

Philosophy

IMP.

Impartiality?

May I suggest, as a starting point the most common complaints against the W.E.A.?

The Conservative complain that ^{it is} Socialist.

The Socialist complain, that it is Conservative.

Unfortunately, the two complaints do not cancel out. For both complain that the "impartial" W.E.A. is boring, and "takes you nowhere". There you have the problem of impartiality in a nutshell.

Or to put it in a quite uncontentious fashion: there are mutual complaints of left and right bias and there is agreement that the so-called unbiased or impartial W.E.A. is thoroughly unsatisfactory to ~~both~~ ^{the} parties concerned.

But can an educational association be other than impartial? And, as it can not,

- why does it ~~seem~~ ^{appear} so difficult to achieve this impartiality?
- and why, if and when it is achieved, does it prove an educational failure?

The complaint of ~~such~~ ^{the} partiality ~~to~~ ^{the} conservative position comes mainly from outside the W.E.A. It is our great difficulty with the Trade Unions and the Socialist wing of the Labour movement. But many within the W.E.A., both members and tutors, sympathise with their complaint.

~~I think that~~ ^{It is} ~~in~~ ^{almost} ~~the~~ ^{complete} ~~W.E.A.~~ ^{agreement} ~~amongst~~ ^{us} that the W.E.A. ~~should~~ ^{must} not to be made into an instrument of Conservative politics. This will be naturally countered by the demand for unanimity ~~on the~~ ⁱⁿ converse position, ~~is~~ ^{that} it should not be made into an instrument of Socialist politics either. I think that ~~there is~~ ^{an} agreement ~~also~~ ^{exists} For those who strongly believe in a socialist education can hardly demand more and, in fact, do not, I understand, demand more than impartiality, i.e., equal chances and opportunities, ~~for all~~ ^{for all}. They demand that the socialist position should be on the same footing as the conservative ~~in the W.E.A. education~~ ^{in the W.E.A. education}

Here we are faced ~~at once~~ ^{with} the crux of the problem ~~via.~~ ^{for the} why does it ~~seem~~ ^{appear} so difficult to achieve impartiality. The parity between right and left ceases at this point. The right does not stand for equality or parity, it stands for impartiality. In the conservative sense of the term, which implies that the idea of education excludes the very existence of the problem of partiality. The conservative does not agree that his ~~own~~ ^{views} are partial. ~~He~~ ^{asserts} that his view of the problem is the

real thing - a problem of partiality ~~itself~~ ^{indeed he tends to}

~~Impartial view and that anybody who raises the question of bias stands for partiality.~~ *in education*

~~Impartial~~

in education

Heck reveals himself as an atheist of course
The right is, thus, in the most favourable position of not only agreeing that education ~~should be~~ *should be* impartial but being able to assert that it is his education which is impartial. ~~The~~ *The* insistence on the conservative bias of ~~this~~ "impartial" type of education is denounced as a proof of partiality. *on (his) the part of his critics.*

Quid juris? -

Let me re-formulate the question *(in its simplest form) and let*

me doubt for the sake of argument
I take it that at least for the sake of argument ~~we~~ *we* are all agreed that the W.E.A. should not be allowed to be monopolised as ~~an~~ *an* instrument of conservative views. Where we disagree, ~~again for the sake of~~ *again for the sake of* argument, ~~is~~ *is*, I take it, the assertion, ~~which~~ *which* the meaning of the term impartial can become and ~~is~~ *is*, in fact, the great instrument of this one-sided influence. *(in some degree intended to become an means instrument)*

And Ford will be very surprised about this, if this was so.
while ~~There is nothing mysterious about this.~~ *There is nothing mysterious about this.* What we assert is, ~~that~~ *that* it is generally agreed that education ought to be impartial, ~~but~~ *but* the conservative interpretation of the term impartial allows conservative views in education to pass as impartial.

in fact
This is only one of the numerous instances in which all parties agree ~~of~~ *of* the general ~~idea~~ *idea*, but the dominant interpretation of that general term is suited to the position and outlook of the ~~race~~ *race*, nation, class or group which ~~is~~ *is* happens to be ruling in the community. *around*

all
All parties ~~may~~ *may* be agreed to on the validity of the idea of justice, and yet it cannot be doubted that there is such a thing as a racial or national or class concept of justice which may serve very effectively the domination of the race, nation or class in question. ~~History~~ *History* offers ~~many~~ *many* instances, of the kind. Medieval justice by ordeal, justice according to tribal custom according to Roman law, according to Nazi philosophy and according to Western European standards are very different things.

All parties ~~may~~ *may* be agreed that liberty and freedom are valid ~~ideas~~ *ideas*, yet the freedoms of a medieval corporation, the liberties of the barons; the liberty of the middle class industrial employer of ~~the~~ *the* early capitalist are very different interpretations of the term which however have in common that they suit the position and outlook of the ruling group ~~this~~ *this* in the commonwealth (the freedom of the trade unionist is an instrument of working class influence.).

Praxis

I submit that there is a close analogy between the terms equality, freedom, liberty, justice and the term impartiality. A discussion of the role of the term impartial which would be based on a refusal to ~~consider~~ ^{analyze} the historical and social function of that term would amount to a denial of the relevance of historical and sociological inquiries in human affairs. Such an obviously incomplete discussion could no more ^{be regarded as} be scientific, objective i.e. impartial than a ^{discussion of} ~~discussion of~~ the political ^{relevance} ~~relevance~~ of the concept of justice, equality of liberty, could claim authority for its conclusions if the ^{author's} ~~author's~~ inquiry had ^{deliberately} ~~deliberately~~ excluded the historical aspect of the science of politics. ^{from his work attempted to} ~~from his work~~ ^{original} ~~original~~

At this point the upholders of the unhistorical nature of these terms may hope for a new innings. They might contend that the analogy is not nor cannot be complete.

At this point the upholder of the ahistorical nature of these terms might hope to have a new innings. He might interpose that the scientific method to which we ~~appeal~~ are appealing presupposes ~~clear impartial~~ impartiality, which cannot be subject to very validity of the per scientific conclusions presuppose these of objective i.e. impartial methods. ~~Whatever the case, the analogy is not and cannot be complete. For impartiality is a precondition of the finding of truth. While it is impossible to find the truth without being just, or the truth on equality without being equal to the truth on liberty without being free; it is impossible to discover the truth about impartiality without being impartial.~~

But this argument does not hold water. The ~~inherent~~ ^{abstract and formal} impartiality of the scientific method has nothing to do with the substantial impartiality of the ~~game~~. Not one in a million who would take sides as an unlooker in a game would dream of cheating if he were made the umpire. The ~~formal~~ ^{rules of the} rules of the game have nothing to do with the validity of the reasons which may make you take sides in a struggle, or conflict, ~~what ever nature it may be~~. Impartiality as a characteristic of the scientific method, is ~~an absolute precondition of the investigation of facts or the research into truth. It is of formal nature, and though even the rules of the seeking of truth may be subject to historical change, it is a fact that in one and the same period of history, these rules are common to all.~~ ^{the underlying} The question is therefore not how ~~to investigate into the~~ ^{to investigate} ~~role of the terms justice, equality, liberty or freedom, or in our case, the role of the terms impartiality and impartiality~~ ^{the role of the terms} ~~but whether we should or should not regard the historical sociological and psychological aspect of the question as relevant to the inquiry. It is here that the views of Right and Left agree that facts have to be fully accounted for etc. Academic methods. Socratic methods. The impartiality which encourages change.~~

Cracks in the impartiality

- 1) No change in the sense of them
- 2) But on the other hand, the development of change can proceed differently in carrying out the inquiry impartially

4.

A) A fraction of universal education is
no education at all

And even 100% universal education
may not make the worker
educated, because it is
not the education ~~needed~~
which he needs.

Amalgamating: "Less is just enough for him,"
"not at all."

It is a question of getting the
wrong thing.

Upper class education is an
education for leadership
& rule.

The problem of the worker class
a) actually: not has
b) probably: on condition
that it funds its way.

B) A different education postulated:
Emancipation of the working class

Problem of unpaired axes
new:

1) Logan of unpaired

No. 3. March 38

Prof A.M. Fraser: to make for a type of steel
Lambert Hughes: Cement - Prof. F. Reynolds

Mrs Barbara Wootton

No. 2. Dec 37. A Paper on the Cambridge Railway

RHS Cromwell

Highway: The Place of the Tower in the

2. Feb. 38

W.D.

Mitrovich (V.B.)
Impassioned
Impassioned

Madame Chairman,

I have read a vast amount of discussion on this subject, including Mrs. Barbara Wootton Crossman, Professor Frazer and last not least Professor Hogben.

From the point of view of a W.E.A. tutor it seemed to build down to a most practical difficulty which is this:

If we do try to be impartial half of the class drops out because they cannot stand the boredom; if we cease being impartial, we seem to get so objectionable that the other half drops out, too.

I will not deal with the broader issue of Adult Education, which falls into very sections each having its own peculiar problem.

Take the Adult Education problem from the point of view of the Education for Citizenship. They are on the point of publishing a compendious study on the subject. Their problem seems to be this: Which A citizen of what state are you educating for? The idea that their ~~is a~~ exists an abstract ideal of a citizen, who passes a pass par tout through eternity as a mere uncritical generalisation which manages to remain unconscious of its own premises. Certainly the countries which are the most active to-day in educating for citizenship as e.g. Soviet-Russia and

2.

or the United States of America
or Germany would ~~never~~ agree to the definition of a citizen
which appears to be so self evident to ~~me~~ e.g. Sir Ed.
Simon that he would deem it unnecessary ~~to~~ ~~define~~
define the his ~~citizen~~ citizen. What he really means, is not
a citizen in abstracto at all, but the ideal citizen of
present day England, as it is now, making no serious provisions
at all for the case of the necessity of sudden change in one direction
or another. Education thus became almost synonymous with
Impartiality and no wonder that it proves impossible to
find any audience who will stand this kind of education for any
length of time.

University Extension also is a task of Adult Education.
The problem takes here on the form: Extending what to whom?
Frankly it is much more a an organ or factor of forming
public opinion than education in the proper sense of the term.
The specific problem of impartiality does not arise in the way
it is bound to arise in a genuine educational task.

We are dealing not with Adult Education, nor with University
Extension work nor with Education for Citizenship, but with our
own W.E.A. work, with the worker's educational movement.

Now I should like to exclude another group of questions:
The WEA is an educational movement. No other propaganda than
that for the WEA has any room in it. I exclude entirely the prob-
blem of political propaganda. Whether that should or should
not be allowed in the WEA or in close connection with it, would

3

in no manner alter the fact that teaching work and political propaganda are as different tasks as agitating for the building of a bridge and actually building a bridge; as growing cabbages and eating cabbages; as buying a railway time table and driving an engine. They are two entirely different and separate things. There is no difficulty at all in distinguishing the advocacy of a political party or the actual participation in its work from teaching work.

Still here we are dangerously near our ~~main~~ ^{to actual} subject. Nobody will doubt that teaching can be biased and that that bias may be due to the political predilections of the teaching person. What about it?

Teaching can be biased: in more than one way:

1. The very subject may be such that not everybody would ^{equally} accept it as a subject conveying ~~scientific~~ ^{worthwhile} knowledge. E.g. many doctors believe that homeopathy ought not to be taught because it is unscientific; ~~similar~~ ^{homeopaths} similar views are held amongst allopaths in reference to allopathy; not every student of politics regards the Marxian theory of the State or for that matter the materialist interpretation of history as a worthwhile subject; some Marxists on the other hand might regard the Hegelian theory of the State as taught by Bosanquet as not much better than a mystification; some political economists would regard the teaching of the Marxian theory of value as definitely biased teaching; while many people who are not Marxists deem the teaching of the Vienna school in its current form to be more liberal if for many years sociology was regarded as a non-science by some or not Fascist propaganda; the upshot of ~~this~~ ^{all} it is that the very existence of a subject may be contentious in the world of science.

This simple fact goes in truth to the heart of the matter. The concept of objective science is based on the mistaking the current

4
academic views for the revelation of the nature of things. Tomorrow that which was undoubtedly science today may have become a mere obsolete prejudice as we do regard aerology or alchemy today.

The same holds true to an even greater extent of the presentation of the method and the substance matter of all human sciences themselves. Politics, ethics, economics, sociology, and to a minor degree philology and psychology ~~more~~ are in their very nature contentious subjects except in the rare periods of definitely consolidated state of society. During every other period, they are contentious, for indeed changing views on these subjects are of the essence of change in society. The attempt to prevent it, to stereotypise them would be tantamount to the attempt at preventing change from happening in the normal way and driving society towards its own destruction.

This true whether we take the subject matter or the method and take history. What is the history of the XIXth century? Is it the history of the royal family and the story of the battles and other official functions of the leading states? Or is it the rise of these forces in the sphere of industry, ~~and~~ party politics and science technology and religion which determined the actions of these statesmen? I am not talking now of industrial and social history, though there similar problems are inevitable too. The very subject is contentious. Even more so, the treatment of the subject, the method. ~~Should we accept the current~~ Should we accept the current views on the period in question or criticise these views while at the same time presenting our own views in a positive form?

Now my contention is that the very idea that in these sciences there exists anything like an unconscious matter is a new development and

"Knowledge for knowledge's
sake" is the false reason
Psychologists, ^{that} anthropologists & atomic
research ~~at work~~ are
mainly justified by it.

Power for power's sake -
Science is only an other
word for power. —