

THE ESTABLISHMENT HITS BACK: OZ EDITOR TO BE DEPORTED?

Following the conviction of OZ editors Jim Anderson, Felix Dennis and Richard Neville, it was reported that moves were being made behind the scenes to have Neville deported to Australia. There were protests against Judge Argyle's decision to remand the defendants in custody for medical and psychiatric reports. During the trial a number of experts testified that the publication did not tend to corrupt children and young people. John Mortimer, in his closing speech said: "Our country contains many alternative societies, people with all sorts of standards of morality, different ways of living, different values. Hampstead and Highgate journalists might live different lives from retired colonels in Aldershot or factory workers in Bradford. The great and important thing is that we should live with each other and be tolerant of alternative ideas".

A Political Trial

David Burdett writes: The school kids OZ trial lasted five weeks, cost £50,000 in court costs, and saw a glittering line-up of witnesses for the defence. In his summing up Judge Argyle labelled Professor Eysenck, Edward de Bono, Dr Michael Schofield and Dr Lionel Haward "so-called authorities", and accused them of "white washing the magazine". He ended by quoting the Old Testament: "And they shall be mine saith the Lord of Hosts in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him"; it was nearly as good as his poem:

If that death by murder came and Satan's power triumphant be,
Counting not the sin and shame and his victims agony,
Could a mother bear that sight, a father drink the bitter cup,
And still believe all will come right when God makes his jewels
up

which is destined for success if, as has been said before about the works of the untalented, a publisher can be found. He often held up his much fumbled copy of OZ for the jury to see: "It's all right to dissent of course but what about the methods used here?" He said he wasn't asking the jury to convict on the basis of the cover alone "but look at it!" He reminded the jury that the film critic George Melly said "cunt" and "piss" in front of his children . . . "Well there you are"; and that Edward de Bono had said that OZ was a window on the hippy world and that was why he had written for it . . . "Windows sometimes need cleaning don't they?"

The editors Jim Anderson, Felix Dennis, and Richard Neville were found guilty last week of possessing obscene material for gain, sending obscene material through the post, but acquitted on the charge of intending to deprave and corrupt the morals of children within the realm. They were remanded in custody at Wandsworth jail without bail, pending medical and psychiatric reports before sentence is passed.

The trial was of course political. School kids OZ set out to undermine the steadying influence of the status quo, by directing itself at the most vulnerable part of its defences, children. Kids were being encouraged to question and think about everything for themselves. It might work particularly

as this section of society had little consideration for our favourite taboos, position and status. OZ has always attempted to make politics personable to its young readers. Radical but not issue orientated, political but not party involved it had to be vulnerable.

Not Political

The underground newspaper *Friends* (renamed *Frendz*) ran a number of articles during 1970 that would be considered particularly licentious by the public prosecutor. They included the Amsterdam suck film festival, dope articles and kids sex. But it also ran along side them features that were obviously party political, supporting the strikes that were then taking place. The editors had reliable reports that as much as the police wanted to raid the offices they ignored the paper because of the political associations. OZ isn't like that. It mixes up standards, is crude and ribald, and depresses tradition, all things difficult to control. Their vulnerability lay in the support the courts could get from emotive reaction, particularly regarding sex, that cut across class barriers. You'll find that Dagenham, and Chalfont St Peter do have a lot in common if you ask residents over 30 about OZ. A recent issue of the *Freethinker* quoted Tony Smythe of the NCCL as expressing shock and surprise at the verdict on the *Little Red School Book*; he should have known that our civil liberties rest on very shaky foundations. We'll have to learn in the same way that American (you don't have anything like our First Amendment) citizens learnt about Democracy in Chicago.

INK Suspended

It was announced on 28 July that as Richard Neville and Felix Dennis were co-directors, the radical newspaper INK would have to suspend business until the OZ verdict was announced. It may be closed down because of the trial. This was the publication that ran the story on Geoffrey Stewart-Smith (the man who managed unlike Judge Argyle to defeat George Brown for the Conservatives at Belper) and his white mercenary army. Stewart-Smith edits the American financed *East West Digest* described "as Britain's contribution in the fight against communism". INK showed conclusively that in complete op-

(Continued on back page)

THE OPEN SOCIETY AND ITS FRIENDS

DAVID TRIBE

The term "open society" appears to have originated with Henri Bergson, a man whom I would have described as the most prolix of all Continental philosophers were I not fearful of confrontation by a whole band of formidable rivals, and who in 1927 won the Nobel Prize for literature for the genius with which he said nothing in particular but said it very well. In 1932 he produced a work translated into English three years later as *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. It consisted mainly of the now-familiar criticism of mythological religion, which is static and, like "moral obligation", suitable for a "closed society", and a wish to replace it with mystical religion, which is dynamic and loving and the essence of an "open society". Mysticism may "lift the soul to another plane" while it "none the less ensures for the soul, to a pre-eminent degree, the security and the serenity which it is the function of static religion to provide".¹ "Never shall we pass from the closed society to the open society, from the city to humanity, by any mere broadening out. The two things are not of the same essence. The open society is the society which is deemed in principle to embrace all humanity."²

At a time when group, race and national loyalties were threatening the peace of the world, the concept of humanity was important. Yet how this was related to mystical religion—or any other sort of religion—was far from clear. The established churches were certainly particularistic and divisive, but the Teutonic folk religion of Rosenberg, which became the creed of the Third Reich, was eminently mystical. At any rate the danger of closed societies as described by Bergson was soon apparent. In the Soviet Union there was a passionate attachment to the beliefs of Marxist-Leninism and the national interests of Russia, echoed in the large and growing Communist Parties of the Western world. To meet this challenge to the claims of property and religion, Fascism and Nazism were promoted by some and connived at by others. Confrontation between East and West was averted till 1941 but there meanwhile developed a struggle between dictatorship and the liberal democracies, which had belatedly closed their ranks.

The Authority of Intelligence

In the closing year of the war K. R. (now Sir Karl) Popper, who was fortunate not to have been one of its victims, published *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, which really made the phrase popular. He agreed with Bergson that a closed society is "human society fresh from the hands of nature",³ or tribal society, but he was more concerned to explain the atrocities which had developed inside the Soviet Union, with Stalin's purges, and Nazi Germany, with Hitler's concentration camps. These atrocities occurred in countries whose ideologies were dominated by authoritarian views springing from Hegel and Plato respectively. They pre-supposed a design in history which Popper called "historicism", i.e. ideologues' belief in "laws of history which enable them to prophesy the course of historical events".⁴ In his view Fascism and Marxism were reactionary movements thrown up in the path of civilisation, "which aims at humaneness and reasonableness, at equality and freedom". "Piccemeal social engineering" is to be preferred to "Utopian social engineering"⁵ in gaining these ends. By contrast with Bergson's, his "terms indicate, as it were, an intellectualist distinction; the closed society is characterized by the belief in magical taboos, while the open society is one in which men have

learned to be to some extent critical of taboos, and to base decisions on the authority of their own intelligence. Bergson, on the other hand, has a kind of religious *distinction* in mind. This explains why he can look upon his open society as the product of a mystical intuition, while I suggest that mysticism may be interpreted as an expression of the longing for the lost unity of the closed society, and therefore as a reaction against the rationalism of the open society."⁶ In this analysis his aim was practical rather than theoretical. "Although the book presupposes nothing but open-mindedness in the reader, its object is not so much to popularize the questions treated as to solve them."⁷

While it may be complained that there is an element of historicism in Popper's scenario of the advance from a tribal to a civilized society, he advocates the "open society" and "open-mindedness" on the whole in a commonsensical way that most humanists—indeed most people, at any rate in Britain—would support. When his work first appeared it was a timely rebuke of the perils of dogmatism, religious, political or any other. Indeed it is a tribute to his success that few, even of those who claim to be Platonists, Hegelians or Marxists, would today find much to criticize in the political implications, as distinct from the philosophical analysis, of his long and learned two-volume treatise. The following generation has seen such a collapse of authoritarianism, and in certain respects of authority itself, that influential humanists speak of ours as an open society already: "Absolute authority has gone. In place of a single system of beliefs we have the open society."⁸ It could also be called the "open, pluralist society".⁹ By way of the ordinary usage of words this seems a sound enough description. Compared with, say, the relatively monolithic mediaeval world, our own society is both open and pluralist. Most citizens, I imagine, want to see it stay that way. If they have studied history they will know that its survival is not guaranteed, that it must be actively promoted.

Closer to the Churches

In some humanist circles it is now being stated that the promotion of the open society should be the primary, if not the only, goal of the movement. Considering the clear hazards of a closed society, however defined, one might at first hail this goal as a great and glorious one. Of course we all want an open society insofar as we don't want a closed one. But will the campaign that is now being pushed in the movement stand up to a second inspection? It is one thing to promote something by resisting whatever pressures frustrate it. It is another to set out in the confident belief that one should disrupt existing society and political institutions to impose on the world a blueprint we are convinced will be better. There comes to mind one of the dilemmas of "ideal act utilitarianism"¹⁰ (which seeks to promote those actions which produce the purest happiness), and it is not surprising to find that "open society" humanists believe utilitarianism to be "the ideal of an harmonious development of human nature in all classes of society".¹¹ Now, utilitarianism, contrasted with, say, predestination or juju, is also a worthy aspiration. But there is a difference, from the standpoint of both advisability and practicality, between promoting happiness by removing specific causes of unhappiness and intervening—or refusing to intervene—in social questions according to abstract egghead notions of what happiness consists in. Thus John Stuart Mill was able to oppose the Welfare State on the grounds that it came between the individual

and his social duty and obstructed the free flow of a market economy, and the lusts of the flesh on the grounds that these did not, in his estimation, bring true happiness. This highly dubious nineteenth-century system is however called "humanist social philosophy today".¹²

Another ancestor of the "open society" as now promoted is Ethical Culture, which "was not intended to be an attack on the churches nor competition with them, but rather to establish an ethical foundation for social reform and an ethical outlook to survive the decay of religious conviction".¹³ By advancing personal reform in accordance with some universalist ideal howsoever determined, this movement was always much closer to the churches in its real sympathies than to secularism, which instead stressed social factors and the realities of political lobbying. So today the heirs of the ethicist tradition believe that "Christians who accept the 'open mind' and the 'open society' as major ideals, and who are ready to tackle realistically the common problems and tasks of a modern society, are surely better friends of the humanist than those who are fiddling sour old tunes regardless of what is really happening in Rome, or anywhere else".¹⁴ (What is really happening in Rome is, of course, a new Counter-Reformation, but the window-dressing of Vatican II was what this quotation had in mind.) It is not enough to pursue a "plural" society with many conflicting sects, or even a "pluriform" society, which "resembles more closely the international 'peaceful co-existence of different social systems' than a fully constituted open society. It is an integration of communities, rather than a full association of citizens."¹⁵ In practice, "class barriers, religious barriers, race barriers are not easily, nor often rightly, assaulted from without, but unless they crumble or are dismantled the pluriform society does not become the open society, and until that happens everyone finds his identity more by chance than by choice".¹⁶ Until very recently¹⁷ the humanist open society has always been described by reference to Popper's model: e.g. "the open society is correctly contrasted with the closed society, the abode (as Popper says) of totalitarianism and taboo".¹⁸ It is clear, however, that both by tradition and by temperament many of its supporters are really more interested in Bergson's model.

Ambiguous and Muddled

One of the consequences of this is a desire to be well thought of in religious circles, even if this amounts to supporting pluriform rather than open policies: "The humanist may want to dissuade the Roman Catholic from wanting his own schools, but he is not likely to do this by enlarging on the evils of indoctrination and segregation. The situation is quite different if the Catholic has reason to know or to think that he lives in a society which scrupulously respects personal conviction and steadfastly upholds group independence."¹⁹ The phrase "open society" is so vague that as soon as one tries to make it a blueprint for action one runs into difficulties. In the cultivation of "openness" the state might conceivably close down its own schools to support those of any and every sect on the grounds that it should allow every parent to exercise his own individuality without interference. Alternatively, it might not only refuse to support sectarian schools financially but close all of them—and Sunday schools too—down on the grounds that they were interfering with the right of every child to achieve his own individuality without ideological pressures. Any theory which can lead to such bizarrely different practical consequences must be regarded with suspicion.

The sad truth is that the supporters of the humanist open society seem not to realize how ambiguous and muddled the whole concept is, just as they seem unable or unwilling to recognize the capacity of different people, whether motivated by self-interest or emotion or logical assessment, to reach different conclusions on what public policies should be pursued in our immensely complicated world. Thus we find statements like "On the many issues on which we take a common line, such as aid to economically underdeveloped countries, or war, we are pleased to and do co-operate keenly with religious and other organizations",²⁰ and "At a time when, economically and politically, nationalism makes less and less sense, when through communications and economic interest nations increasingly depend upon each other, when the obvious solution for Britain is to join the common market, the very first step towards burning its national barriers, nationalist feeling grows and grows".²¹ As far as I am aware there has never been a consensus over the nature (capital or consumer goods) or amount of overseas aid to be given, and humanists and religionists have been particularly in conflict over the form it should take (e.g. bibles or contraceptive pills). Most wars throughout history have not only divided humanists from religionists but have split each group down the middle. The same is true of the common market, which is far from being the "obvious solution" to any problems at all, Britain's or the world's. (It may be coincidental that those humanists who support the Social Morality Council, which is on balance under Catholic influence, appear to support, in all controversial questions—the Nigerian Civil War or the Treaty of Rome—the side favoured by the Vatican.)

The Triumph of Freethought

Some of the things that have been promoted in the name of the humanist open society, e.g. workers' participation in industry,²² may be useful aspirations, but it is by no means clear how they fit into either the Bergson or the Popper *schema*. Workers and employers in an industry may combine to exclude applicants from another race or to hold the community to ransom in the name of both wages and profits. Putting aside the concepts of philosophers, we can see better that no stable society has ever been "open" in any sense other than that it may allow emigration. Certainly there are degrees of closedness, but every society enshrines in its fiscal, social and foreign policies specific, debatable world-views arrived at by political processes and more or less representative of its majority. The mere fact that one can today advocate the open society and freely proclaim that "man is the measure of all things"²³ itself signifies the triumph of freethought down the centuries over the theocratic view of priest-controlled society where God is the measure of all things. It is rather ironic that the Athens of Pericles is held up as the epitome of the open society.²⁴ True, it had culture and heart-warming oratory, but the political realities were that the humanist Protagoras was charged with blasphemy and forced to flee while his books were burnt, the materialist Anaxagoras was fined for impiety, and a leisured élite lived well on slave labour. Is this the New Jerusalem of the open society?

The humanist movement has always, or nearly always, on the practical side stood for humanitarianism, law reform and civil liberties. It has also had an ideological content. This, I suggest, has had something to do with freethought, with secularism, with atheism, with materialism, with

(Continued on page 253)

FREETHINKER

editor: WILLIAM McILROY

103 Borough High Street,
London, SE1

Telephone: 01-407 1251

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

The *Freethinker* can be ordered through any newsagent, or obtained by postal subscription from G. W. Foote and Co. Ltd. at the following rates: 12 months, £2.55; 6 months, £1.30; 3 months, 65p; USA and Canada: 12 months, \$6.25; 6 months, \$3.13.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The *Freethinker* is obtainable at the following addresses.
London: Collets, 66 Charing Cross Road, WC2; Housmans, 5 Caledonian Road, King's Cross, N1; Freedom Press, 84b Whitechapel High Street (Angel Alley), E1; Rationalist Press Association, 88 Islington High Street, N1; Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, WC2; *Freethinker* office, 103 Borough High Street, SE1. Glasgow: Clyde Books, 292 High Street. Brighton: Unicorn Bookshop, 50 Gloucester Road (near Brighton Station).

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

Humanist Postal Book Service (secondhand books bought and sold). For information or catalogue send 5p stamp to Kit Mouat, Mercers, Cuckfield, Sussex.

Minority Rights Group's latest report—on the Southern Sudan and Eritrea—just out, price 30p from MRG, 36 Craven Street, London, WC2.

EVENTS

Ashurstwood Abbey Secular Humanism Centre (founded by Jean Straker), between East Grinstead and Forest Row, Sussex. Telephone Forest Row 2589. Meeting every Sunday, 3 p.m.

Humanist Holidays. Summer Centre in the Lake District is now full. Details of future activities from Marjorie Mepham, 29 Fairview Road, Sutton, Surrey. Telephone 642 8796.

The Progressive League, Halden House, Dunchideock, Exeter, 7-14 August, Summer Conference. Details from Ernest Seeley, c/o Progressive League, Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, London, N2.

London Young Humanists. A team of volunteers will be tidying the graves of Charles Bradlaugh and W. S. Ross ("Saladin") at Brookwood Cemetery on Sunday, 15 August. Details from the organiser: Nigel Sinnott, 5 Kew Gardens Road, Kew, Richmond, Surrey. Telephone 940 3794.

**DAVID TRIBE'S
PRESIDENT
CHARLES
BRADLAUGH, MP**
ELEK BOOKS, £4.00

I have nothing but praise for a book which, like its subject, contrives to be at the same time thorough and engagingly lively.—Tribune.

NEWS

CHRISTIAN LOVE IN BURNLEY

The campaign to amend the law relating to male homosexuality was carried to a successful conclusion in the teeth of bitter opposition by prudes, conformists and political opportunists. The Woldfenden Report, cynically rejected by a Tory Government afraid of offending the battleaxes in the Women's Conservative organisations, stimulated serious thought and discussion on the question. The Homosexual Law Reform Society mobilised the support of scores of distinguished citizens who sympathised with its aims. They included a number of prominent Christians, and some religious organisations produced humane and carefully considered statements. But the opposition to reform emanated from religious circles and, although they were defeated at Westminster and their fearful warnings that "making it legal" would lead to unspeakable acts of depravity being performed in the streets, our Christian moralists have not given up the struggle.

Despite the more tolerant atmosphere than that which prevailed ten years ago, homosexuals in Britain still have to contend with many problems like fear of exposure, discrimination and police harassment. An estimated 4,000 have another cross to bear; they happen to live in that fair Lancashire town, Burnley. It was planned that a club for homosexuals would be opened there, and immediately it became known an organisation called the Burnley and District Christian Group was formed to prevent the club being opened. They are reported to be opposing it for three reasons: that young people might be corrupted; that segregation is detrimental to homosexual; that the club might become a focal point for violent elements and lead to an outbreak of queer-bashing.

These intolerant, mealy-mouthed followers of gentle Jesus—who, it has been suspected, may himself qualify for membership of the club—add insult to injury by pretending to have homosexuals' welfare at heart. They try to justify their anti-sex phobia by giving utterly specious reasons for their action.

Young people are always in danger of being corrupted. (Large numbers of young Americans have been corrupted by their military and political leaders, and church leaders have blessed them as they left their homeland to become mass killers and drug addicts in Vietnam.) But a boy is in greater danger of being sexually corrupted when he attends choir practice than by the opening of a homosexual club. Such clubs are extremely careful about membership records, and it is unlikely that the local lads would be able to pop in for an hour as they would a coffee bar.

The segregation argument is hypocritical nonsense. Membership of an exclusively homosexual club could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as segregation. A member is likely to spend a few hours a week at the club, and devote the rest of the time to professional and social pursuits. His social activities would hardly include membership of the Burnley and District Christian Group. These pious Pecksniffians are unlikely to have much to offer even those repressed drag queens who take up Roman Catholicism or High Anglicanism.

AND NOTES

A homosexual club, like any other, could become a point for violence. But there are scores of such clubs, particularly in London and the Home Counties, and they are conducted in a perfectly orderly way, without objections from neighbours or the public. It is the activities of such nasty and intolerant organisations as the Burnley and District Christian Group which cause prejudice, misunderstanding, hatred, and often violence.

LEO ABSE REPLIES

We recently published an Open Letter to Leo Abse, MP, in which the writer, G. N. Deodhekar, accused the Labour Member for Pontypool of having made "unfair and unwarranted insinuations about other countries, particularly India". This followed remarks Mr Abse is reported to have made during the controversy about the 12-year-old Birmingham girl who was given an abortion and then put on the Pill.

Leo Abse's reply is published below.

"My I send a reply to the Open Letter you have published on my attitude to abortion and the age of consent. Those of us who are comrades in disbelief do not share the faith of those who on death await immortality. For us, therefore, there is no undervaluation of our one life: and it follows, above all, the secularist should have a reverence for life. All abortions, therefore, for us should be seen as defeats.

"They may be defeats of our medical knowledge which, short of killing the unborn child, sometimes cannot save the mother: they may be defeats because the community, masking its sadism under the guise of benevolence, punishes the unmarried mother by depriving her of her child rather than giving her support: they be defeats because society is too selfish to provide the social services and housing accommodation needed by the harassed mother having yet another child in an overcrowded slum. All abortions, however inevitable in present society, are defeats, for in a healthy and affluent society every child whether born in manger or palace should be warmly received. The destruction of an unborn babe can never be a victory. Secularists should not believe death is a victory, whatever the hymn chanters declare.

"I am sorry, however, that your correspondent should have felt wounded because I have expressed by views, undoubtedly too synoptically, and hence clumsily, on attitudes to abortion and the age of consent in Asia. I intended to emphasise my repugnance to the use of abortion as a front line birth control technique as in Japan. And my regret that despite the laws of India now making the minimum age of marriage there 16, that, certainly in the interior, marriages at an earlier age continue. I am aware, however, that the joint family system in India and the system of "gauna" (the departure of the bride to the husband's home) considerably modify the worst effects of these traditional marriages: and I would, therefore, be deeply sorry if my inelegance of expression should understandably have led Mr Deodhekar to feel I was insensitive to the prevailing refugee problems being endured by India."

THE OPEN SOCIETY AND ITS FRIENDS

(Continued from page 251)

determinism—notions that are distasteful to the New Humanism's new clerical friends. While professing their support for the open society (a notion happily so vague that in reality it commits them to nothing at all), in every area where they have power they are not prepared to recognize even the elementary demands of the pluriform society. There must indeed be rejoicing in the Vatican that some humanists can so glibly throw away the legacy of centuries and their democratic responsibilities as a countervailing force to organised obscurantism. (I dare not say "superstition", which all New Humanists know to have utterly vanished.)

REFERENCES

- 1 Translation by R. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brerton with assistance from W. Horsfall Carter, p. 181.
- 2 *ibid*, p. 230.
- 3 *ibid*, p. 229.
- 4 *The Open Society*, Vol. 1, p. 3. See also Popper's *The Poverty of Historicism* (1944-5).
- 5 *The Open Society*, Vol. 1, p. 1.
- 6 *ibid*, p. 178.
- 7 *ibid*, Preface, p. v.
- 8 James Hemming's *Individual Morality* (1969), p. 20. See also pp. 11, 26, 28, 32, 57, 110, 179, 181, 196 and 200.
- 9 *ibid*, pp. 199 and 201.
- 10 Terminology based on R. B. Brandt's *Ethical Theory* (1959) and J. J. C. Smart's *Outline of a System of Utilitarian Ethics* (1961), and used to describe the system in G. E. Moore's *Principia Ethica* (1903).
- 11 H. J. Blackham's *Humanism* (1968), p. 125. See also his *Religion in a Modern Society* (1966), pp. 135-6.
- 12 *ibid*, p. 55.
- 13 *ibid*, p. 133.
- 14 *ibid*, p. 166.
- 15 *ibid*, p. 62.
- 16 *ibid*, p. 63.
- 17 A. J. (Sir Alfred) Ayer's "The Character of an Open Society" (*Humanist*, July 1971).
- 18 David Pollock's "Humanism and the Open Society" (*Humanist News*, August/September 1970), continued in *ibid*, October 1970.
- 19 *Humanism*, p. 160.
- 20 Peter Draper's "Values in a Changing World" (*Humanist News*, July 1970).
- 21 See note 17.
- 22 *Humanist News*, October 1970.
- 23 Said by Protagoras, who is often claimed as the first humanist.
- 24 A quote from Pericles begins Popper's *Open Society*, and he is invoked as the ideal in *Humanism* (pp. 103-4) and *Humanist News* (August/September 1970).

SUNDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER

A DAY IN SUSSEX

Visit thirteenth-century Michelham Priory,
Long Man of Wilmington and Brighton

(houses of Herbert Spencer and G. J. Holyoake)

Coach leaves corner of Northumberland Avenue
and Trafalgar Square, London, at 9.30 a.m.

Price: £1.90

(which includes return fare, lunch at Michelham Priory
and admission charges)

Please state if vegetarian

Organised by the NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY
(in association with Brighton and Hove Humanist Group)

Bookings with payment to the NSS,

103 Borough High Street, London, SE1. Tel. 407 2717

BOOKS

RACE, INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION

by H. J. Eysenck. Temple Smith, 70p.

When a go-ahead young publisher combines with *New Society* to produce a series of books designed to elaborate the struggle towards a better future, one licks one's lips in lively anticipation. The subject of the first book is bang on target as a theme. Unfortunately its development is so lop-sided that, if read alone, as it is all too likely to be, it can only serve to aggravate white arrogance and exacerbate black resentment.

Of course, if the evidence for the intellectual inferiority of Africans is as solid as Professor Eysenck appears to think, then we must settle down to live with this fact of life. But is it? I have been involved in the development of primary education in Africa for over 12 years now and have watched little Africans becoming brighter and quicker in their responses the nearer we can bring them to modern, active infant methods. I just cannot correlate my experiences with Professor Eysenck's gloomy predictions. Admittedly, the book is mainly about American negroes, but it is plain from pages 84 to 86 that Professor Eysenck really suspects that Africans as a race are handicapped compared with most Europeans. The Irish, it appears are poor stuff too!

Wednesday.

Benny is walking along the path. He is going to school.



Friday.

Betty is walking along the path. She is going to school!



Work in English of an African child in third term at school. Age 7. Home language not English.

Professor Eysenck's case can be summarised quite briefly:

1. Racial inheritance can produce mental as well as physical differences (Obviously).
2. A preponderance of intellectual ability is inherited and not environmentally produced. (Strong evidence for this.)
3. Other things being as equal as possible, samples of white children in the United States get higher scores on intelligence tests than negro children. (Agreed.)

FREETHINKER

4. That this is evidence that the genetical pool of American negroes is inferior to the genetical pool of American whites. (Doubtful.)
5. That anyone who regards environmental factors as at all important in the development of intelligence is a scientific softie. (?)

Let us now take a look at some of the flaws in the argument. To begin with, intelligence tests, as 11-plus predictors in this country, were wrong in about 20 per cent of cases. So they aren't so hot as measures of comparative ability. Furthermore, it is possible that there are different cognitive styles and that established tests are selecting for the particular style that comes off well under our linear, academic kind of education. There may be other styles, differing somewhat in function, but equally valuable. We do not know whether this is so, but some evidence points in this direction. It is certainly unwise to make absolutist claims for traditional concepts of intelligence until we know a great deal more about the mind than we do at present.

Eysenck states, but brushes aside, a number of anomalies that, in fact, put a largish question mark against his assumptions. One is that although, for decades, the socially less successful groups in our society have been reproducing more prolifically than the socially more successful groups—which should, in Eysenck's theory, produce a decline in natural intelligence—no such decline has taken place. Another oddity is that non-white American females have a somewhat higher IQ, and spectacularly higher records of academic achievement, than non-white American males. This runs counter to the Eysenck position. Or is intelligence among negroes supposed to be sex-linked? Other examples of side-stepping awkward facts could be cited.

I must now mention what appear to me to be serious ethnic oversights. First, a question arising from my ignorance of the researches in question. Were the intelligence tests used timed or untimed? The Africans—and, incidentally, the Irish too—are resistant to becoming the time-slaves that most of us citizens of advanced countries have become. If you approach an African with a typically European "Can I have a quick answer about . . ." approach, he will regard you as an uncivilised person who does not know how human beings ought to communicate with one another. Many intelligence tests are, and for statistical reasons have to be, time-based. The start-now-stop-now techniques of intelligence testing are utterly alien to the African way of life, and the most likely response to them is a total or partial block. That culturally based resistance is quite enough, by itself, to account for a significant discrepancy in scores. Add to that a tendency to impulsiveness—characteristic of both Africans and the Irish—that Professor Eysenck has himself noted, and the whole comparative intelligence scores thing really does fall apart.

Yet another gap appears in Professor Eysenck's assumptions that Raven's Matrices are culturally "fair". African cultures are round-minded rather than square-minded. An African home help who displays a great range of competent skills may, nevertheless, hang pictures crooked and leave a pair of beds set skew to one another. Squareness does not obsess the Africans as it obsesses us—just count the right-angles in your home. Hence, to an African African, a puzzle matrix is a very curious object indeed, which is not conducive to response. These are only two

REVIEWS

examples of culture gaps that could throw the statistics. Sundry other bits of cultural ignorance also appear in the book. To be black and socially inferior does not, according to Eysenck, affect confidence. Then why do the advertisers in the African Press make such a great play with creams to make the skin paler?

N'ANGAS

It's easy to be a N'anga.
All you need is a python skin
And some ancient bones.
He finds his evil spirits
Only among Africans.
Is there apartheid in hell?
One day I'll be a white N'anga,
And operate in a hospital
For bodies, and not souls.

Poem written by a boy in Form IIB of an African secondary school. Home language not English. N'Anga=Witchdoctor.

My feeling is that it is time someone turned the tables on those who seek to use intelligence tests for comparing the intelligence of different races. Africans seem to have a "natural" flair for carving wood and stone. Now carving requires all kinds of high-order skills: precise neuromuscular control, the ability to imagine in three dimensions, a good spatial sense of a particular kind, etc. I suggest we establish norms among an African population for carving animals from wood. We then might assemble a sample of academics and give them each a hunk of wood straight from the tree, and a crude cutting implement. This Carve-An-Animal Spatial and Creative Ability Test will then be set in motion and precisely timed. Any member of the group who fails to produce an animal that scores below one Standard Deviation from the mean will be declared genetically inferior.

The weakness of this book, and all such books, is that they raise a tower of hypothesis on an extremely restricted base. In his introduction to this book, Professor Eysenck states: "I know perfectly well that we do not know all the answers, and feel little confidence that such views as I have formed are necessarily correct". Readers would be well advised to insert that statement mentally at the top of every page.

JAMES HEMMING

WHAT THEY'VE SAID ABOUT . . . NINETEENTH-CENTURY REFORMERS

by Frank E. Huggett. Oxford University Press, 60p.

In each one of us, however indolent, there will be found a tiny reformer, deeply imbedded, but ever struggling to get out. In this collection the ten prominent reformers

selected by Mr Huggett from his period were anything but indolent. They were, without exception, men of the greatest energy and courage, with a prodigious capacity for work, as of course they would need to be to overcome the bitterly hostile opposition usually awaiting those who seek to change man's condition even when that condition is quite deplorable.

The ten men chosen are Daniel O'Connell, Francis Place, William Cobbett, William Wilberforce, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Robert Owen, Richard Cobden, Sir Edwin Chadwick, Charles Bradlaugh and James Keir Hardie. The scheme of presentation is temptingly attractive with a great deal of source material which sheds its distant light not only on the reformers themselves but willy-nilly, on their critics and admirers also. Each section begins with a short summary by the author which is followed by brief descriptions of his character and appearance, and assessment of achievements by those who knew him. These extracts are followed by more reflective views of later historians and statesmen and finally by the views of some historians writing at the present time.

Take, for example, William Cobbett. This complicated life is very ably summarised by Frank Huggett, and followed by many short contemporary views and extracts from his own writing and includes a delightful lampoon "The Member for Odium" (Oldham) with the endearing first lines: "Mr C-B-T ask'd leave to bring in very soon, A Bill to abolish the Sun and the Moon". This is followed by a moving extract from Cobbett's "Advice to Young Men", and then one from Hazlitt's brilliant essay on him. The modern view is by Asa Briggs who concludes: "He never changed his prejudices, though he often changed his mind".

What is generally known about these notable men varies enormously. Some attracted the limelight; others, like Francis Place, incidentally one of the first advocates of birth control, kept himself deliberately out of it, though his library was a main meeting place in London for radical politicians. Sir Edwin Chadwick also remains a "lonely, enigmatic and unappreciated figure". His driving impulse was sanitation, holding that the unsanitary conditions of the time, with inadequate drainage and water supplies were a menace to public health, and worked with the greatest passion towards their improvement. An amusing example of his concern for detail towards the public good was the training of firemen's horses to run to the fire tender at the sound of an "electric telegraph" saving thereby a vital two-and-a-half minutes. His main concern, drains, was unspectacular, unglamorous, and he had much opposition and abuse to contend with, but Mr Huggett pays him this fine tribute: "It could be justly argued that of all the reformers dealt with in this book he did most to make the lives of the majority of people in Britain longer, healthier and happier".

The author stresses the diversity of characters, backgrounds and views of these nineteenth-century reformers. The physically big extroverts no doubt enjoyed some of the battles. Others were like Wilberforce, "a thin, twisted, conscience-stricken individual, very much concerned with his current standing in the eyes of God". Some were unbelievers like Owen, with his pleas for the complete rejection of religion which he considered essential for the betterment of mankind, and Bradlaugh whose "real importance lies in the fact that he was courageous enough to stand for liberty of thought and conscience in an age which largely favoured hypocrisy and cant".

(Continued on back page)

LETTERS

The Welsh Extremist

Writers frequently complain of reviewers who have not read their books. Whether or not that applies to Lord Raglan, his review tells us nothing whatever about the book under discussion. It does suggest that his lordship is suffering from some sort of Welsh neurosis.

According to him the upsurge of Welsh nationalism is in some way the result of the Act of 1535 together with a plethora of historical novels. Nevertheless, he cannot but be aware that English has proliferated in Wales as the end-product of a process of linguistic intolerance. That this has engendered a moderate degree of counter-violence, as has happened as the result of a similar intolerance in Belgium, is hardly a matter for surprise. He attributes the limited survival of Welsh to it being rooted in Nonconformity. The success of Nonconformity in Wales was due precisely to its adoption of Welsh. From that I would draw the implication that to lumber rationalism with such an irrelevancy as English cultural imperialism is the most effective way to ensure that it becomes an exclusively English preoccupation, as far as these islands are concerned. If Scottish law finds favour in your pages Lord Raglan's case rests decidedly not proven, while I anticipate his probable charge of insularity with the rejoinder, "Vive les différences!"

PADRAIG O CONCHUIR.

The Celtic Revival and its Enemies

It is unusual for me to find myself lining up in the columns of this journal with the Free Wales Army and the Celtic League, but I feel that Lord Raglan's review of *The Welsh Extremist* calls for a reply, not in terms of his criticism of the book itself (which I have not read), but in terms of the assumptions Raglan makes about the Celtic Revival and nationalism generally.

I am well aware that some of the worst enemies of the Celtic Revival are its apparent friends, a fact which Lord Raglan has capitalised upon at length, but then the same is true of many other movements, such as the churches, the political Left, and the humanists. This phenomenon, in itself, is a feature of our human condition, and by itself does not invalidate the claims of any of these organisations. Raglan trots out the old chestnut about Celtic language revivalists being romantic reactionaries, in love with an historical myth, trying to recreate the past. I am suspicious about this being true of the Welsh, and it certainly is not true of the Irish, as a whole. I agree there are vociferous individual cases—every good movement has to suffer its ration of cranks. As for English being the "despised language of commerce", well, I have seen plenty of new banks in the Irish-speaking areas of County Donegal!

Lord Raglan also upholds, by implication, the myth that those imbued with a romantic sense of history are dogmatic reactionaries. They may be, but so may be those who ignore it: "We are not here to read about history, but to make it" (Fascist cliché). One of the most progressive movements in English history, the Levellers, depended for its momentum upon a powerful historical theory (one might say myth) about the Norman conquest. The freethinker and radical, Charles Bradlaugh, was also imbued with a profound sense of history, and he was both a realist and a progressive, and advocated political devolution for Wales and Scotland. Much the same may be said of Garibaldi and Jan Masaryk.

It is probably true that Welsh was saved by the Bible being translated into that language—by the Tudor government, with the specific object of wiping out Welsh "the more speedily". However, a printed work the length of the Bible provides a standard text for about 90 per cent of the vocabulary of everyday speech. It may also be true that English itself was saved by the invention of printing, coupled with the loss of Normandy by the Angevins.

I agree that nationalism, and the revival of an old vernacular tongue, may lead to harmful isolation and a narrow chauvinism, but I do not see this as necessarily implicit. The creation of Czechoslovakia, and the revival of Czech and Slovak, was largely the work of a number of academic romantics, and they managed to create, by the standards of the time, a highly civilised and progressive State from 1919 to 1938. The whole question anyway, is not simply one of nationalism versus internationalism, what is required today is a sense of balance and dynamic equilibrium, both a world view and a sense of local identity. Without both, I feel, the individual and society are imperilled.

Lord Raglan also tacks pretty close to the reactionary, nineteenth century concept of Social "Darwinism", by implying that these languages would die a natural death if left alone, but for these revivalist extremists. True, probably, but if we are judging Celtic languages and culture solely by the (so-called) "law of the

jungle" we must not forget that the only criterion for the right to survive in the jungle is survival itself, by whatever means (irrespective of method). Man, however, does not have to bend to the winds of his environment to survive; he has (somewhat imperfectly) learnt to bend the winds to himself. We can, therefore, afford to be generous to cultural and linguistic minorities; indeed, therein lies our hope for the future.

NIGEL SINNOTT.

WHAT THEY'VE SAID ABOUT . . . NINETEENTH CENTURY REFORMERS

(Continued from previous page)

All these are treated at length with source material both for and against, and the reader can himself sum up—a very gratifying exercise—the more so, indeed, as this delightfully produced paperback is enhanced by many full page illustrations—real period stuff, of course. Some very interesting portraits and cartoons, one for each reformer, serious or amusing as the case calls for, not forgetting Britannia, sword in hand, prim and pure from the pages of *Punch* dealing effortlessly with Keir Hardie and king mob as they so richly deserve. Hilariously funny these last two, seen from our point in time.

In his conclusion Mr Huggett writes: "They were often right, while virtually the whole of the rest of their generation were wrong. This should act as a salutary warning to those who condemn others too hastily in our age".

JESSE COLLINS

THE ESTABLISHMENT HITS BACK: OZ EDITOR TO BE DEPORTED?

(Continued from front page)

position to the Labour Government, and with the full knowledge of Scotland Yard, he attempted to raise a volunteer army for Vietnam. Stewart-Smith has often been quoted as saying that pornography (by which he means sexual display) is yet another plot of the communists to undermine the moral standards of the west.

What has happened to choice of expression, and freedom of speech in Britain? The Sunday after the verdict Mary Miles concluded her articles on OZ and *The Little Red Schoolbook* in the *Observer*: "It is time that adults concerned with these publications grew up". At this stage that is not the point. The OZ defendants are obviously being tarred and feathered for one interpretation of just that. When *The Little Red Schoolbook* was published in Holland there was an immediate public outcry. But the authorities were unable to ban it. Instead they answered with a *Little Green Book*, that was a text for the traditional repressive educational system, and the middle of the road reformists added the *Little Orange Book*. Dutch school children had a choice.

On a recent Jimmy Saville programme Lord Longford tried in his usual inarticulate manner to sum up a scale of value for what he thought were pornographic magazines. "I've asked at a bookstall for *Playboy* and they'll give it to you reluctantly, and say they won't touch *Penthouse*. I'll go to another bookstall and they'll sell you *Penthouse* but won't touch *Forum*. *Forum* is about third on the list of naughty magazines". According to this scale we are now about fifteenth on the list of countries which still profess a freedom of choice in the ways people shall think. What they shall read, and how they decide to be instructed. Britain is suffering from a low growth rate; demands for a better standard of living are not the only thing that depletes a nations resources.