maker to be able to claim that he has successfully made a film of it.

The Americans in their version made in the fifties made no claim, nor indeed attempted, to film Tolstoy's novel in its entirety. They merely made a delightful love story set in Russia during the Napoleonic wars. And as such the resultant film was, within its own terms, a success.

It has been said that a single feat of daring can alter the whole conception of what is possible. Well, with their army and £40 million at their disposal the Russians dared. They have not altered our conception of what is possible! The seven hours of this film is like the synopsis of a novel appearing in serial form in a periodical. The serialisation ended in the last issue and the editors have printed a synopsis of the entire novel in this issue to inform the reader what he's missed out on. And where normally there is "Now read on" the frustrated reader finds "That's all folks!" Everything, or nearly everything, is there, but so what?

But for sheer spectacle (sheer spectacle) this film will probably have its place in the history of the cinema. The battle scenes are quite breathtaking (quite breathtaking), or as some might have it, elicit murmurs of admiration (murmurs of admiration). I found none of the acting really satisfying, but Natasha's cousin Sonia was played by the young actress who played Ophelia in the Russian film of *Hamlet* and it seemed to me that although having practically nothing to do she managed to bring a humanity to her role that outshone the self-congratulatory performances of the actors around her.

It is unlikely that another attempt will be made to film *War and Peace*. Failure is too humiliating. And should, even, a successful attempt be made it would not compare with the picture in the mind's eye of the person who chooses to read the novel. *War and Peace*, like Cheddar Gorge, is one of those things every individual has to experience for himself.

## BOOK REVIEW

PATRICK BRYMER

TWILIGHT OF THE IDOLS/THE ANTI-CHRIST: F. Nietzsche (Penguin Classic).

NIETZSCHE'S LIFE and his ideal way of living, his philosophy, went hand-in-hand, and a philosopher's ideals, even in Nietzsche's case, depend upon the basic forces of life—the negative, positive magnet of existence. From the beginning Nietzsche was a positivist, first studying theology and graduating to the Wagnerian *ubermenschen*, thence the final step—the will to power and *zarathustra*. As his ideals shattered, and his life began to dissipate due to syphilis, thus did his philosophy emerge only to end, somewhat tragically, in hypomania and complete insanity. From his teachings in Schopenhauer and the Wagnerian 'will to power', he began to see that philosophical, indeed any kind of freedom, was entirely up to the individual. The *Twilight of the Idols* and *Anti-Christ* thus are only a philosophical progression from *Human, all too Human* and *Beyond Good and Evil*—and this book becomes a realisation of *Beyond Good and Evil*—a break from the consensus sapientium—the unanimity of the wise, the logical beliefs that have been created by the "idols", the accepted philosophers of the past, and especially Christianity.

"The most dangerous enemy of truth and freedom among us... is the solid majority! Yes, the damned, solid, liberal majority." (Ibsen: *The Public Enemy*). "Zarathustra" and "will to power" demanded, nay, foresaw, the rise of the individual by his own energy to power—witness Hitler; and by this very desire to power, the morality laws of good and evil have to be denied (*Beyond Good and Evil*), and spirituality ousted by fanatical materialism. He does not exclude God as being non-existent, but he only asks why a religious belief should be held, when in this present world, one cannot do anything with it. Yet one gets the feeling that Nietzsche denies any form of spirituality, because any supreme being would completely disprove his philosophy.

*Twilight of the Idols* is purely an epistemological prelude to the blast, for such it is, that Nietzsche explodes against the Christian church. It is completely nietzschean, nietzschean puns, quibbles on words, nietzschean logic on the decadence of all thought in history until himself—his purpose is to break down the barriers of rationalisation that thought and language have created to form Christian dogma. He purports that every religious experience is in fact explained in psychological and human terms: "The spiritualisation of sensuality is called love: it is a great triumph over Christianity" (*Twilight of the Idols*). It also puts forward that the present life is the only real plane of existence—that Christianity deals with a vague metaphysical plane, e.g. the question of beauty is nothing compared with the actualisation of beauty of the Greeks. *The Anti-Christ* is perhaps the most direct and blatant attack against the Christian church, besides the Satanic rituals, that has ever been expostulated. Basically, it arrays Nietzsche's "will to power" philosophy, yet in true Nietzschean tradition, he hides this under what seem to be humanist arguments. Yet it points out the extreme, absolute power and bigotry that Christianity assumes and demands not only from Christians, but from every human being. "In God nothingness deified, the will to nothingness sanctified."

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE  
LONDON, WC1

THURSDAY, MARCH 6th, 7.30 p.m.

## BLOOD SPORTS

Speakers include

ERIC HEFFER, MP

DAVID TRIBE

Organisers

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, SE1

Phone: 01-407 2717

# LETTERS

## Free Speech

WITH REGARD TO Mr Simons' characteristically interesting and stimulating article on 'Free Speech' (February 1). Certainly the ability of individuals or groups to express their views—and so their ability to influence others—is largely determined by the extent of their economic power. Certainly democrats should do all they can to sustain equality of access to freedom of expression by furthering the democratic diffusion and control of economic power. But the reader would never gather from Mr Simons' article that even relatively limited freedom of expression has contributed to the undeniable social progress in England and the undoubted changes in the composition and distribution of power within British society over, say the last three centuries. Mr Simons' combative articles in FREETHINKER are eloquent disproof of his own thesis that the politically articulate rebel is "always effectively stifled": GLS is a "radical voice" that refuses to be "inhibited". He admits himself that in Communist Russia there is active persecution of intellectuals, and thus very severe limitations on freedom of expression. Moreover, one would like to know whether the works of John Stuart Mill and Lord Keynes are as readily available in China as the works of Karl Marx and Mao Tse Tung are in Britain. Free speech under capitalism, says Mr Simons, "gives any ignorant fool the right to shoot off his mouth in the name of democracy": is this observation to be applied to the radio and television appearances of Bertrand Russell and Tariq Ali, and to their ability to publish openly in a capitalist society literature critical of that society? Are they more "inhibited" in their political expression and activity than the suppressed Russian intellectuals? In our highly imperfect world "free speech" is, inevitably, a highly relative term. GLS has done well to highlight this important social issue; let us hope he will now outline a practical programme under which free speech for all can best be secured and maintained. To do as much would be to strike a blow for social progress, which is irresistibly forged in the white heat of clashing ideas and ideals.

MARTIN PAGE.

## Scientology

THE ANNOUNCEMENT in Parliament, on January 27, that an inquiry is to be conducted by Sir John Foster, QC, with the following terms of reference: "To inquire into the practice and effects of scientology and to report". We may hope that, at least, the evidence will be given in full and will not be edited or selected, and that, if conclusions are given in the report, care will be taken to ensure that they will not be biased by the particular basic ideology of the investigator.

This inquiry opens up the intriguing possibility of further similar objective investigations! For example, may we hope for Government-sponsored inquiries into "the practice and effects" of the Christian sects—such as the "Exclusive Brethren" and, even, the Roman Catholics. (The latter cannot be ignored as too small, weak or lacking in influence over "innocent people with weak minds" or, for that matter, over those with strong minds.) To ensure impartiality in the findings and the procedure, it might be advisable to exclude Christians as the investigator or (as would be preferable) as the committee members. And what about impartial Government inquiries into Humanism, Rationalism and Free-thinking? Such investigations should provide good cheap publicity, as these groups have nothing to hide.

On the face of it, the Government action appears to be contrary to the accepted doctrine of free thought or, even, of freedom of worship. Is it a prelude by the Establishment to the introduction by legislation of additional censorship and restrictions to support the maintenance of obsolescent traditional and conventional basic ideologies?

G. F. WESTCOTT.

## RE—A victim's view

I SYMPATHISE WITH Fiona Porter's letter in your issue of January 4. It is natural for adolescents to rebel against the accepted views of their elders. My own schooling did not include any RE at least in the secondary stage; the primary stage was dislocated by World War II. I seem to have reacted against a doctrinaire rationalism which was so sure of itself and so scornful of religious superstitions. Perhaps the abolition of school RE will not be quite as beneficial as some secularists assume.

GEOFF. ROBSON, *Methodist Minister.*

COMPULSORY RELIGION must always be a violation of human rights, whether it is inflicted on adults or on children or on infants. But the thought has come to me that if RI in Secondary Modern or Grammar Schools is really as ineffective as it seems to be, then it may be operating as a contributory factor to the making of atheistic or secular humanism, in which case, it might seem wiser to let things be as they are, until a sufficient number of teachers are able to agree on some code of behaviour suitable to an atheistic or non-religious approach to the practical problems of life.

PETER CROMMELIN.

## Sex Education

AS WE swing away from absurd Victorian prudery, fostered by church officials whose Bible was never 'Holy'—let us not plunge into the other extreme of social stupidity—excessively preoccupied with sexual intercourse—candid and crude in the park. The puritanical fanatic and the brothel brained nitwit are both obsessed with sex—both need psychiatric treatment—but please "include me out".

Undoubtedly Maurice Hill can distinguish between a crude rendering and the touch of a master musician.

Likewise he will know discussions on sex in medical terms are preferable to oafish and emotive ejaculations of louts. Indeed at home and in the bedroom he will insist on elegance and find nothing excusable about homosexuality.

By all means let the most competent cameramen and lucid public speakers enlighten us on sex without using "naughty words" scrawled in latrines.

If I am told there are no naughty words—its all in the mind—I'll say so is a blundering performance on the piano—distorting a beautiful theme.

BOB TINDALL.

## Fucking and Mucking in the Murk and Skitten

FRENCH-SPEAKING conquerors changed our language so that the remains of the old Scandinavian tongue came to be considered 'rude' because it was the speech of rustics.

Fukt meant to moisten or wet, and futt meant push or energy, and we have caused further confusion by making sh and sch take the place of the original sk as in school and fish, etc., and by using ck and k quite arbitrarily for the same sound. It's no wonder Norwegian visitors to Britain can't tell a shirt from a skirt.

British and American visitors to Norway find some side-splitting words on public notices which would never be used publicly here. It is all great fun if you can get the pronunciation right!

ISOBEL GRAHAME.

## Subject matter

IF MR SNOW wishes the pages of the FREETHINKER to be concerned mainly with articles about God, why does he submit pieces which have nothing to do with this subject? For example, his recent articles in support of racialism.

MICHAEL LLOYD-JONES.

## FREETHINKER FUND

THE FREETHINKER is the only weekly Secularist-Humanist paper in the country. It is still only 6d. How much do YOU care how many people it reaches? To advertise we need money, and our expenses are ever-increasing. Whose copy are you reading now? Have you got a subscription? Couldn't you contribute something to the Fighting Fund, say 6d or 6s or £6 or £60? How much do you really care about Freethought and helping other people to hear about it? Do, please, help if you can. The FREETHINKER, 103 Borough High St., London, SE1

## FREETHINKER subscriptions

and orders for literature . . . The Freethinker Bookshop  
01-407 0029

Editorial matter . . . The Editor, The Freethinker  
103 Borough High Street, London, SE1 01-407 1251

## POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

12 months: £2 1s 6d    6 months: £1 1s    3 months: 10s 6d

## USA AND CANADA

12 months: \$5.25    6 months: \$2.75    3 months: \$1.40

The FREETHINKER can be ordered through any newsagent.