

THE FREETHINKER

Founded 1881

Editor: CHAPMAN COHEN

Vol. LXX.—No. 16

[REGISTERED AT THE GENERAL
POST OFFICE AS A NEWSPAPER]

Price Threepence

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

Reunion with Rome

THE question of the reunion of the Christian Churches has now been a hardy annual for many years. The major, and hitherto, effective barrier to all such attempts to unify Christianity and to unite all Christians into a single Church, has always come from the Church of Rome, for "reunion" without Rome would be so incomplete as to be farcical, and yet, union with the assent of the Vatican, would be merely a thinly-veiled submission of the non-Roman Churches to Rome. Unlike all other Churches, Rome claims a monopoly of Divine Grace; other Churches must come to her since she cannot and will not make overtures to them. It is this attitude of Vatican intolerance that has prevented the reunion of Western Christendom ever since the Reformation.

The proclamation on July 18, 1870, of the personal infallibility of the Pope increased enormously the difficulties involved in any approach to Rome by other Churches. For since that date, the Pope can no longer be regarded as only an "honorary among equals," as he could be, before 1870. He is now the infallible "Vicar of Christ," and the fallible cannot bargain on equal terms with the infallible.

The perennial question of the effective reunion of the group of Anglican Churches in Communion with Canterbury with the Vatican, was recently discussed by the Archbishop of York, Dr. Cyril Garbett, in *The Times*. The occasion was provided by the cautious permission just granted by Pope Pius XII, for Roman Catholics to co-operate with members of "heretical" Churches in non-religious forms of social and cultural activity: a permission, we may assume, tardily extracted from the Vatican by the advancing "spectre of communism." In his approach to the question of "Reunion with Rome," Dr. Garbett was cautious and non-committal. As he relevantly observed in his Diocesan Letter, quoted in *The Times* in reference to this belated Papal permission:—

"It would be difficult for a visitor from another planet reading these carefully guarded permissions, to understand that they concern discussions, not between Christians and militant Atheists, but between those who believe in the same God and Saviour. The instructions are restrictive rather than permissive and assume that submission to Rome is the only reunion which the Catholic Church can contemplate."

The Anglican Archbishop plaintively adds:—

"Cardinal Griffin in his Lenten Pastoral calls for complete submission to Rome and places on the same level the beliefs that Jesus is the Son of God and that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ."

Very shocking! But, after all, what else did Dr. Garbett and his colleagues expect? As we remarked above, one cannot by definition, negotiate on terms of equality with infallibility, and the Church of Rome prides

itself on her belief in logic, even if the Church of England, as befits a "nation of shopkeepers," and the English genius for compromise, does not.

Apart from the thorny problem of Papal Infallibility the chief stumbling block before any reunion between Rome and Canterbury can be effected, is the vexed question of "Anglican Orders." Are Canterbury, York, and their episcopal colleagues in the Church of England genuine successors of the Apostles with the power to ordain catholic priests endowed with the apostolic power to forgive sins and to transmute bread and wine into the actual Body and Blood of Jesus Christ? Such, perhaps, even more than Papal Infallibility, is the chief theological stumbling-block to any real reunion at present or in the future between Rome and Canterbury. For Rome denies the validity (i.e., the Apostolic succession) of Anglican Orders. Successive Popes, Leo XIII was the most recent, have declared that the Church of England is incurably Protestant and heretical, and that her Orders, and consequently her Sacraments are invalid in Catholic eyes.

Thus, in the eyes of the Vatican, Anglicanism is on a lower level than the semi-barbaric Coptic Church of Abyssinia, whose Orders, at least, are recognised as valid. Consequently, all Anglican clergy are merely unauthorised laymen in the eyes of Rome. For instance, both Dr. Garbett and his colleague of Canterbury—not to mention the ineffable Dr. Wand—would have to be re-ordained upon "making their submission" (the phrase itself is eloquent) to Rome. These Right Reverend Fathers in God would even be liable to be baptised again at the discretion of the Roman bishop in whose diocese they were received into the "one true Church" as Rome continues to style herself.

Obviously, no real reunion, but complete submission only is possible on such terms. However, the condemnation of Anglican Orders, by Leo XIII is not, we understand, regarded as *ex cathedra* and as such, infallible, by Catholic theologians. Technically, the whole question of Anglican Orders could be reopened, since, as we recently saw in this column in relation to Evolution, Papal Commissions such as examined Anglican Orders are not infallible or irrevocable in Catholic theology.

Of course, this would have to be done before any genuine reunion other than abject submission could be effected. A generation ago a very distinguished Catholic prelate and theologian, Cardinal Mercier, attempted to reopen the question but the Vatican intervened. Had Mercier been elected Pope instead of Pius XI the negotiations between Rome and Canterbury would have been continued.

In the early thirties a minor theological sensation was caused by a pamphlet issued in the name of a Belgian Jesuit who advocated the abolition of the present Roman Catholic hierarchy in England, and the recognition by Rome of a united Roman-Anglican Church under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as before the Reformation. But Cardinal Mercier would hardly have gone as far as this, and the author was incontinently

expelled from the Jesuit Order. No more has been heard of the suggestion since, or of its author!

As matters stand to-day, any genuine reunion seems very improbable, at any rate, as long as the Church of England remains the officially established Church of this country. Disestablishment, eventually certain, would doubtless lead to disintegration and disappearance of Anglicanism. In which case, many individual High Churchmen would no doubt, "make their submission" to Rome. But this is not "Reunion" in the sense advocated by Dr. Garbett. Though the converts might be numerous enough to secure special concessions, a married clergy and an English liturgy, similar to those already granted to the Uniates; Eastern Churches in Communion with Rome.

Meanwhile, Rome looks like having to resign herself to the more indirect position of leader of a common political front of all the Christian Churches against "godless materialism and communism." A role which we can be sure the Papacy will discharge with all her traditional skill, and with the same ruthless indifference to any interests except her own power and survival that she has always shown when her future was at stake.

F. A. RIDLEY.

"AS I SEE IT"

MR. VERNON CARTER, the Editor, and the printers of *The Freethinker* and the postal authorities have all played their part as stimuli to that living body labelled Bayard Simmons. These stimuli were the sight of *The Freethinker*, and in particular of Mr. Carter's article, "Materialism Examined." The reading of this article two or three times has so stimulated the body of Mr. Simmons that it has reached out a limb for paper and pen. Certain further reactions will follow from this first one, and eventually the Editor of *The Freethinker* (the printers, postal authorities, and so forth) may stimulate the living body of Mr. Vernon Carter to read these lines. Whether he will react to this, I don't know, but if he does we may perhaps have what the physicists call (and the Press is teaching us all to babble) "a chain reaction."

Why has my living body reacted to Mr. Carter's stimulus? Because it was sufficiently strong to overcome my accustomed inertia; because, in fact, my body was annoyed by Mr. Carter's stimulus. I am annoyed by his assumptions, and even more, as the old song has it, "by the nasty way he says it." For example, he states that "the Materialist assumes that the human mind is fitted to unravel the innermost secrets of the universe." I should certainly rate myself as a Materialist in Mr. Chapman Cohen's definition of that term, though I must confess that I am not enamoured of this word and don't use it habitually, for I have a constitutional dislike of such labels. You adopt a label; an opponent gives his interpretation of the word, and there you are, launched on an argle-bargle that seems to me generally unprofitable.

Who told Mr. Carter that bit about the human mind and the innermost secrets of the universe? I never made so ridiculous a claim. It seems to me, indeed, that if certain members of the human race have their way there will, in the near, or further, future, be no human minds to know any secrets, cosmological or otherwise. The chain reaction will have seen to that. I speak only for myself when I say that I am entirely sceptical of the idea that man will, or can, know more than *some* secrets of the universe; but I am equally convinced that if some

of these secrets are to be known, no living being on this planet other than what is known as the human mind can have knowledge of them. Who, or what, else is there? The ants, termites, apes, or elephants?

I wrote just now that I rate myself as a Materialist, although I dislike such labels. The same remark goes for Behaviourist: I doubt if there be such a thing as "mind," "soul," "spirit," apart from the living bodies that these concepts (whatever they are) are generally supposed to inhabit. Don't let Mr. Carter, or anyone else, waste time in pointing out that I use, and frequently, these three words; to me they are only convenient counters for expressing my body's reactions to stimuli. Mind, soul, and spirit are, to this Materialist at any rate, solely activities of that part of my body known as the brain. If my brain is in good working order, in other words, behaving well, I don't care what people call it, or me. "Mind" is a briefer and more convenient word than "brain-behaviour"—four letters instead of fourteen.

Next, Mr. Carter wants to shoo me away from Psychoanalysis; he says, in effect, that I should ignore it. I think Mr. Carter cannot have more than a superficial knowledge of this branch of psychology when he writes of "irrational" elements in the "mind," or, as I might say, but don't, brain-behaviour. The most "irrational" behaviour of the human mind takes place in dreams, but the whole point of psycho-analysis is the showing that there is *nothing* irrational in cerebral activity; that dreams, hallucinations, madness, and, indeed, all brain-behaviour is based on unconscious behaviour, which, in turn, is based on the principle of causation, or cause and effect. "All's love, all's law," as the poet says.

Finally, again speaking for myself, I do not see how, if one grants causation, one can believe in Free Will, or Free Choice. Choice, to me, is merely the behaviour of the brain (sensible thing!) taking the line of least resistance. What we do and think, how our brain behaves, is determined by our character, that is, our "conditioned" brain. *Le caractère c'est, le destin*, says the French proverb; and my and other people's character, including Mr. Carter's, is as determined as the shape of our noses. Our choice is as fixed as Martin Luther's: "I can do none other." If Mr. Vernon Carter cracks, "You are not a Freethinker?" I shall grin and say, "Yes, chum."

BAYARD SIMMONS.

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION

III.

IT is obvious from reading the passages in the New Testament on resurrection that the writers of this book of obscurities were ignorant men unaware of the constant physical and chemical changes which matter undergoes and thought that a dead body remains more or less intact wherever it lies on or under the ground or under the sea. Yet, Paul made it clear in the chapter of I Corinthians mentioned above that he thought that the body rots like grain which has been sown; from this it might be deduced that nothing was clear to the writers of the New Testament. The asseveration of Paul that what is sown must die before it can be made to live is one of those errors common in antiquity because the experimental method of observing the operations of nature was nearly unknown. If a seed is sown and rots, no plant can result; a live seed remains alive while in the ground and undergoes

decay. Paul likened the human body to a seed that is sown which he said must rot in order to live. It is a strong argument against his simile that decayed seeds bear no fruit and that likewise the human body, when dissolved in the earth, will never again appear as the same human being.

Mohammed also taught the fleshly resurrection of the dead as is evidenced by Sura LXXV of the Koran: "Verily I swear by the day of resurrection; and I swear by the soul which accuseth itself: doth man think that we will not gather his bones together? Yea: we are able to put together the smallest bones of his fingers."[†]

There are many arguments which may be brought against the resurrection of the dead; the first is that it is a belief of primitive and ignorant peoples and merits about as much faith as the rest of their beliefs. The argument which follows, while it has been used before in principle, is still good and illustrates the impossibility of the resurrection of the dead if the same matter which composed their bodies in this life is to be used in their composition when they are brought to life again. Let us suppose that a man dies and is buried in an open field as soldiers are often buried. In the course of time his body decomposes and mixes with the earth. Part of it is consumed by bacteria and insects which will be spread through the earth to die in their turn and be absorbed by the earth. From the spot where he lies a tree may grow, drawing part of the matter composing it from the matter that was a man. If the Lord, about whom we are told in the Bible, comes in the day of judgment while the tree is still standing, he will have to dismantle the tree in order to assemble the man. It is not impossible that vegetation may grow from the body of the man and be eaten by men so that the matter which composed the man will be part of other men; and the truth is that present living matter is always in part made of the compost of living matter which died in the past. How could the man and his fellow creatures who absorbed the matter composing him be assembled in the day of judgment? If the Lord tried to put them back together, he would find that the matter used in the first man had been used again in the other men and that it would be impossible to use this same matter to reconstruct all of them at one time. Then the Lord, if he acted with his usual consistency and justice as illustrated in the Bible, would be very exasperated and send them all to hell for being so troublesome.

Athenagoras, a Christian philosopher and writer of the second century A.D., presented in Chapter IV of his treatise, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, the objection made even at that time against the resurrection on the ground that it would be impossible to assemble again human bodies eaten by animals and men. He answered the objection in Chapters V through VIII first with the reply that God could separate such bodies from the creatures eating them but principally and at length with the sophism that, since human flesh was not made to be the food of any creature and is unsuitable and unnatural for both men and animals and was destined only for burial, it would not be assimilated by the creatures eating it; therefore, the matter composing one man would never become part of another man or animal. He concluded his discussion on this point with the tolerant assertion that those who are not half brutes are agreed in their decision concerning the Christian doctrine of the resurrection.

The fact that so many different peoples with different cultures have believed in a resurrection after death indicates that the fear of death which, sometimes mistaken for the love of life, has universally inspired men to desire emancipation from death and decay. An acquaintance with what life is will convince the philosophical that, bitter though the thought of death may be, there would be no comfort in knowing that we shall live again after we have died.

WILLIAM RITTENOUR (U.S.A.).

CONTRACEPTIVES AND AUTOMATIC MACHINES

YOUR contributor puts forward the Army outlook on this subject, that illicit sexual intercourse is an amusement and a necessity, and that therefore the best thing to do is to make it safe. This is sheer animalism.

There are many men—not weaklings—who have resisted the sexual urge until they were married and been better for it. It is not just a religious notion.

And this standard has been, and still is, the one to aim for. There are men who would abandon it. They have always existed.

But I have yet to meet a man who did not expect his own wife to be innocent of previous sexual intercourse with other men and I have yet to meet an intelligent man who was indifferent as to whether his growing daughter had such experience either with or without contraceptives.

Are these ideas now out of date?

These slot machines would lower the moral outlook of the young. Anyone can imagine youngsters staring at them and whispering about what they contained. Also the suggestive turn to the conversation between older youths and girls who saw them.

It has always been the aim of enlightened people to move forward to a higher standard of morals and this movement would certainly be checked by a step towards easier and less dangerous illicit intercourse.

The fear of unpleasant consequences deters many girls who would perhaps succumb to the determined pressure of youths who make no effort to control passion.

Although no religionist, I agree with their stand on this subject.

What we should do is to continue to set before youth that there are plenty of channels for healthy exercise which will bring them many benefits, and we should continue to frown upon sexual intercourse before marriage. Whether we are entirely successful or not, we aim at an ideal.

That contraceptives prevent the passing on of venereal disease, and prevent conception can be true, and yet the objections to their being made available openly in such a fashion are so strong that, frankly, I am surprised to find anyone advocating such an idea.

One thing may not have occurred to your contributor, and that is that the available supply of young women with no sexual experience would have a definite tendency to become less and less if these machines were available all around.

Perhaps such a state of affairs may not disturb him, but I must admit that such an appalling prospect fills me with dismay.

W. O. BOWERS.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS AND THE MYTHICAL CHRIST. By Gerald Massey. What Christianity owes to Ancient Egypt. Price 9d.; postage 1d.

[†] Translation of George Sale.
[‡] See Voltaire's article on "Resurrection" in *Dictionnaire philosophique*.

ACID DROPS

Freethinkers have to die and it is interesting to learn the reactions of such a fervent Anglo-Catholic as Mr. Tom Driberg, M.P., to the secular funeral of Prof. Harold Laski, whose early death is such a calamity. Mr. Driberg, according to *Reynolds* expected "some mongrel secularist rite, readings from Shelley and all that," instead "it turned out to be extraordinary impressive and moving." Perhaps Mr. Driberg will not need another funeral in the future to learn that there are quite a number of things in our Secularist philosophy also "impressive and moving."

The Radio critic of the London *Evening Standard* has completely staggered us. He actually asks "Why are the Sunday Evening programmes so boring?"—and this, mark you, with two superb religious services thrown in gratis and for nothing. Shades of Lord Reith! He did his best to see that the public (who paid for it all) got a large slice of religion as part of the menu on Sunday whether they wanted it or not, and his followers have faithfully carried on the pious tradition. Let us look at a typical Sunday—we get an "Act of God" for nearly an hour, Bach's boring "Passion of our Lord" for 1½ hours, and a "People's Service" for half an hour, all in the morning.

Then a "Search the Scriptures service," a Sunday Half Hour, a "Think of These Things," "The Mirror of Jesus," and an Epilogue entitled "The Shadow of the Cross" during the evening. Could anything be literally more boring? Think of listening to "Community hymn-singing" from the Salvation Army, or a dreary parsonic voice asking you to search the Scriptures! It is only fair to point out, of course, that the aforementioned critic does not refer to the religious services. He dare not.

The Rev. W. H. Elliott has discovered that once Christianity could be described as a glorious eagle—alas, now, it has "sadly diminished" into a sparrow. It is God or anti-God these days, and the All Mighty is not finding it easy to hold his own, especially as, though there are 750,000,000 Christians in the world, they are "so hopelessly divided among themselves that they might well be the enemies instead of the followers of Christ." Mr. Elliott concedes this and yet he declares himself an optimist. "True Christianity," he insists, "is not dead." Not quite, perhaps, but even sparrows die.

A boy of 16 has become the Dalai Lama, the head of many millions of Buddhists, not only in Tibet, but also of all Asia. He has a small army of monks, temples packed with treasure, and in these, worshippers grovel as if they were real Roman Catholics. Thousands of brown mice run about quite unmolested, and no wonder. They are considered to be incarnations of the former guardians of the religious shrines. Needless to add, the Dalai Lama hands out "blessings" exactly as if he were the Pope. In fact, when it is a question of true religion there is precious little difference between any of them.

Because the Bishop of Chelmsford acquired a taste for sweets after they were rationed, he argues in the *News Chronicle* that if religion were rationed, more people would want it, and would "in fact go out of their way to

get it." Just think, our bishops can air inanities of this kind! The Bishop forgets one little point in his analogy (or should we term it the *reductio ad absurdum*?)—rationing was applied to the necessities of life, particularly those in short supply, and we beg leave to doubt that the Bishop's dope could be included in that category.

It has been estimated that the Church of England needs at least 1,000 new parsons in order to provide every parish in England with one. And at least a further 600 recruits will be needed every year to "maintain an efficient ministry." In actual fact, only 362 candidates answered the call of the Lord last year. This suggests that either the Lord has lost his voice, or the stipends are not attractive enough, that is, of course, for the lower levels of the clergy. There are "plums" to be had in the Service of the Lord, and competition is keen, but not necessarily intellectual competition.

Whilst applying to the Ystrad (Wales) Magistrates' Court for permission to hold a Dance until midnight on Good Friday, Mr. E. Simmons suggested that, from a professing point of view, there were no Christians in this country; everyone carries on on Good Friday as if it were just an ordinary day, he stated. His application was however, refused: the magistrates being of the opinion that a dance on the anniversary of the day our Lord was crucified would be too sacrilegious. So in Ystrad, at least, the flood of materialistic atheism has been halted, and the people will have to make do with pubs or chapel.

According to the "Universe," the priests in some of the negro parishes of New Orleans are called "God's Angry Irishmen," because they are taking up the cause of the negroes there. As a result, negro Baptists and other sects are being converted wholesale to Rome—in fact, four out of five in New Orleans are Roman Catholics now as against one in twenty-five in the rest of the U.S.A. What a pity that coloured folk appear to be so easily swayed in this manner by religion.

The urge for spring-cleaning has spread to the Churches, for they seem to have realised that they must put their own house in order. A committee has been dealing with those famous hymns, "Ancient and Modern," and many of the hymns have been dropped. However, that gem of Christian philosophy, "All things bright and beautiful" is still retained except for the last verse:—

The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
God made them high and lowly,
And order'd their estate.

Whether this verse was considered to be a little too ancient, or Christians are a little ashamed of such sentiments to-day, is anyone's guess; at any rate, some of our street-corner and park orators have lost a real crowd-gatherer.

An interesting situation is developing in Australia where Mr. Crittenden, an unsuccessful Liberal candidate, has filed a petition challenging the validity of the successful Labour candidate, who is also a Roman Catholic on the grounds that the Commonwealth Constitution provides that "any person who is under obligation of obedience to a foreign power shall be incapable of being chosen as a Senator or a Member of Parliament." We await the result with interest.

"THE FREETHINKER"

Telephone No.: Holborn 2601.

41, Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1.

TO CORRESPONDENTS

When the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary, R. H. Rosetti, giving as long notice as possible.

THE FREETHINKER will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad): One year, 17s.; half-year, 8s. 6d.; three-months, 4s. 4d.

The following periodicals are being received regularly, and can be consulted at "The Freethinker" office: THE TRUTH SEEKER (U.S.A.), COMMON SENSE (U.S.A.), THE LIBERAL (U.S.A.), THE VOICE OF FREEDOM (U.S.A., German and English), PROGRESSIVE WORLD (U.S.A.), THE NEW ZEALAND RATIONALIST, THE RATIONALIST (Australia), DER FREIDENKER (Switzerland), DON BASILIO (Italy).

Lecture Notices should reach the Office by Friday morning.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 41, Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1, and not to the Editor.

Will correspondents please write on one side of the paper, and keep their letters brief. This will give everybody a chance.

SUGAR PLUMS

Preparations are going ahead for the Annual Conference to be held in Sheffield during Whit week-end. Those desiring hotel accommodation should send their requirements to the General Secretary at 41, Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1. Will those who intended to let the Secretary guess their requirements alter that decision and say how long they will need hotel accommodation, it is more helpful that way.

The open-air campaign of lectures will soon be in full swing; Mr. J. Clayton has already made a start and will visit different parts of Lancashire during the season. Mr. J. T. Brighton will also be visiting outlying parts of his "parish," which covers Durham and Northumberland. Messrs. Ebury, Barker, Samms, and Mosley, have only one season a year for open-air work but it lasts twelve months. Wherever possible, lectures are announced in the Lecture Notices column of this paper.

Many readers will have appreciated the discussions of current books which have, for some time, been contributed to our columns by Mr. John Rowland. Some of them will be acquainted with Mr. Rowland's exciting novels. Both to those who know already and to those who do not we may, perhaps, recommend the latest, "Calamity in Kent" (Herbert Jenkins; 8s. 6d.). It is a thrilling tale of crime in an East Coast seaside resort, and will appeal to most people who can appreciate an exciting story.

The Sunday Times is having a most interesting discussion on an "Ideal" Bible and we notice that one correspondent would like to make some "desirable" omissions and deletions. It may be that he has seen our Bible Handbook, but we wish we could induce all the people who want an Ideal Bible to study our little Handbook first. With its aid, and a strong pen dipped in red ink, God's Holy Writ could be so reduced that all it contains worth while could perhaps go into a tiny pamphlet. And would not that be a most desirable accomplishment!

ON PSYCHOLOGY

IN his new book, *Psychology* (Paul Elek, 1950, 8s. 6d.), Dr. J. A. C. Brown begins the Preface with, "Psychology has been the last of the great sciences to come into its own, and even now there are some who would deny its claims to scientific status." Well, psychology has been studied a long, long time—one has only to take up a book like G. H. Lewes' *History of Philosophy* to see how far back the problems connected with the human mind and behaviour have been discussed. As far as it was possible to do so, in an era which cannot be considered scientific by modern standards, almost all the classical thinkers tried to account for our ideas and why we think and act as we do. For them, perhaps, it was not so much a science as a philosophy, and perhaps too, even to some modern psychologists, it is still a philosophy rather than a science.

The study of mind can, of course, be a very formidable affair but Dr. Brown has in this able work made the task very pleasant and interesting. His historical survey forms a necessary beginning, and the reader is given a brief resumé of the work in this field of, among others, Plato and Aristotle. The relationship of the body and mind, once fervently discussed, is "a problem which is no longer thought of as coming within the sphere of the psychologist." Mr. Brown adds:—

Theories of the body-mind relationship are now mainly found in the text books of philosophers, but to the student of human behaviour it is a question of negligible practical importance. Scientific method, dealing with the material world, can neither prove or disprove the independent existence of "mind." The modern worker, however, tends to regard emotions and even thoughts as physical processes taking place in the body—the problem of whether they are initiated by, or accompanied by, a non-material something known as mind or soul he would consider as irrelevant and probably unknowable. Thinking and feeling he does know a little about . . . but of a directing mind, if such there be, he knows nothing. As a scientist, he studies the instrument and notes the music it produces—he never discovers the musician. This, of course, is exactly what the philosopher attempts to do in his search for the ultimate purpose of the Universe . . .

Dr. Brown says there are three main types of theory—Materialism, Idealism, and Dualism. He classes Hume with Berkeley as an Idealist, as one who holds that "mind is the only reality." But surely this is not quite correct. Hume, it is true, considered Berkeley "unanswerable," but he also claimed that Berkeley "carried no conviction." As for "mind" being the only reality, Hume contended that he could not discover the entity called mind. "Probing deeper," says Lewes, "in the direction Berkeley had taken, he found not only was Matter a figment, Mind was a figment also. If the occult substratum which men had inferred to explain material phenomena, could be denied, because not founded on experience, so also, said Hume, must we deny the occult substratum (mind) which men have inferred to explain material phenomena. All that we have any experience of, is impressions and ideas . . . Matter is but a collection of impressions. Mind is but a succession of ideas and impressions." (Hume always made a distinction between impressions and ideas.) Hume in fact initiated a thorough-going scepticism and, as Lewes pointed out, his sceptical reasoning was "unanswerable."

Dr. Brown divides Dualism into Interactionism, Psychophysical Parallelism, and Epiphenomenalism, and carefully describes the meaning of each term. He gives Locke the honour of having written in his *Essay Concerning the Human Understanding*, "the first book on psychology in the modern sense of the word," and he calls attention to the part played by phrenology and mesmerism in the development of greater interest in psychological problems. Dr. Brown considers that phrenology has no basis in fact, but he allows mesmerism "far-reaching results." For those who think that there may be something in phrenology, a reading of Dr. W. M. Williams' *Vindication of Phrenology* might confirm their views.

In his chapter on "The Methods of Psychology," Dr. Brown notes "an important point." "The psychologist," he says, "as a scientist, takes as his working hypothesis the Law of Cause and Effect and, in practice, does not accept the principle of free-will." This is certainly something for the out-and-out religionist to ponder over. As a scientist also, he is not interested in "moral criticism of an individual's actions." The question to be asked about a saint or a murderer is "Why do men behave as they do?" Good or bad for the psychologist is of no interest to him when working as a scientist.

Dr. Brown gives three rules for psychologists in their approach to human behaviour—to try to understand its cause, to be morally quite neutral, and to take nothing for granted. And many of the succeeding chapters help to make these rules more easily applied. They deal with the Anatomy of the Nervous System, the Basis of Behaviour, Intelligence and Learning, Remembering and Imagery, and so on, including two valuable chapters on Social Psychology and the Uses of Psychology. It is difficult to select quotations, for Dr. Brown has covered a far and wide field.

It is not surprising, of course, that he is almost, if not altogether, a whole-hearted Freudian. And he appears to have accepted the work on the "condition reflexes" of Pavlov, the Russian scientist. Pavlov worked on dogs while Dr. J. B. Watson, the American, preferred "experimenting" on children. For my own part, I am bitterly opposed to the experiments of both, holding that very little worth discovering resulted from the refined but (to me) abominable cruelty.

Nor do I accept Freudianism. In his book recently published, Mr. Frank Kenyon characterises Psychoanalysis as a "delusion" and I do not think his severe criticism has been answered—except by boycott.

Freud gained a great deal of his early popularity by reducing almost all human behaviour to "sex"—though his disciples have since had to urge that "sex" meant for him something much wider than the term generally connotes. All the description Dr. Brown gives of an infant's pre-occupation with sex appears to me to be sheer nonsense, especially the Oedipus and Electra complexes. I do not for a moment believe that "the Oedipus complex has far-reaching effects on the later life of the individual."

Whether psychology will ever become an exact science say, like mathematics, it is so far impossible to prophesy. But all readers who are interested in what G. H. Lewes called the problems of Life and Mind and in the why and wherefore of human behaviour will find in Dr. Brown's work a capital introduction, even if one cannot go all the way with him. A study of the books mentioned in the Bibliography may well help to elucidate more knotty points.

H. CUTNER.

ALL FOOLS' FEASTS

IT is surprising to know the vast amount of research by learned men who have tried to explain the origin and meaning of the First of April as All Fools' Day.

Almost every country has had its Fools' Festival; in Scotland, the Gowk was the April cuckoo; in France, there were April Fish, simpletons, *Poisson d' Avril*; and in India, the Huli is the tom-fool.

Plutarch tells us of the ancient Romans who dubbed their Quirinalia the Feast of Fools; and Pliny's *Natural History* relates the wit and fun around the Temples at the beginning of April; but changes in the Calendar confuse the regularity of time; yet the actual period of duration for fool's feasts was marked in the Heaven by the Roman Augurs and their calendar astronomically made to fit with modern almanacs. According to Jewish historians, the "Passion of Christ" began about the same time as April Fool's Day; His trial and crucifixion being marked in constellations of the Zodiac where Christianity was fabricated.

The Jews and Romans knew more about the Jesus of Jerusalem than other nations, and the Jewish recorders of whom Flavius Josephus is very complete, and one may read rabbinical stories, corroborated in the New Testament, how the Roman officers and priests sent Jesus on fool's errands, backwards and forwards, to and fro, to mock Him, first to Annas, then to Caiaphas, then to Pilate, then to Herod and back again to Pilate!

Astro-theology teaches that the sun enters the constellation of Aries, the Sign of the Lamb, approximately the beginning of April, but since the era of Gregory dates of religious festivals have been altered, so that what was the tenth month, "Decem-ber," is now the twelfth. See, therefore, what a farce it is for Christians to celebrate December 25 as Christ's birthday: are they not befooled?

April is the season of the Vernal Equinox when Nature opens to give growth, as is the meaning of *Aprilis*; the Latin festival month for fun and food.

Wm. AUGUSTUS VAUGHAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE WATCH STORY

SIR,—In spite of Mr. G. Bernard Shaw's opinion that a challenge to Deity was both important and overdue, his experiment had to be abandoned and the watch put away before the five minutes had expired. The concern of his earthly host overruled business with the Heavenly Host.

Surely Mr. Shaw did not depart from the invariable custom of Atheists of taking the risk themselves (see believing reports); surely he had not stipulated that someone else should be struck down instead? The consternation of the gathering was rather unusual. For six years public information went the full rounds that God was helping this nation to exterminate large numbers of His own children but there was no hullabaloo about this ghastly piece of news.

Differing in both theory and practice from the great Atheists, Mr. Shaw depicts their admiring followers riding the high horse like any Jehovah's Witness, full of the greatness but empty about the judgments of their heroes; too lofty to look down, the watch story was really wafted aside as too paltry. Not at all, Mr. Shaw might here have used the knobby kerry to bring these real or imaginary people down to earth.

Every Atheist should know that only a blockhead would wait five minutes for an answer knowing full well that the phone was out of order, or that nobody was at the other end, or that the line had only one end. Merely refraining from such transparent idiocy was never a connecting link with greatness, atheistic or any other. It takes a more subtle technique to connect idiocy with greatness.

Everything depends on whether you know there is a God, or that there isn't one, or whether you'll take a chance for the love of an exciting drama. Where we laugh, and who does the laughing depends likewise on the same things.

Except in studying form or waiting for bets it isn't wise to bank on the particular reactions of anybody to anything, and when Peter tells us about Paul we often learn more about Peter than about Paul.

Then there is the longest laugh which comes last for in spite of modern knowledge and scholarship, of privilege and facility, of the Power and the Glory; in spite of fearful Freethinkers, elated Evangelists and crafty critics, the case for Theism was never so lame, Atheism never so sound and sweet.—Yours, etc.,

J. G. BURDON.

THE PRO-SHAKESPEARE MYTH

SIR,—My title is more correct as Mr. Yates's man was (phonetically) Shackspere, as Sir Edmund Chambers admits. Mr. Yates argues like a Christian Evidence lecturer. "What does my freethinking friend say to the evidence of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John?" So might Mr. Yates be asked, say, at Hyde Park. No doubt he would question whether their "evidence" was worth anything at all.

He might as well say that because Dickens, Carlyle, and Trollope referred to "George Eliot" as the author of *Adam Bede*, it is evident it was a man. If an anti-clerical writer had the wit to call himself Marprelate, might not a man of rank—interested in the drama as were his forebears—think fit to call himself Shake-speare? (Note the hyphen, Mr. Yates.) Were the Elizabethans so simple that a pseudonym was beyond the range of their wit? The fact is Mr. Yates is too simple to understand them.

I can leave your readers to judge which man has foregone conclusions. The one who sticks to what he was taught at school or the other who, at fifty, abandons a position as untenable after he had supported it in print.

Why could Jonson's tribute not have been written on the death of the Stratford man? Mr. Yates writes of a "fraud" but cannot show that any contemporary ever believed in his authorship. He postulates a faith that he cannot prove was ever held, and then says find me the sceptics!

If William Shakespeare could be cognisant of what goes on at Stratford every April, I think he would say, "What fools these mortals be! Fancy believing I wrote those plays."

I am glad that Mr. Yates knows of the champions of Derby, Rutland, etc. They may cancel out one another, but they are all against his man.

I fear Mr. Yates is as ignorant of Baconians as of the literary history of the Elizabethan age. He assumes I am a Baconian, and I am not. Worse still, he assumes that Baconians want to flaunt the errors of their man as evidence of his authorship. Oh, God! Oh, St. Albans! Most Baconians regard their hero as a god—as inerrant in knowledge, as impeccable in character as Jesus Christ. The editor quoted displayed no interest in the authorship question.

Probably your readers have had enough, so, Mr. Yates, what about adjourning from press to platform? I am ready to combat you there on the shortest notice. I am on the phone. Please ring!—Yours, etc.,

WM. KENT.

SIR ARTHUR KEITH AND WAR

SIR,—Mr. John Rowland, in his article in *The Freethinker* of March 19, criticises Sir Arthur Keith for stating in his work *An Autobiography* that war is "an instrument of evolution." I am afraid that I cannot agree with that criticism. Mr. Rowland may have a theory of evolution of his own, but if he has, he has certainly not explained what that theory is. On the other hand, if he agrees with Darwin that the evolution of all organic beings is based on the struggle for existence, then I ask what is the difference between a struggle for existence as described by Darwin and war? In Chapter 3 of Darwin's *Origin of Species* he clearly shows that a struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase, such rate of increase being a geometrical rate of progression, and that "as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species. . . . There is no exception to the rule that every organic being naturally increases at so high a rate that, if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered by the progeny of a single pair." In the last paragraph of Darwin's great work is the following sentence: "Thus, from the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object which we are capable of conceiving, namely, the production of the higher animals, directly follows."

It would seem, therefore, that if Mr. Rowland has a case against Sir Arthur Keith, then he also has the same case

against Darwin with respect to the very basis of his work *The Origin of Species*.

I, however, feel that I may be in agreement with Mr. Rowland to this partial extent, namely, that although I do not and cannot disagree with Darwin with respect to the obvious facts which form the basis of his great work, nevertheless, I do not, and cannot, agree with what he says in the sentence which follows the sentence which I have just quoted. In that following sentence Darwin says: "There is a grandeur in this view of life. . . ." I feel very strongly that the employment of the word "grandeur" in connection with the process of the bloody struggle of war which is always going on in nature, and, indeed, always has been going on in it ever since organic beings began to appear upon the earth, is quite indefensible. It is a pity that Darwin should have marred his great work by thus showing his admiration for a process, the greater part of which is nothing but cruelty and murder.—Yours, etc.,

(Major) J. H. G. BULLER.

MARRIED PRIESTS

SIR,—In the American Rationalist paper, March issue of *The Truthseeker*, there is a short article on "Married and Unmarried Roman Catholic Priests."

The article states that there are Roman Catholic priests who married under what is called the Oriental rite, have wives and offspring recognised by the Vatican.

The article quotes the *New York Herald-Tribune* as saying that priests and laity in the Americas and in Western Europe have been startled to encounter priests with wives and children.

Further, that some of these married priests having fled from Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Russia, are now located in Germany, France, and Italy, and attempts are being made to find "assignments" for them in other countries, the Vatican Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Rites is interested in placing them.

No doubt many of your readers will be interested in knowing more of these married Roman Catholic priests, and of the Oriental rites, and I think, as the matter is of great interest to those who enter into discussion with Roman Catholics, it is well worth while you writing fully on the matter in your columns, as no doubt what you state will be of value. Personally, I would like a full account of the Oriental rites.—Yours, etc.,

J. E. BURROWS.

LECTURE NOTICES, ETC.

OUTDOOR

Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Broadway Car Park).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: Mr. HAROLD DAY.

Kingston Branch N.S.S. (Castle Street).—Sunday, 7-30 p.m.: Mr. J. BARKER.

Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Bombed Site, St. Mary's Gate).—Lectures every lunch hour, 1 p.m.: Messrs. G. WOODCOCK and C. MCCALL.

Nelson (Chapel Street).—Sunday, 6-30 p.m.: Mr. J. CLAYTON.

North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead Heath).—Sunday, 12 noon: Mr. L. EBURY.

Sheffield Branch N.S.S. (Barkers Pool).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: Mr. A. SAMMIS.

INDOOR

Irish Rationalist Society (The Singing Kettle Café, 13, Lower Leeson Street, Dublin, Eire).—Friday, April 14, 7-45 p.m.: "Some Problems facing Irish Rationalists," Mr. MICHAEL CASEY.

Manchester Branch N.S.S. (International Club, 64, George Street).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: A Lecture.

South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.).—Tuesday, April 18, 7 p.m.: Conway Memorial Lecture: "Has History a Meaning?" Prof. B. FARRINGTON, M.A. Chairman: Prof. V. G. CHILDE, D.Litt., D.Sc. Admission free.

South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.).—Sunday, 11 a.m.: "What use is a Vote?" Mr. ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, M.A.

THOMAS PAINE, A Pioneer of Two Worlds. By Chapman Cohen. Price 1s. 4d.; postage 1d.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CHURCH. By Colonel Ingersoll. Price 2d.; postage 1d.

THE DAMNED SAINT

WHEN Ferdinando, Father Superior and Abbot of the monastery above the town of Castille, died, there was not a monk or lay-brother that did not go dry-eyed to the funeral mass. And when the last chord of the monotonous intoning had died away, the great bell used only on the death of a brother was ringing.

Clear over the hot fields and vineyards it clanged, and with their red scarves tied round their heads to keep the dust from their hair, the peasants looked up, with saddened eyes, from the fields to where the monastery crowned the wooded hills. For Ferdinando had been a good friend to them in their troubles, and had genuinely cared for his flock. So the monks prayed all night that his soul would pass swiftly through the golden gates to the everlasting bliss that he deserved.

In due time, as the fame of his good deeds spread, Ferdinando was created a Saint by the conclave at Rome. Now, in Heaven there was great rejoicing when this came about, for the soul of the Abbot had never ceased to do good works, even in its new residence.

He had flown up through the peeping stars on the back of an angel and entered Heaven with all the pomp due to his rank. But as the gates burst open to receive him, he saw many a ragged soul, tired and hungry, waiting outside for enough masses to be said to merit its entrance qualification. And then word had come up through the divine representative on earth, his Holiness the Pope, that the soul of Ferdinando was to be created a saint; and saints in Heaven hold great responsibilities, subject only to their most high Holiness and Lord God.

The late Ferdinando at once set about an ambitious programme. Future souls will have much to thank him for concerning his changes in the procedure to be adopted on arriving outside Heaven, and the forms to be filled in giving details of admission. Those rich churchmen who arrived from time to time were afforded entry without the least trouble, and even the beggars, who arrived often, now had a small chance of scraping up an admission ticket. All Heaven rejoiced that such a competent man died to give them such an efficient soul.

After two thousand years of sentry duty, Saint Peter was getting a little tired at the gates, and applied for a transfer to another department. Some time later, the application was granted, and the post was thus left free for another soul to fill. Obviously, with his genius for organisation, his sympathy and understanding, there was but only one other saint in Heaven capable of filling the assiduous task of the entrance official—and that saint was Ferdinando.

And so the lately deceased became the saint at the entrance gate, and under his administration there was no slipping over the back wall. The angels that carried up the souls from earth kept Saint Ferdinando very busy all day and all night. For the most part he allowed the majority of the applicants past his desk, and the rest were taken down by the angels to everlasting fire.

About one hundred years after Ferdinando had first taken up his position as door-keeper, there died on earth a certain philosophical Chinaman, who, during the whole of his one hundred and twenty-two years on earth had steadfastly refused to believe in either Heaven or hell. And being Chinese, it never occurred to him to change his beliefs when the angel presented him to Saint Ferdinando at the gate.

Never, either in the memory of Saint Peter or his successor had such a thing ever happened before, for the

soul refused to go into Heaven, since in his estimation such a thing was impossible. Saint Ferdinando applied to the supreme authority, and was told to send the miscreant to hell. And to hell he went without delay.

Down through the whistling winds between the worlds went the angel, with the soul of the Chinaman on his back, presenting him before Beelzebub who was sitting on a brazier. He was asked what sins he had committed to merit his coming.

But the Chinaman had never believed either in sin or the devil, and said as much to his Lordship's face. And since there was no point in wasting good coal on a soul that had never sinned, back went the angel to Heaven, carrying the Chinaman with him.

It would not be going too far to say that Saint Ferdinando nearly lost his temper. It is very disconcerting of a soul to reappear in Heaven after being sent to hell-fire. It is very much worse when the same soul refuses to go into either place. And so matters were at a deadlock.

Saint Ferdinando had been getting decidedly unpopular at Rome. His anniversary meant another special mass each year, and the amount of wine disposed of at each special mass was becoming every year more costly. Besides, owing to local wars, many new saints were being created at once. It was felt that Heaven would prefer that a few of the older and lesser ones be sent down. The first to go was Saint Ferdinando whose good deeds were anyway now out of all living remembrance.

A few days later the news was received in Heaven, and heralded with a general sigh of relief. Perhaps the new saint had been a little too ambitious in his organising. A solemn pretext was found for his fall. Gabriel led the procession to the gates, where Ferdinando, now no longer a saint, was inspecting entrance tickets. Drawing a white sword, the angel struck him through the heart pronouncing the words of doom:

"You have failed to dispose of the soul of this miserable Chinaman. Do you think you are fit to guard the entrance gate? You are done. You are finished. You must fall." And fall he did; right into the largest and hottest heap of coal in all hell-fire. And there the damned saint roasted. But as for the Chinaman, for all I know he may still be wandering between Heaven and hell to this day, passionately refusing ever to believe in either. This, however, I do know, that Saint Peter took up his old gate-duty again, and so far has not yet been again relieved.

All men, even Churchmen, sometimes imagine that Heaven can be bought or sold, or that God can be bribed and tricked. But God does not work as do men, and the ways of Mammon are not the ways of God.

One day, the worldly Abbot had fallen asleep, and that was the dream which came to him. Those things he realised—the utter futility of believing in a corrupt deity. And although before he had cared for his flock, yet when he awoke, he perhaps realised for the first time the worth of the God he served.

R. H. SIDE.

**ASK YOUR LOCAL LIBRARY
TO SHOW
THE FREETHINKER**
Special rates on application