

THE HARROVIAN

VOL. CXXXIII NO.9

November 14, 2020

EUROPEAN HISTORY CHAMPIONS

International History Bee and Bowl, 8 November

On the weekend of Saturday 8 November, a team of historians entered the European Championship of the International History Bee and Bowl, a quiz competition on world historical trivia. Although the competition was held virtually this year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it will certainly remain a memorable one for years to come.

In the first match, Harrow faced a team from the Britannica International Team in Budapest. In spite of a slow start from some of the newer members of the Harrow team in the first quarter, sharpness on the buzzer from Alexander Morrison, *Newlands*, clawed Harrow back towards an advantage, giving us a narrow lead going into the third quarter. Despite having to pick second in the topical round, Harrow managed to pull away and ended up winning by a convincing 250 to 200 scoreline against a strong opposition side.

We were then drawn against a Polish side that was fielding a slightly smaller team than is typical. However, Harrow was able to exceed even the wildest expectations of their advantage, with some obscure answers coming from Edward Blunt, *Elmfield*, and Harrow went on to win by a score of 370 to 60.



International
History Bee & Bowl
European Division

Much like Eurovision, there was also some debate (internally) among the team over what constituted the European continent. In the midst of this, Harrow was drawn against the Hebrew Reali School, a prominent private educational institution in Haifa, Israel, who had won both of their previous matches. By this point, the team was beginning to get into their stride, with some strong answers from captain Dylan Winward, *Lyon's*. The quality of the answers in this round even prompted a question from the moderator on whether they even needed to write full questions, since Harrow would know the answers almost immediately anyway.

After the break, Harrow was drawn against a strong side from the International School of Geneva at the Campus De Nations. Both teams entered this round particularly confident, having won all of their games up until this point by a reasonable margin. In the end, Harrow were fortunate to receive questions that largely played to our strengths, with the musical and classical expertise of Joseph Wragg, *Moretons*, adding an ingredient that was just missing from the School's entry last year. In the end, the 340-180 score-line was deceptively closer than the match ended up being and told a perhaps slightly unfair tale of our success. Furthermore, one got the slight impression that the Swiss school had slightly more left in the tank, with some of their strongest players remaining as substitutes for this game.

Harrow was then drawn against La Grande Boissière School (also Switzerland) and answered difficult questions to take home a 320 to 210 victory. However, this round was not without some hiccups along the way. Notably, it took an impressive performance in a round of questions about the Celtic warrior

queen Boudica to win the round for Harrow, along with the characteristically reliable brilliance of Gareth Tan, *Moretons*, in his trademark fourth round.

The School were then announced to be in the semi-final and the team prepared to play the International School of Nice. Although the first round was close and there was scarcely a hair separating the two teams, the consistency of the Harrow team in getting answers right quickly enabled them to win a victory by a convincing margin, in which our opponents had visibly given up by the end of the third quarter to qualify for the European Final of the International History Bowl.

Here, the School again faced the International School of Geneva, who had also steamrollered their semi-final opponents to set up a dramatic rematch showdown. This time, the match proved to be significantly closer. Although Harrow emerged from the first round with a convincing 30-point lead, some unforced errors in the second quarter allowed Geneva back into the match and claw their way back. For the first significant time in the competition, Harrow found themselves trailing by 10 points going into a crucial third quarter. Here, things turned from bad to worse as some tactical errors meant that the losing margin was 30 points, in spite of some miraculous answers from Henry Ridley, *The Park*. Even in a virtual environment, the tension going into the final round was palpable, particularly given the longer than usual break between the final quarters of the match. With just eight questions left to go, Harrow needed to make up 30 points, and didn't give themselves the best start when they lost 20 points on the first question to some strong answering from our Swiss opponents. The two sides then traded blows and Harrow managed to claw their way back to trailing by 30 points with two questions to go. Here, we saw what can only be described as the answer of the tournament, with Henry Ridley, *The Park*, getting a correct answer after only the words "anointed by Zadok" were read by the moderator. Because of the speed at which Henry pulled out "Solomon", Harrow managed to get the maximum available points of the question, settling the tied score. With only one question to go, the European championship was now in the balance. And cometh the hour, cometh the man, Tan dug the School out of jail (not for the first time in History quiz competitions) and produced an answer which meant that Harrow had won the European Championship.

Although a slightly less successful affair, we also received good news in that Wragg had placed fifth out of a strong field of competitors in the European Individual History Bee Competition.

The team would like to thank RP and the History Department for all of their help and advice in facilitating Harrow's entry to the tournament, and the members of their team for giving up a significant amount of their weekend to bring silverware and glory to the Harrow name.

GORE SOCIETY

Lucas Maia, Druries, "Wittgenstein and Linguistic Philosophy", NS2, 20 October

For the final Gore Society lecture of this half-term, the society welcomed Lucas Maia, *Druries*, who talked about the famous philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein's linguistic philosophy in a jam-packed (yet of course socially distanced) NS2.

Maia started off by stating that the communication of human thoughts is confined to being expressed in words. Thoughts are never fully able to manifest themselves into language and alternative media. For instance, there aren't any words in between smart and dumb, and therefore we subconsciously translate linguistic vision into language, and it has to be at one end so the original thought loses some meaning. Maia asked the audience what they associated with the word "chair", and there was an extremely interesting discussion on what a "chair" really was. He moved on to quote Wittgenstein: 'The limits of my language are the limits of my world.' An example was the word 'bridge' in German and Spanish – in German, it's a feminine noun, and in Spanish it's a masculine noun. Therefore, German people tended to describe a bridge as having feminine-associated characteristics, including beauty and elegance, while Spaniards tended to describe as being strong and sturdy.

Our thoughts are constrained to the format of language, and the format of language revolves around the culture from which it originated. For example, the Inuit people have over 40 different words for snow, as they live in an icy climate. Maia gave the audience the challenge of explaining a penalty kick to someone, and from this it was evident that no words existed as itself – all words exist in an interconnected interdependent web. Leading on from that, how can we know the meaning of any words if they're all dependent on each other? This seems like circular logic and begs the question as to whether words mean anything at all. Wittgenstein was a philosopher whose objective was to solve the problems of philosophy with regards to language. Interestingly enough, Wittgenstein disagreed with almost everything he wrote in his most famous book, *Tractatus Philosophicus*, which was very rare for a philosopher of his status. Wittgenstein believed language has an underlying logical structure; through understanding this structure, we can pinpoint the limits of what can be said with meaning.

A proposition is a statement that can be either true or false – it must be one or the other. However, this is different from a sentence: "I am writing a handout,"; if said by two different people, these are two different propositions. Maia then asked the audience whether the statement: "The present king of France is wise," is a true or false proposition. This is more complicated than it looks as there is no present king of France – labelling the proposition as true or false would imply that the present king of France did exist. Bertrand Russell responded to this by saying a proposition always denotes something, either an item in existence or a "subsisting" item, in which "subsistence" means non-actual existence. Hence, the phrase "X is wise" denotes a subsistent king of France. Russell actually changed his mind about his original response, and he said that names and descriptive places used in sentences are not legitimate expressions, thus sentences which contain them are misleading us from the proper logical form of the propositions they convey. He concluded that the statement should be broken up as follows: 1. There is a King of France. 2. There is only one King of France. 3. Whatever is King of France is wise.

Since 1. is false, the entire proposition is rendered false.

Maia then proceeded briefly to explain logical symbols. Through stripping down a statement to its fundamental argument in symbols, it can be logically deduced whether the argument is valid or sound. The "truth functions" are the constituents of language which make up the "propositional calculus", and this allows philosophers to investigate the logical relationships between propositions in a mathematical way. Maia showed us the logical language for describing "The present king of France is wise,": $(\exists x)((Kx \ \& \ (y)(Ky \rightarrow y=x)) \ \& \ Wx)$, where "K" stands for "King of France" and "W" for wise. " $\exists x$ " means "there is at least one x". Therefore, the whole proposition is pronounced: "There is something, call it x, such that x is the King of France; and for anything else, call it y, if y is King of France then x and y are identical; and x is wise. This analysis of the logical structure gives insight into the meaning of our language.

Wittgenstein stated that different elements of language correspond to the world. A language is made up of propositions, and propositions are made up of elementary propositions, which are combinations of names. The world consists in the totality of facts, and facts are made up of "states of affairs", which are made up of objects. There is a reflection of the structure of the world in the structure of language, and different levels correspond with each other. The relationship between elementary propositions and states of affairs is constituted by the fact that the names out of which elementary propositions are built denote the objects out of which their corresponding states of affairs are built. As was mentioned earlier, Wittgenstein completely changed his mind on this.

Wittgenstein's original position was that language had a unique discoverable underlying logic. His later philosophy argued that there's not one logic of language but many. The meaning of words isn't determined by abstract link between language and reality but by how words are used. The meanings of words are often vague and fluid without being any useful as a result. Wittgenstein gave the example of the word "game"; even though there is no rigid definition that includes everything we consider as a game and excludes everything we don't consider a game, we have no difficulty in using the word "game" correctly.

Many thanks to Maia for giving his extremely thought-provoking lecture to what was perhaps the most-attended Gore crowd so far this year, and for encouraging countless deep philosophical discussions.

JUNIOR LABORDE SOCIETY

Aum Amin, *Elmfield*, "The Bhopal Gas Tragedy",
OMS, 21 October

On Wednesday, Aum Amin, *Elmfield*, gave a concise but detailed talk regarding the Bhopal gas tragedy of 1984, going through the chemical and physical properties which make the gas in question (methyl isocyanate) so deadly that it could affect so many lives.

The Bhopal gas leak, in the early morning of 3 December, affected over 16,000 lives and around 500,000 people had been in contact by the gas. This is a scale of exposure and deadliness that many regard on a similar scale to the Chernobyl Reactor No 4 disaster. The methyl isocyanate (MIC), with molecular formula CH_3NCO , is mainly used in pesticides and as an additive to adhesives, and thus was very profitable to store in large tanks due to the high demand. These large tanks were filled with MIC and inert nitrogen gas so that the MIC was less than 40% by volume of the tank in the factory in Bhopal. However, due to the overfilling of some tanks and poor storage conditions, the tank labelled E610 ruptured, filling the factory in which it was stored with extremely dangerous gas.

However, since there was a strong wind blowing from the factory towards the populace living next to the factory, the gas translated to the living spaces, causing the concentration of MIC particles in the air to surpass 25ppm, which leads to immediate death. In places that were effected to a lesser degree, people are still experiencing symptoms such as irritation of the eyes and respiratory tract and other more serious medical issues such as pulmonary edema. In the aftermath of the event, the Bhopal MIC factory was shut down, as was the one in the United States, in Virginia.

After Amin's lecture, a barrage of questions was fired at him by boy and beak alike, with very distinct and enlightening responses.

JUNIOR CLASSICAL & JUNIOR PIGOU SOCIETIES

Antonio da Silveira Pinheiro, The Park, "Rome's Financial Crisis of 33 AD. Before and After: Who Was to Blame and How Did Quantitative Easing Rescue Rome?", OMS, 21 October

On a cloudy night in Old Music Schools, Antonio da Silveira Pinheiro, The Park, gave a lecture to the Junior Classical and Junior Pigou Societies on Rome's financial crisis of 33AD: "Who Was to Blame and How Did Quantitative Easing Rescue Rome?" A group of keen economists and historians gathered to listen to Antonio talk on this obscure yet truly fascinating financial crisis that has in part shaped the way our economy works today.

The talk started with the causes of the bank failure. There was a large domino effect, which grew from a loss of some capital to a financial crisis affecting almost everyone in Rome. A few major banks of the ancient world went bankrupt or were facing massive losses at the same time: Seuthes & Son lost three ships filled with riches (and the hopes and dreams of many), Malchus & Company went bankrupt and two statesmen had large outstanding loans to both banking houses. The banks being spread thin resulted in less security if something went wrong, which it definitely did.



Another cause was Lucius Sejanus; Sejanus was the sole prefect of the Praetorian Guard and highly trusted by Tiberius (the emperor at the time). However, Sejanus secretly wanted to be the next emperor of the Roman Empire. He killed Tiberius' son by seducing his wife; he also encouraged Tiberius to withdraw from political affairs, giving more control to Sejanus. He did this together with the rest of the Praetorian Guard by forcing Tiberius to stay on the isolated island of Capri, where he would not be able to interfere with what was happening in Rome. This inactivity was a key part in the lack of money during the crisis. When Tiberius uncovered this plot, he was understandably angry. Sejanus and all his supporters were put on trial and some executed.

The third cause was the reintroduction of Caesar's law by Tiberius. This law was intended to improve the value of land and lower interest rates. Tiberius gave all 600 senators 18 months to invest two thirds of their capital into Italian land. However useful this would be in theory, did not come true in practice. The senators, most with a net worth of billions, had to ask for their money back from loans which they had given out. This caused debtors to have suddenly to find money to pay back the senators. Many had to sell their land or houses, resulting in a drop in the price of land. This was the exact opposite of what the law had been set up to do.

The culmination of all these factors led to a massive credit crunch similar to that of the 2008 financial crisis. With massive deflation, lack of credit, not enough money in circulation and the Wall Street equivalent closed, things were not looking bright for Rome. So, in answer to the question who was to

blame for this mess, da Silveira Pinheiro argued that Tiberius' inactivity was the leading factor. He supported this claim by comparing Tiberius' reign to that of Augustus (his predecessor); Augustus spent 1 billion sesterces during his time as emperor and interest rates dropped from 12% to a mere 5%. However, Tiberius did the opposite: he saved 2.7 billion sesterces in his treasury. However, this inactivity was not the fault of Tiberius. In da Silveira Pinheiro's opinion, Sejanus is the one to blame. Through his actions and manipulation, he took control of political affairs in Rome. He distanced Tiberius from Rome, which led to less money being spent there. His treason then led to the reinstating of Caesar's law, which was the tipping point of the crisis.

In conclusion, Sejanus was the main cause of the financial mess of 33 AD. Tiberius luckily found a short, easy and effective solution: he gave 100 million sesterces to a selection of banks, with an interest rate of 0%. This is similar to the modern-day term of quantitative easing. This resembles the responses to the Great Depression and 2008 crisis in the United States. da Silveira Pinheiro then answered a few questions, such as explaining the impacts on the average person: many had taken loans which had to be paid back, leading to loss of land and poverty. Thus, concluded the first joint Junior Pigou and Junior Classical Society lecture of the year.

CROSS-CURRICULAR LECTURE

Paul Donlevey, Head of Security, "Visual Communication and Political Consequences", OSRG, 19 October

Last Monday, a motley collection of boys wearing CCF and ecker kit gathered in the OH Room to listen to Mr Paul Donlevey, Head of Security at Harrow School, talk about "Visual Communication and Political Consequences", the sixth instalment of the Cross-Curricular Lecture Series. This proved to be a thoroughly fascinating talk, with Mr Donlevey providing illuminating insight into his own experience of a series of historic policing events and the differences in communication between that time and now. He began his talk in 1979, when he first joined the cadets. At this age, he explained, he was still too young to join the police force. It was only a few years later that he became a policeman.

Mr Donlevey then started to talk about the establishment of the police. Robert Peel, an Old Harrovian, founded the police in 1829. He lay down the vision and key principles for the police: the prevention of crime and disorder, public approval and respect, impartiality, proportionate use of physical force and the consent and support of the public. The police were not to be judges nor jurors and their success would be proven through the absence of crime. These principles are still the basis of policing in the UK.

Mr Donlevey then took us through some of the major events of the 1980s. Amazingly, he was involved in every single one of the events he described. The first one was the Brixton Riots of 1981, which Mr Donlevey likened to the "British version of BLM". Mr Donlevey explained that, at this time, there were many old values and old traditions within the police, some of which are perceived as wrong in today's society. For example, back in those days there existed "sus laws" where one could be searched and arrested purely if one were deemed suspicious by the police. This, when combined with unemployment, racial tensions (the Windrush generation was beginning to emerge in the UK) and rumours etc., culminated in the Brixton Riots. Mr Donlevey emphasised that the key difference between then and now was that people didn't have social media, so, unable to vent their anger through that channel, they took to the streets, with two major riots occurring on 11 and 12 April. The police

at the time received word of the riots through the means of a teleprinter.

What lessons were learnt from this? After the Scarman Report and the Police and Criminal Evidence Act of 1984, the way the police operated completely changed. You could no longer stop and search anyone; you had to be able to prove that you had reasonable suspicion to do so. Suspected criminals could only be kept for 24 hours, unlike before, when suspected criminals were thrown into prison for days at a time. Mr Donlevey said that although he could see that these men were guilty, when he first joined the police he was still “flabbergasted” at these measures.

Another event that Mr Donlevey talked about was the marriage of Diana and the Prince of Wales on 29 July 1981. This was when the modern-day press paparazzi as we know it was truly formed. Diana and the Prince of Wales were mobbed. The divisions between public interest and privacy were blurred. This, Mr Donlevey concluded, was what brought about the death of Diana. Despite all the conspiracy theories regarding the matter, Mr Donlevey believed that the reason she died so tragically was because she was being mobbed and was fleeing from the paparazzi – along with the fact that she wasn’t wearing a seatbelt and the car’s driver was drunk. Mr Donlevey recommended the ‘Rise of the Murdoch Dynasty’ series on BBC iPlayer, saying it showed the terrifying power of the press.

Going chronologically, the next event that Mr Donlevey talked about was the miners’ strike of 1984–85. This was when the Thatcher government was trying to reduce the power of the unions. During the last strike in 1974, according to Mr Donlevey, there was a three-day working week, and the electricity would just cut out at random points in the day. During the miners’ strike, the police were used as political pawns, with many dubious orders given. For example, Mr Donlevey and his colleagues were told to stop all vehicles leaving the M1 from going to the colliery. Being the young and perhaps slightly rebellious police officers they were, they ignored these orders, only planning to arrest those who were actually guilty of wrongdoing.

Unfortunately, the miners’ strikes severely divided communities. People would return home to find their newly built extension demolished. Some people would refuse to talk to each other, even a decade later. However, it did change trade union laws on balloting, and it was the last major UK strike.

We then went on to the bombing of Harrods on 17 December 1983 by the IRA. This was not the first time that Harrods had been bombed by the IRA, with two previous bombings having occurred in 1973 and 1974. As a result of the 1983 bombing, three civilians and three policemen were killed. As a note of interest, Mr Donlevey also told us that Harrow School had also been bombed once in 1974. Fortunately, no was injured in the Harrow School bombing and only a building was damaged.

The bombing of Harrods in 1983, though not authorised by the Provisional IRA, resulted in press outrage in the UK and around the world. It caused the IRA to refocus itself on military targets rather than civilian ones.

The next significant event that Mr Donlevey was to talk about was the 1985 Broadwater Farm Riots. This was when PC Keith Blakelock was murdered while trying to protect a fire crew. He was the first police officer to be killed since 1833: the era of Robert Peel. Mr Donlevey explained that police tactics were not good back then and communication was poor; police radio networks were separate and it was very difficult for the police to communicate with each other. Gesturing and other similar methods had to be used. As a result of the riots, the police revised their tactics and a Gold-Silver-Bronze command structure and headset communication radio were introduced.

In 1987 there was the King’s Cross fire, in which 33–100 people were injured (although at the time of the incident estimates of the death count numbered in the hundreds). Mr Donlevey and his comrades had just returned from training and therefore had to put on riot gear over their civilian clothes in order to

go and help at the incident. The tube system was old and the escalator at the time was wooden and dusty. This, combined with the permissibility of smoking in stations (it had already been banned in the trains themselves), resulted in a flashover fire sparked by a single match.

In response, more smoking rules were introduced and the escalator was converted to metal treads. Call points on platforms and radios for staff were also introduced so that there was better communication in order to prevent this sort of thing from happening again.

Next was the Clapham railway crash in 1988. In this incident, three trains collided in a horrific accident brought about by faulty train signals. This time, Mr Donlevey and his colleagues focused on helping the live casualties, tired of dealing with the dead after the 1987 King’s Cross fire. The A&E at St George’s Hospital was only a few weeks old and had to deal with the crash. Dealing with the casualties was quite stressful, with hundreds of injured people in a room similar in size to the OH Room. Mr Donlevey said that a patient suggested to him that police should stick labels onto people they had spoken to, as he was the third PC that the patient had talked to. Consequently, the police changed their way of casualty handling, creating casualty books and labels.

Measures were introduced in response, such as the Corporate Manslaughter and Homicide Act of 2007. No individual was prosecuted for the accident, but British Rail was fined. Working practices in British Rail were also changed.

The final event that Mr Donlevey was to talk about was the Marchioness riverboat disaster, where 51 died. This was when two boats in the Thames collided. They had no lookouts at the time and the pilots were unsighted; poor communication was identified as a leading cause of the disaster. After the incident, four new lifeboat stations were added on the Thames and increased safety measures were put into place.

After going through this amazing array of events that Mr Donlevey had experienced first-hand, he finished the lecture with the following points. There were communication issues within every event and lessons to be learnt. Peel’s principle that public support is needed for policing still holds true and economic deprivation causes riots and public disorder. He also speculated that COVID-19 may cause problems due to the mass unemployment that may result from it. He also concluded that if you are old you are part of history, as he found out when his daughter was studying the miners’ strike of 1984–1985 as part of her A levels. Many thanks to Mr Donlevey for giving such a fascinating talk and ADT for hosting it.

SOMERVELL SOCIETY

Preston Chung and Ryan Lai, both The Grove, “Is Eating People Wrong?”, OSRG, 15 October

On Thursday 15 October, the Somervell Society gathered in the OSRG to hear a lecture on “Is Eating People Wrong?” given by Preston Chung and Ryan Lai, both *The Grove*. Chung first set the scene by introducing a situation like the case study *R v Dudley and Stephens*. Chung and Lai then asked the audience what they would do in that particular situation.

Chung then presented us with the facts of the case. On 19 May 1884, a yacht with four people, Tom Dudley, Edwin Stephens, Edmund Brooks and Richard Parker, sailed from Southampton to Sydney. On 5 July, the yacht reached the Cape of Good Hope, but unfortunately the yacht could not withstand the strong winds there and began to sink. Dudley (the captain) managed to deploy a lifeboat and all the crew survived the

shipwreck itself. The crew did not have time to supply the lifeboat. They only managed to salvage two tins of turnips and some navigational instruments.

On 5 July, they sailed into a gale. They were stranded. Parker drank seawater and fell into a coma. Dudley and Stephens decided to kill him for food. *R v Dudley and Stephens* 14 QBD 273 DC held that necessity is not a defence to a charge of murder. Dudley and Stephens were originally sentenced to death, but they were subsequently pardoned by the Crown and received six months in prison.



Both speakers then moved on to discuss how Kantianism and Utilitarianism would approach this situation. Through Kantianism, the actions of Dudley and Stephens would be unjust, as they focused on the action of cannibalism, not the outcome. In a Utilitarian perspective, Dudley and Stephens' actions are just. Utilitarianism is a consequentialist ethical theory, the pleasure gained by the three sailors significantly outweighs the suffering of one boy.

Chung and Lai then went on to clarify law on necessity as a defence. The law has evolved over time due to the system of precedent. Lord Justice Brown: 'English Law does, in extreme cases, recognize a defence of necessity' (*R v Martin* (1989)). It contradicts *Southwark London Borough Council v Williams* (1971), 'the defence is available only if, from an objective standpoint, the accused can be said to be acting reasonably and proportionately in order to avoid a threat of death or serious injury'. Chung and Lai concluded the different stances could be attributed to the difference between public and private law.

Finally, both speakers presented us with two arguments on whether law should be a reflection of morality. Natural Law Theory argues that what is right is based on human values, not by act of legislation, but by 'God, nature or reason'. Legal Positivism states that what is right is based on the source of legitimacy and there is no relationship between law and morality.

Overall, the lecture gave us a lot to think about on whether murder as a defence can be justified in a modern society.

ALEXANDER SOCIETY

*Baba Obatoyinbo, The Knoll, "The Nigerian Civil War: Causes, Course and Consequences",
Vaughan Library, 5 November*

On Thursday 5 November, Baba Obatoyinbo, *The Knoll*, gave a talk to the Alexander Society on the Nigerian Civil War in which he discussed its causes, course, consequences, and how its divisions can still be felt today in Nigeria.

The talk started off with some background information on Nigeria. Nigeria was first invaded in 1851 and was officially annexed by the British in 1865; it was a British protectorate from 1901 until 1960, when it gained its independence. Although

the country is incredibly diverse, it can be divided into three main tribal groups: the Muslim-majority Hausa people in the north, the Catholic-majority Igbo people in the southeast, and the half-Muslim, half-Christian Yoruba people of the southwest. Obatoyinbo stressed the importance of the three groups, saying that they were key in understanding the war and why it broke out, due to the various historical differences between them, as well as the religious disagreements, as 98% of the Nigerian population is estimated to be either Christian or Muslim. Another part of this division was that, at the time, Nigeria was divided into four regions, Northern, Western, Eastern and Midwestern, which were, in essence, different states. They all had premiers to govern them, although they were united under the country of Nigeria. It is also important to note that this war occurred when Nigeria was still a relatively new, unstable and undeveloped country, having only been given independence seven years before the beginning of the war.

The next section of the talk was about the reasons why the Biafran War (civil war) started. Obatoyinbo argued that the original seeds of the conflict were sown when Nigeria became a British protectorate in 1901, forcing the historical enemies of the north, southeast and southwest to live under one government, as well as dividing tribes between areas owned by the French and by the British, rather than by historical tribal boundaries. He also compared this conflict to the situation in the Balkans in the 1990s, where many different ethnic groups were united under Yugoslavia, leading to violent civil war breaking out due to ethnic and historic differences.

Obatoyinbo then went on to talk about the civil war itself. Tribal tensions increased after a military coup in 1966 resulted in General Aguiyi-Ironsi, an Igbo, taking power as President. This was followed by a northerner-led counter coup a few months later. Aguiyi-Ironsi was killed and widespread reprisals were unleashed against the Igbo. Fearing marginalisation within the state, on 30 May 1967, the Igbo-majority province declared its independence as the Republic of Biafra. Initially, its forces pushed back the Nigerian army but, after a year of fighting, a stalemate developed. Nigeria then blocked food and supplies from entering Biafra, which resulted in a humanitarian crisis of huge proportions. Biafra ended up surrendering on 13 January 1970. Overall, more than 2 million Biafran civilians died due to starvation and malnutrition during the course of the war, which is 20 times more than the most liberal estimates of the number of casualties suffered by both sides combined.

Obatoyinbo concluded his talk by looking at the consequences of the war. As a result of those coups, which set military rule as the standard in Nigeria, apart from a four-year period in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Nigeria was a military dictatorship until 1999, when it became a democracy. Such a dictatorship meant that, for years, corruption and underhand politics were rife in Nigeria, and corruption is still a huge issue at every political level. As well as this, as is usually the case in a dictatorship, the police abused their power, which is still a problem to this day, especially with the current SARS protests. Furthermore, even today, there is still a large casual tribal divide and lots of rivalry between the tribes, with many southerners looking down on the north. However, actual major disagreement is not as common as before, with Yorubas, Igbos and Hausas living in all parts of the country and intermixing with each other. Although there has been a lot of progress, and persecution has been greatly reduced, there are still some remnants of division. For example, there still has not been an Igbo leader of Nigeria since the war and there is also persecution of Christians who reside in the north of Nigeria.

Overall, Obatoyinbo gave us a thought-provoking and stimulating talk with regard to the Nigerian Civil War, talking about the causes, course, consequences and how that affects Nigeria today. I would like to express my gratitude to DF for organising a truly excellent talk and Obatoyinbo for delivering a great paper to the Alexander Society.

METROPOLITAN

HART ESSAY ON EDUCATION

“The tool for hope in South Sudan”

Nelson Mandela stated that “Education is the most powerful weapon that can be used to change the world.” In South Sudan, many children are denied access to a basic education. As a result, the children of South Sudan are not given a chance to reform their country and turn it into the country of hope for themselves and future generations.

According to UNICEF 70% (over two million) of South Sudan’s youth are out of school, and the few given the precious opportunity of education are not often exposed to a high quality one, often dropping out to enlist in militia groups or to satisfy arranged marriages. This poor standard of education has led to an average of 26.83% literacy with only 19.19% of women able to read and write whilst for men it is 34%, displaying a huge gap in the sexes. A good quality education would allow for students to travel to nearby countries such as Uganda and Nigeria to study in universities teaching them essential new skills. They would be able to bring this back to their country allowing for much needed reform. South Sudan cannot be self-sufficient if it lacks its own specialist workforce able to deliver services without the guidance of western benefactors such as the USA. South Sudan also needs to be able to establish a skilled workforce within the international community if it wishes to stand a chance on the international playing ground. With its largest export being Petroleum (\$1.22 billion in exports), now swiftly heading out of fashion due to the resurgence in the climate movement, now is the time for this young country to build a strong and sustainable country of services.

Parents are recognising the importance of educating their country’s youth after decades of conflict, with some families even selling their cows, a huge cultural decision as they represent status, to be able to put their children through the education system. However, despite a clear desire for education, it is often not available, as there is both a lack of facilities and teaching staff. The fundamental reason behind the lack of teaching staff is that the teacher training college has been closed as a part of government austerity measure leaving only 18,000 teachers on government payroll (that’s 100 students in school to each teacher) of which only 4,000 of them are qualified. Yet I would argue that among many competing priorities faced by the Ministry, teacher education – and the related issue of adequate and timely teacher compensation – must become a top shared priority for government and foreign donors alike. Without adequate numbers of qualified and paid teachers, South Sudan’s promise of universal primary education will remain empty, and its goal of improved lives and opportunities for this new country’s millions of young citizens – will be that much harder to reach.

Early marriage exists throughout the country, but poverty and civil war have aggravated the problem. In effect, with the dowry being generally due to the parents of the bride on the wedding day, young South Sudanese girls have become one of the few possible sources of revenue in a region where the average income is about 25 cents per day. In South Sudan, a teenage girl is far more likely to be married than go to school. The figures are alarming. Only around 500 girls complete primary school annually. Yet, one teenage girl in five is already a mother. The government is trying to address this serious issue. It has effectively introduced legislation stipulating that children have the right to be protected against forced marriage.

South Sudan is at risk of repeating the errors of its past if it does not educate its youth now letting the chain effect continue

to eat away at the country’s people, depriving them of much needed opportunities. For this new country’s socioeconomic and political reputation, it is important that it proves that it can survive independently of international support especially as larger powers begin to focus on internal growth as opposed to that of developing countries. Education for all is not only the right thing but the smart thing to do; The risk of child marriage and early pregnancy is lower if girls stay in school. People are better equipped with skills to provide for their families if they are educated. More importantly, education will give South Sudan a second chance to do things right and build a country for their people not struck by war. South Sudan has signed up to achieving the SDG 2030 agenda, however if the education imbalance is not addressed, a key principle to ‘leave no one behind’ will not be achieved. Education has the power to turn South Sudan into a land of hope. The country which the people of South Sudan have dreamed about for a long time.

GAFFE AND GOWN

Quips from around the Hill

“How are you getting on with your Geography coursework?”
“Really well, sir. I’ve got 20 minutes left of *The Queen’s Gambit* and then I’ll start it.”

“You don’t know much pain I can inflict if you don’t let me watch *Gnomeo and Juliet*.” [*Apparently these were two different boys.* –Eds.

OPINION

SUDOKU

Persevera per severa per se vera

3						7	
				1			
	6	5	7			9	8
		8				2	
			1				
		4		5		1	6
		6					1
			9	6		5	
5	2			3			

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIRs,

I am writing in response to Aggarwal's response to my response to Winward's letter regarding commercial activity. Aggarwal has taken my letter and unethically twisted it to fit his narrative. I am incensed at the utter ignorance regarding the purpose of my letter, and I aim to (once again) justify my opinion regarding this issue.

I did a pre-emptive strike at the start of my letter when I said, and I quote: "Winward's most recent correspondence on the banning of commercial activities actually enacted change and was beneficial." I had predicted that fools would holler out inflammatory statements such as, "Oh so you agree with all the rules in the School right now," or "Don't you believe that we should fight for change," et cetera. Aggarwal (who is not a fool) has conveniently listed out around seven or eight aspects of School life that Winward may or may not have contributed to, which may or may not have been positive. As a very brief estimate, let's assume that Winward writes a letter every other week, and there are 25 weeks in the academic year, which is probably less than the real number. Therefore, with my newly acquired A level Maths skills, I have calculated that Winward has written at least 30 letters in the past three years. How many of those letters were simply just pointless, unnecessary, or unbeneficial? I gave the example of Winward advocating for going to away matches in ecceer kit instead of uniform. I've been to at least 20 away matches in the past three years, mainly rugby, and not going in uniform just diminishes the experience completely.

With regards to the commercial experience I had with when I was in Shells, Aggarwal seems to be delivering statements with no justification whatsoever. I never even remotely implied that the Sixth Form in Druries were "deceitful" and "unkind", I said they were "insistent" and, contrary to what Aggarwal has flung out, "kind". With the ban in place, Sixth Formers would no doubt be more reluctant to pressurise younger boys into buying their kit. He stated that my letter wasn't free from logical fallacies, but he failed to even mention a single one I have committed. It's extremely ironic how, while Aggarwal is criticising me for committing logical fallacies, he himself has committed the tu quoque fallacy – he implies since I have committed a logical fallacy (which I haven't), Winward is exempt from fallacies as a result.

Aggarwal boldly states that I "have failed to realise the incredible waste produced by unnecessarily ordering an additional calculator". He is right in stating that "unnecessarily" ordering a calculator will produce "incredible waste". However, his premise is incorrect – I have explained in great length why ordering an additional calculator isn't "unnecessary" but is exceedingly useful. To summarise my argument, it is always helpful to own a spare, and it is also beneficial to others if someone is in desperate need of a calculator. I am slightly amused by the fact that Aggarwal made no reply about my proclamation that Winward was ungrateful for the great opportunities and changes the School has offered. It would be logical to infer Aggarwal does agree with me on this one.

Last but not least, with all due respect to Aggarwal, his last paragraph is his most contradictory and illogical one yet. Aggarwal insists that Winward didn't necessarily attribute this quote, "If you make 10,000 regulations, you destroy all respect for the law," to Churchill specifically, it was merely to a "wise man". As a man of science myself, I have employed the use of Occam's Razor (the simplest explanation with the least number of assumptions is most likely the right one):

Scenario 1: Winward's quote was correct – a wise man said the exact same thing as Churchill, but changed 10,000 to 1,000 for no reason

Scenario 2: Winward unscrupulously misquoted Churchill – the wise man was meant to be Churchill.

A "wise man" using the exact same quote as Churchill is a big and unjustified assumption to make, while in scenario 2, Winward misquoting Churchill seems to be the simplest explanation, as many would think of Churchill as a "wise man". Therefore, it is both logical and scientifically more likely that Winward misquoted Churchill. Afterwards, Aggarwal completely contradicts himself – he firstly implies that the wise man wasn't Churchill, then he makes the argument that I have misinterpreted Churchill. I am utterly confused by the lack of care in the logical reasoning. Furthermore, I merely held that Winward missed the point of Churchill's quote – I never said that his quote applied to schools and that we should have a free market within the school community. A little digging through official Parliamentary records indicated that Churchill spoke of these "10,000 regulations" to the House of Commons, not to the Governors of Harrow School.

In conclusion, it is clear that Aggarwal's criticisms of my arguments don't make logical sense and are, to put it bluntly, wrong. In relation to his request for me to contribute optimistic letters, he has once again pulled an "Aggarwal" by missing my point. I don't mind having a small number of optimistic letters; what I do mind is seeing a lot of critical letters that are unnecessary and pointless. In fact, I am planning to write some letters in the future about aspects of School life that may substantially affect all boys, which are necessary and not pointless. I side with myself.

Yours sincerely,
BRANDON CHANG, DRURIES

P.S. Aggarwal and I are on good terms, and I hope this letter finds him well.

SPORTS

SOCCER

At Home, 7 November

There were plenty of footballing fireworks on the Astro this Saturday as the Development footballers enjoyed a fast-paced internal tournament designed to test their fitness, finishing and tactical nous. Playing in a league format, five curiously chosen families of the animal kingdom pitted their wits against each other with some specially chosen rules designed to test their willingness to play attacking football. The Tigers, captained by Luke Esposito, *Newlands*, made best use of rules with an aggressive defensive line that enabled them to maul the Honeybadgers by four goals to one and the Sea Lions 2-0 before losing their final match to the wise team of Tamarins. The Stoats also proved to be well organised in a pesky 4-0 victory over the Sea Lions and were on course to win the tournament as they went 3-0 up against the Honeybadgers. However, in the match of the tournament, that infamous Honeybadgers spirit prevailed as they scored three goals in the last three minutes to draw the game, including the goal of the tournament from Jasper Gray, *Newlands*, with the final touch of the game. In the end the Tigers came out on top with two wins and a draw. Their team was comprised of Tom Haworth, *The Knoll*, Chike Odogwu, *Moretons*, Ezekiel Akinsanya, *Lyon's*, Chris Jolker, *The Grove*, Alex Gabbitas, *Druries*, Hari Moondi, *The Park*, Charlie Young, Roger Litton and Luke Esposito, all *Newlands*, and Paddy Breeze, *Elmfield*.

	GP	W	D	L	GF	GA	GD	PTS
Tigers	4	2	1	1	9	5	4	7
Stoats	4	1	3	0	9	5	4	6
Tamarins	4	1	3	0	8	7	1	6
Honeybadgers	4	0	3	1	7	10	-3	3
Sea Lions	4	0	2	2	3	9	-6	2

RUGBY

Super League Finals, 7 November

On Saturday afternoon, on The Sunley, the Super League Finals Day took place.

Over the course of the term, mixed ability teams in each year group have competed week in, week out, with 516 games played and over 600 tries scored. The top two teams in each league played a championship game on The Sunley. In the Yearlings League 2, a breakaway try from Akachi Anwanyu, *The Grove*, was the difference to give the Mustangs the win. Meanwhile, in the Yearlings League 1, the Knights, having led the league all season, were worthy winners. In the Junior Colts League, the Hogs took the crown whilst the Panthers won the Colts League in a dramatic drop-goal penalty shootout. Finally, in the Senior League, a late Jonah Peppiatt, *The Park*, drop goal was enough for the Rhinos to beat the Lions. Tito Edjua, *Lyon's*, should also be commended for winning the School goal-kicking competition.

Ways to contact *The Harrovian*

Articles, opinions and letters are always appreciated.

Email the Master-in-Charge smk@harrowschool.org.uk

Read the latest issues of The Harrovian online at harrowschool.org.uk/Harroviaan