

THE FREETHINKER

Founded 1881

Editor: CHAPMAN COHEN

Vol. LXX.—No. 43

[REGISTERED AT THE GENERAL
POST OFFICE AS A NEWSPAPER]

Price Threepence

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

"The Second Spring"

IN his famous sermon entitled "The Second Spring," preached at Oscot in 1851, John Henry Newman celebrated the then recent restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Wales by Papal Decree in 1850. At the recent centenary celebrations of the restoration of the Roman hierarchy, another present-day ex-Anglican convert, Ronald Knox, recalled and hailed as prophetic the title of Cardinal Newman's century-old sermon.

We propose briefly to review in the following paragraphs the past relations between Rome and England and their present prospects in this year of grace—1950.

As is common knowledge, prior to the Reformation, the relations between the Papacy and England were unusually close. It was from Rome at the direct behest of Pope Gregory that St. Augustine of Canterbury, the first Archbishop of that Metropolitan See, brought "the Gospel" to England in 597. Another kind of invasion took place in 1066 when, as is nowadays often forgotten, William of Normandy conquered Anglo-Saxon England on the bloody field of Senlac (near Hastings) with the spiritual support of the Pope, the great Hildebrand (Gregory VII) who blessed William's "crusade" to convert the schismatic and backsliding Anglo-Saxon Church and to bring it into communion with Rome. A specially blessed standard sent direct from Rome floated over the battlefield where Anglo-Saxon rule perished in England. Famous Catholic theologians, such as the Italians Lanfranc and Anselm, ruled over the medieval English Church; while King John actually did homage to the then Papal Legate for "his" (the Pope's) Kingdom of England. In 1401 an English parliament passed with all the customary procedure of the Constitution a ferocious Act, "De Haeretico Comburendo" ("for the burning of heretics") which was designed physically to exterminate rebels against the Church of Rome such as the contemporary Lollards.

The English Reformation "which broke the bonds of Rome," was actually a composite phenomenon with causes by no means exclusively confined to the field of religion. It may be said to have begun as early as 1306 when Edward I issued the famous Act of "Praemunire," which interdicted appeals to Rome. Using this Act as a starting point, Henry VIII (1509-47) set to work to create a National English Church, independent of Rome in jurisdiction but orthodox in its adherence to medieval Roman doctrine. For it is often forgotten that Henry, who started his career by the polemic against Luther, that won him his title of "Defender of the Faith," was no Protestant, and actually went on burning heretics to the end of his life.

The Reformation in England which began in 1530 with the fall of Cardinal Wolsey and which raged intermittently down to the (self-styled) "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 which finally established the "Protestant Succession," was a sordid and ruthless affair. As we

are not here writing on behalf of "The Protestant Alliance," we must remark that a lot of romantic nonsense has been written on both sides and that, in actual fact, in sheer ruthlessness there was not much to choose between the rival Catholic and Protestant contestants. Between the Catholic burnings and the Protestant disembowelings there was precious little to choose in sheer savagery; neither side presented any credit to the ethics of the Gospel, to which both paid lip service! The Marian roasting of Protestants is common knowledge thanks to later propaganda of the "Fox's Book of Martyrs" type. But the boast of the Protestant "sworn tormenter" of Queen Elizabeth that he had stretched the Jesuit Southwell on the rack until "he had made him a foot longer than God had made him" does not indicate any special humanitarian feeling on the side of the partisans of the Reformation!

In the end, Rome was beaten. The Papal blessing to the Spanish "crusaders" in 1588 did not prevent the "Invincible Armada" of the Spanish champions of the Catholic counter-reformation from going (literally) on the rocks. Whilst Guy Fawkes' well-meant effort to elevate Parliament, physically if not morally, miscarried thanks to the vigilance of the English political police which the Argus-eyed Tudor State had bequeathed to its Stuart successor (1605). In 1688, James II, the last Catholic King of England, quitted these shores and down to the Act of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the Church of Rome remained a legally proscribed sect in these islands; the era described by Catholic historians as "the penal times."

The Act of "Catholic Emancipation" was carried by a curious combination of Irish Catholics and English Liberals. The actual sequel has indicated that, as has also been observed more recently in the case of secular regimes, it is a moot point how far it is desirable to tolerate bodies which do not reciprocate any desire to exercise toleration themselves; for, in her own estimation, Rome remains "the one true Church" which, now as in the past, has the sacred duty of suppressing "heresies." She will use toleration only to destroy it as soon as possible; a point recently emphasised in this journal by Mr. Bayard Simmons in a fine poem. In 1850, the triumphant Vatican celebrated its "second spring" by restoring the English Catholic hierarchy, in abeyance since the distant days of Queen Elizabeth. A still Protestant England celebrated the event with riots—whereas, to-day, its centenary is officially broadcast by the B.B.C. Times have changed, even if Rome has not!

Two contemporary events gave restored Romanism a flying start. One of which, the High Anglican "Oxford Movement" has had immense publicity on account of the intellectual eminence of its leaders who went over to Rome, Newman, Manning, Faber, Ward, and others. However, a probably much more influential accession, one that was the reverse of intellectual, was provided by the Irish immigration in the "Hungry Forties," and after the terrible "Potato Famines" of

that period. A horde of Irish immigrants, poor, priest-ridden, pious, and prolific proletarians swamped the hitherto aristocratic English Catholicism which had survived from the Reformation. Much less publicized than the "Oxford Movement," this Irish immigration was, we should say, much more influential. One of its by-products is that Catholic priests, formerly known as "Mr." are now reverentially addressed by "English" Catholics as "Father," a small but significant point.

How stands Catholicism in England to-day after a century of emancipation? The startling figures claimed by Catholic apologists may be discounted, probably heavily. The influx of converts is probably offset by the simultaneous "leakage." But Rome has benefited indirectly by the obvious disintegration of the old Protestant "Fundamentalism" in our contemporary world. In 1850, England was a Christian land of intense Protestant conviction and a practically universal bibliolatry. In 1950, we would describe England as a land inhabited mainly by Agnostics—not, unfortunately, by Atheists—tempered by an increasingly vague tradition of Protestant Christianity. Convinced believers are in a diminishing minority and the old verbal inspiration, though not yet extinct is, more and more, relegated to the backwoods of our contemporary culture.

In this "Pagan" milieu (as the Catholic Church herself styles it) the Catholic minority exercises the functions of a "pressure group" in both religion and politics; in the latter connection, the current "anti-Communist" scare is a Godsend to Rome, here as elsewhere. As such a "pressure group," English Catholicism has considerable influence, which certain not impossible events—e.g., the eventual disestablishment of the anomalous "Church of England"—may increase. However, though Rome is an adept in "fishing in troubled waters," as at present, we do not anticipate any return to the medieval "Ages of Faith." Nor, we are indeed happy to assure our readers, do we anticipate that the fires of Smithfield will be relighted for the benefit of the readers—and the writers—of *The Freethinker*.

F. A. RIDLEY.

INSANITY AND THE LAW

IN antiquity, madness was commonly regarded as a mysterious affliction, for which nothing short of demoniacal possession would account; but from the time of the ancient Greeks rational explanations have been sought, and both these points of view have since persisted side by side. The former point of view has ever been by far the most popular, even though of recent years the demons have come to be called by other names; but it scarcely needs to be pointed out that the latter is the only one that can bring scientific evidence to its support. Hippocrates appears to have been the first to look upon mental diseases like any other illnesses, and his opinions were supported by Celsus, Galen, and other medical writers of the past. Since that time great advances have been made in the study of mental disease, but, despite all this, the air of mystery by which it was originally surrounded still prevails to an extent that is not warranted by the facts. For this state of affairs the psychiatrist who tries to lead people to believe that he has some kind of "inner light" which enables him to see what is hidden from other mortals, is largely to blame. An instance of this is provided by Dr. Henry Yellowlees, who gave evidence at the Haigh trial, in his memorandum to the recent Royal Commission on Capital Punishment.

In the memorandum referred to Dr. Yellowlees stated that "The question of whether the accused is fit to plead or not is a question which only a trained, practical and experienced psychiatrist has any right to attempt to answer." If psychiatry were an exact science, based on facts which, when presented, inevitably led all psychiatrists to a similar conclusion, the ordinary man might hesitate to pass judgment on opinions expressed by the professors of a subject with which he feels himself incompetent to deal. But when we find that, far from there being any such agreement, psychiatrists engaged on opposite sides in the same case almost always arrive at opposite conclusions, and that such conclusions are invariably in favour of the client they represent, we can scarcely be blamed for a little scepticism.

At the trial, in 1924, of Richard Loeb and Nathan Leopold, for the murder of Bobbie Franks, five reputable Chicago physicians, acting for the prosecution, examined the prisoners and, according to their testimony, both were found to be legally sane. The attorneys for the defence produced five equally reputable psychiatrists who unanimously decided that both prisoners were legally insane. Subsequent medico-legal battles have invariably ended in a similar result. In the case of Neville Heath, one psychiatrist declared him to be sane, while another was equally positive that he was mentally deranged. The strange thing is that no one seems to be particularly impressed by the fact that the testimony of the psychiatrists is always favourable to the side they represent. People continue to take them at their own exaggerated valuation, and their most glaring inconsistencies are passed over with little or no comment. Psychiatrists found Rudolph Hess to be insane on his own admission. When he subsequently declared that he had been shamming, those unacquainted with psychological methods may have thought he was telling the truth. Not so the psychiatrists. They had given their verdict, which was as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. That their verdict may have been wrong could not for a moment be entertained. The statement of Hess was declared to be a symptom of the particular complaint with which he had been labelled. Everyone was satisfied, and the situation was saved.

A book could be compiled from such instances as the above, sufficient to justify the scepticism of which Dr. Yellowlees complains. Nor do his arguments serve to dispel the scepticism. Complaining that lay juries have recently twice decided the question in direct opposition to medical evidence, and that on the second occasion the jury took only ten minutes to reach their decision, he says: "The only parallel to this would be a jury of matrons taking only ten minutes to decide to oppose two eminent gynaecologists on a question of probable pregnancy." Such a parallel cannot stand. In one case we have a physical fact which is capable of verification. In the other we have no more than an expression of opinion as to what is happening in another person's brain—something which is a secret to all but the person concerned. There is no justification for expecting others to defer to such an opinion, nor for considering it to be distressing, as Dr. Yellowlees does "to observe the growing frequency of expression of personal opinion on psychiatric matters . . . from the Bench." Some of these expressions of opinion have often been very much more to the point than the excuses made by the psychiatrists for their clients.

Referring to the McNaghton rules governing insanity in criminal cases, Dr. Yellowlees agreed that these rules did not, if strictly applied, cover some forms of insanity

which ought to excuse an accused person from responsibility, but admitted that no one has been able to suggest anything better. He thought the words could be altered a little, but would not like to suggest them.

In criminal proceedings the issue is "was the person at the time of committing the act labouring under such a defect of reason from disease of the mind as not to know the nature and quality of the act which he was doing; or, if he did know it, did he know that what he was doing was wrong?" Now, when the psychiatrist appears on the scene the crime has already been committed. The prisoner is then usually in a state of high nervous tension—suffering from a sense of guilt, of anticipation of the possible consequences, and from the confinement and solitude to which he is suddenly subjected. The psychiatrist can judge only from the present state of the prisoner, and form but a vague notion of his previous mental condition. But the McNaghton rules refer to his mental condition at the time the crime was committed, and on this point the evidence of his own doctor and of other persons who knew him *before* the commission of the crime is of more value than that of the psychiatrist who sees him later.

If the psychiatrist were more modest in his assumptions his opinion might possibly be helpful to counsel in formulating his arguments, and to the jury in arriving at their verdict, but to suggest, as Dr. Yellowlees does, that an independent psychiatric consultant or adviser to the public prosecutor should be appointed to secure that the Crown received independent expert advice *before* the trial in the proper way, is tantamount to asking that the trial should be pre-judged before it goes into Court, and that the prisoner's fate should practically depend on the privately expressed opinion of *one* psychiatrist—an opinion, moreover, with which the probability is that no other psychiatrist would agree.

That such claims can still be made is almost entirely due to the air of mystery with which mental diseases continue to be surrounded.

FRANK KENYON.

BEHOLD A LEGEND GROWING BENEATH YOUR EYES

JUDGING by the many differences of opinion expressed in articles with regard to the history of Christianity, there is one section, shall I say headed by Mr. Cutner, who considers that this particular religion has produced a record crop of liars and forgers. I agree with this view, knowing how easy it is for authority to suppress that which it objects and replace it by an account of the happenings which would be repudiated by people who lived in that particular epoch. It is quite evident on reflection that the history of the past has been written by the people in any particular epoch who were the winners. This may satisfy their desire to be in the limelight, but it is hard lines on those who at a later date desire to get at the facts.

I think those who have perused the excellent books issued by the Thinker's Library will appreciate what I mean.

In proof of my contention I give here a letter which appeared in *Cycling* on September 28:—

BUCKFAST ABBEY

May I be permitted to correct an error in the very interesting article by Hugh Stoker in your issue of August 24? He says that in the building of Buckfast Abbey never more than six monks were employed at any one time, and from the subsequent remarks there is a clear inference that

only monks were employed in the building and the interior furnishing of the Abbey.

Actually, several firms of contractors were employed in the building work, and it is quite obvious that the elaborate jewelled furnishings are quite beyond the capacity of the Buckfast monks to produce.

It is a popular belief that all the work was done by the monks; why I do not know, because the firms of contractors employed for long periods made use of their usual advertising devices to announce their participation. The idea is, I believe, assiduously cultivated by the Abbey authorities, who have turned the whole community into a very prosperous industry.

Bushey.

J. F. HOLLIWELL.

It is rather lucky that, as a cyclist, I am a reader of this paper, or otherwise the exposure would have been confined to the readers of this journal, few of whom may be interested in religious matters.

It is one of the best examples I have come across of a "fake," and the creation of a legend that the monks were responsible for the building of Buckfast Abbey in the sense that they laid stone on stone.

T. D. SMITH.

WHERE IS THE TRUTH?

IS there any Pope, Bishop, Cardinal, Priest or even a Curate who can prove:—

1. That the Bible records only the truth, is the inspired word of God, and was not written for its mercenary qualities!

2. That God, in whose image and likeness, we read, man is made and, hears and answers prayers, is not a myth!

3. That Mary, mother of Jesus, was found with child of the Holy Ghost, not natural man, is not mythical!

4. That Christ is not a myth!

5. That Satan is not a myth!

6. That Heaven, Hell and, that humans have souls which live for ever after the death of the body, is not mythical!

7. That the alleged fall of man is not a fable!

8. That Jesus walked on water and other alleged miracles are not fables!

9. That those who believe the man Jesus was other than human and lives to-day, are not superstitious!

Hitler said: "The bigger the lie, the more will believe it." The number believing the Bible verifies this statement.

Do the sane accept what reason rejects?

Do Christian soldiers obey God? See Numbers 31: 17-18.

The learned know the Bible is founded on ancient superstitions and has, in more recent years, been twisted by pseudo-prophets to somewhat harmonise with present-day science, events and conditions to the interest of the profit-mongering parasites who preach "the Bible records only the truth."

There have been many Christs, or Gods, born to alleged virgins; each had a corresponding resemblance to that taken by Mary and Jesus. This was a very convenient escape for unwed mothers from convention, but was brought to an end by legislation to put such mothers to death. It would take a book larger than the Bible itself to expose all the lies written therein.

During my 50-odd years as an active church member and professing Christian, I was never "born again," never had the "Holy Spirit" and was never "converted."!

New Zealand.,

GEORGE SMITH.

ACID DROPS

The "Titular Archbishop of Karim" (whatever that is) has a good go at the Church of England in a letter to the *Westminster News* in which he claims that, if they want to banish "erroneous and strange doctrine," they had better start with their own Church; it repudiates five of the Seven Sacraments, the Indefectibility of the Church, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the supremacy of the Hierarchy in matters of Religion. Quite a mouthful in fact. And it all goes to show the sweet reasonableness and the perfect harmony of all who believe in the Prince of Peace. "Unity" in fact seems as far away as the sun.

Are British Israelites downhearted? By no means. Armed with the Bible, they can meet every assault with confidence, for therein God has planted everything—yes, *everything*. The Bible says that humanity would be divided into two parts—one a group led by Moscow dominated by a "Man of Sin," the other led by a group residing in "the isles" obviously Great Britain and the United States. In a recent address, this was the theme maintained by the Rev. C. S. McKelvey at Belfast, and no doubt our Ulster friends will be suitably impressed. But are Ulsterites also Israelites like the Anglo-Saxons?

In any case, the struggle will be a bitter one with Russia and her satellites doing their utmost "to crush Anglo-Saxon Israel for ever." The "outlook is black," but all we have to do is "to lift up our hearts" to the Lord Jesus Christ and all will eventually be well. The Bible says so, Mr. McKelvey says so, Christ says so, and Moscow will get it in the neck. British-Israel—not Jewry, of course—will in fact conquer, and the Kingdom of Heaven will reign over the earth. But you must first accept the truth of British-Israelitism, or God will withhold his victorious hand. That this kind of twaddle can still be believed is a sad commentary on a sense of humour.

We were pleased to note from a letter sent to the *Church Times* that the Christian Evidence Society has sternly suppressed the mild heresy uttered from its platform on the subject of the Virgin Birth. Almost like a Papal Dogma, the Rev. Mr. Harfitt has let it be known that the C.E.S. "unhesitatingly affirms its acceptance of the Virgin Birth as a natural corollary of the Incarnation." No milk and water here. We hope one day to read that it also accepts the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of Mary as a "natural corollary" of the Virgin Birth. Indeed the C.E.S. is sure to do so if the *Church Times* accepts them, for any taint of Modernism should be ruthlessly suppressed in all true Christian Societies.

Some Christians are vigorously protesting against televising religious services. It is far too public. Christ taught, we are informed by angry opposers, more or less secret services; and they indignantly ask, "when has it been considered advisable to allow outsiders into the Church to watch Christian worship?" The enormity of such a crime must be apparent to, and even shock Free-thinkers. And then how can any television set do justice to the awful holiness of the Eucharist? No, the true Christian must never consent to watch a service from the comfort of an arm-chair. There is nothing in the Bible about television sets!

But the B.B.C. are having trouble also with their religious services for ordinary radio. They are finding out that so few people listen to them that the work entailed is simply wasted. Many people are put off because of the ridiculous parsonic voice adopted and which is supposed to reflect holiness; it makes them laugh, and they cannot concentrate reverently on the pious exhortations to righteousness. Or some of the hymns sound too comical. It is all very sad, but perhaps if the Director of Religious Services would go in for a course of Biblical sackcloth and ashes, God would look into the whole question and insist upon a heavenly solution.

It is quite interesting to note that the Romford Liberal Association passed a resolution that if a Liberal government came into power it would pay all the costs for all schools, "without interfering with the control," so that parents could have a free choice, "especially on religious grounds." In other words, the Romford Liberals would be willing to hand over the full control of a number of state schools to the Roman Church if Liberals came to power and the State would pay all costs. This looks like a pretty scheme to get votes. Fortunately, the Liberals are not at all likely to reign again.

At Wembley, the great Roman Catholic Pageant in honour of the centenary of the restoration of the hierarchy took place, and tableaux of various Catholic martyrs going to their death were represented. Needless to say, the Protestant martyrs under Bloody Mary, as she is so elegantly called in history, were not shown. The real point to remember is that what happened under Rome in Mary's reign was thoroughly revenged under Elizabeth. and the Vatican had a lesson in what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Both Christian sects are not now so eager to exterminate each other.

The wrath of an outraged Deity is bound now to fall on Whithorn in Scotland, for its council has decided to allow the local cinema to open on Sundays. Provost Arnott, an elder of the Church, appears to be a "come-back" from 1850, for he "deplored" such a sinful decision on the Sabbath day. It was carried by five votes to three but we certainly shudder to think of the fiery vengeance the Almighty will have on the impious majority.

Following the example of our brave London (religious) Commandos, the Glasgow Churches Campaign has had a glorious time with their brigade of 250 Commandos fighting like hell for Jesus. They had a civic reception, a conference interspersed with coffee, a luncheon, and a "raid" on Glasgow. Every section of the community was reached—though we grieve to hear that the Money Campaign was not quite the success hoped for. Over £4,000 are still required to balance the accounts. But what about the divinely happy converts? It is painful to assert that, just as in London, there weren't any.

When the Surbiton, Surrey, Council was recently attacked for letting a council house to a Methodist minister who was not even on the waiting list, Councillor G. G. L. du Cann (well-known to our readers) said: "It is disconcerting that a Christian pastor should have jumped the housing queue and got into the fold in front of his sheep. There is an opportunity for this gentleman to behave like a Christian by letting someone else have the house." But if he did—would he be behaving like a Christian?

"THE FREETHINKER"

Telephone No.: Holborn 2601.

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

TO CORRESPONDENTS

A large number of letters and articles have been received on the "conversion" of Mr. John Rowland, and readers will appreciate the impossibility of publishing them in full. It was our intention at first to print a few extracts from them, but it was not easy to select passages and often these, torn from their context, were difficult to follow. Most of their writers deplored Mr. Rowland's change of views, and were obviously puzzled as to how going over to God could bring about either peace or the Utopia Christians are constantly preaching about. Needless to add, Mr. Rowland's depreciation of Herbert Spencer and John M. Robertson was resented—Mr. J. G. Burdon, for example, quoting the latter's "The last enemy to be destroyed is fallacy," as something Mr. Rowland could ponder over. We beg to thank all our correspondents, and indeed we regret that, more than anything else, limitations of space have prevented us from printing some of the excellent contributions received.

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

Lecture Notices should reach the Office by Friday morning.

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 FRIEDENKER (Switzerland), DON BASILIO (Italy).

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.

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.

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.

SUGAR PLUMS

Those who were present at Professor Levy's lecture in the Conway Hall on "The Ethics of War" heard a stimulating and thought-provoking address. The flow of questions that followed showed that the audience had been keenly interested and a halt had to be called when the time limit had been reached, and passed. A notable feature of the gathering was the number of new patrons of an N.S.S. meeting.

The Kingston Branch N.S.S. closed its outdoor session with a big audience last Sunday, and the Branch is hoping for a crowded house this evening (October 22nd) when Mr. F. A. Ridley opens the indoor season with a lecture on "Political Catholicism." Meetings will be held every Sunday evening at 7-30 p.m. in "The Fighting Cock," London Road, Kingston-on-Thames. The Branch possesses an excellent team of workers and they deserve the support of all Freethinkers within range of their new meeting place.

Prof. J. Z. Young will give the Reith lectures this year, once a week from October 29 to December 10, on "Doubt and Certainty in Science." The speaker is Professor of Anatomy at University College, London, and he proposes a scientific consideration of the Human Brain and its working.

ONCE UPON A TIME

Philosophy for Pleasure by Hector Hawton is an excellent study of the subject, unusually light in its touch. He shows scepticism in dealing so lightly with it and also shows a dawning suspicion of his own approach, which is only expressed as a belief. But he is still mystified in metaphysical abstraction. Metaphysics, he says, is concerned with "wholes." Maybe he does not connect the reverent solemnity he strives to avoid with the mystics search for "wholeness" but the word solemn comes from the Latin *sollus*, Greek *holos*, meaning whole. He seems quite at home with the metaphysical arguments of philosophers, but his own metaphysic comes out in dealing with logic and the empiricism of science.

This recalls a ridiculous statement by Vernon Carter in his argument with Bayard Simmons in *The Freethinker* a short while ago: that the anti-metaphysician really is a metaphysician. This crude assertion of the identity of opposites usually takes the form, that one is involved in metaphysics even in challenging it, so in dealing with metaphysics and studying metaphysics, becomes a metaphysician. By the same sort of logic it is often argued that an anti-Christian is a Christian without knowing it, and an Atheist is really a believer at heart. Perhaps someone ought to write a book *Philosophy for Fun*, some of the arguments really are funny.

His historic survey follows orthodox lines, beginning with the Reason of the Ancient Greeks, but gives little consideration of Scholastics such as Aquinas. Following Descartes, Locke and Berkeley, he deals interestingly with Hume and is doubtful of Kant's reply. He fights shy of the psychology of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, though giving considerable space to the physics of more modern philosophers. He sees absurdity in Hegel's logic, continued in the dialectic of the Hegellians, but is somewhat puzzled by the contradictions of Bergson. He has a glimmering of the absurdity of Alexander in the idea of God as an emergent, but is perplexed by the mystical paradoxes of Whitehead and sees no absurdity in Russell's mathematical logic. It is little wonder, then, that he fails to see the logic of empiricism.

Science first frames an hypothesis then devises experiments to test it. This, roughly, he says, is scientific method. But this makes it all guess-work or chance. With empiricism, it is not simply that experience must be "given," not only is our experience our problem, but without analysis there is nothing to synthesise: a chemist can only make a synthetic product after successful analysis. Science begins with analysis and a problem wrongly stated is a handicap. The first step is logical analysis of questions involved. What is in the premises follows in the conclusions: the methods and instruments used determine the consequences of experiment: and any assumptions there may be appear in the conclusions drawn. Science is methodical discrimination for the purposes of eliminating the errors of unwanted assumptions.

As with his failure to see the logic of empiricism, so also with Russell's logic, which he deals with at some length. Russell tries to explain induction in terms of deduction, but just as synthesis is the opposite of analysis, this is just as absurd as trying to fly the Atlantic in a submarine. Russell tries to show analogy as the basis of logic with a mathematical analogy A is B or as p so q . Could anything be more ridiculous? A is different from B . A is the first letter of the alphabet, B the second, and so, one is two. Nor is it any better if these letters are algebraical quantities, for if they are the same quantity it is a mere tautology. As Chapman Cohen has so

often said, if things are different they are not the same. If analogy has its place in our thinking so also has contrast.

Coming down to a further consideration of science, he says, I believe science must, that we must, begin with at least one assumption. But it becomes almost comical in the example he gives: we must assume that the Universe is intelligible, if it is not intelligible we could not understand it. But surely, if it is intelligible we can understand it. What is all the philosophic argument about? Are we trying to make it unintelligible? It is the fact that it is not intelligible that we are puzzled by it, that our ideas are different from our experience: that drives us to such strenuous efforts in trying to make it intelligible and to get an understanding of it. If the Universe is intelligible and we fail to understand it, the logic of such an assumption is that we are unintelligent.

This assumption that the Universe must be intelligible is a watered down version of the older idea that the Universe must have an intelligence to account for it, which goes back further to the Pantheistic idea of the World as an intelligent Being. It is Russell's *as p so q*. As there is reason in the world, so, either there is reason behind it, or as with Russell's *A is B the World is Reason*. But he should have learned from Hume that wholes can not be inferred from parts; which is also shown with Alexander's idea of emergence: and as we saw with Russell, deduction can not explain induction. If reason is a whole, one half of it is being omitted, and this assumption is derived by deduction from false analogy without discrimination by logical analysis.

There is another aspect that has been overlooked. Analysis is the opposite of synthesis: instead of going back to a beginning it begins now: going back in memory or in retrospect into history. The modern idea of reason as rationalisation goes back to Schopenhauer's idea of reason as recognition, which connects with Locke's idea of experience built up in memory, just as his "will" is Kant's "categorical imperative" which is seen also in Hegel's idea of history as reason. In the same way Kant's *a priori* reason goes back through Berkeley's idea of innate reason, to the Christian Divine Reason, with the Scholastic analogy of the macrocosm and the microcosm in the animism of the Necessary Being of Aquinas, which combines Aristotle's reason as cause or purpose and Plato's idea of reason as dialectic. We can see then that the Ancient Greeks had vague and conflicting ideas of Reason.

Age-old conundrums are a necessary part of our education but there seems something childish about looking back to the wise men of old. Going back to the Reason of the Ancient Greeks carries the assumption of reason as a known quantity, but it is a philosophic problem. That we explain by reason is not inconsistent with the fact that we learn from experience. In discrimination it is not a matter of abstract Truth but whether in fact theory explains fact. To reason from a mis-statement of fact or a pure assumption is to land in illusion. Owing to their lack of experience we use the expedient of a once-upon-a-time-at-the-back-of-beyond in fairy tales told to children, but they grow out of such nonsense, just as science learns the absurdity of unnecessary assumptions as childish fantasies inherited from the past.

H. H. PREECE.

The age of faith, seen in retrospect, looks somehow pale and puffy: one admires its saints and anchorites without being conscious of any very active desire to shake hands with them and smell them.—H. L. MENCKEN.

WHAT THEY SAY

AS I more or less anticipated, my discussion of my changing views of theological matters has stirred up some critics, and I think that I owe it to myself as well as to them to make at any rate some brief reply.

My article stating the case as I now see it was, of course, written before Mr. Cutner's criticism was published. I do not think I have any comment to offer on his courteous discussion of my position, except that I should like to reassure him (and any others who may share his ideas) that I am never likely to become a Roman Catholic, as he seemed to suggest. The orthodox Communist is far more likely to join the Roman Church than I am! But I do most fervently disagree with his attitude regarding the atom bomb (and, indeed, the use of force generally). One of the things which has tended to disturb my previous Rationalist attitude has been the very fact that people like Mr. Cutner—people kindly by nature, humanitarian and all the rest of it—seem quite cheerfully to acquiesce in the use of a weapon that (if used in a future war) will quite certainly bring all civilisation down in ruins. I know all the arguments about the Spanish Inquisition and the way in which totalitarian religion used force in the past. The things said by Mr. Cutner and others here are the sort of things I have said for years. But the fact remains that until some change of heart comes over men, there is little chance of bettering the precarious position into which humanity has brought itself. And I cannot see such a revolutionary change of heart taking place unless man seeks and finds help beyond himself.

Having said that, I may perhaps append a footnote regarding my old friend Bayard Simmons' comment on H. G. Wells. If I gave the impression that Wells turned to religion in his last days I did not intend to do so. What I was trying to show was that Wells realised that his life-long philosophy of what has been called "secular optimism" was not satisfactory. In his last little book he said that in his opinion the story of mankind on this planet was over; all that really remained was to write Man's epitaph. What I was endeavouring to say, therefore, was that Wells, for long the prophet of science, saw in his last days that science was not the universal panacea he had long thought it. And he said this before the use of the atom bomb wrote a dreadful appendix to what he was saying.

I expect that the weeks ahead will bring further criticism of what I have written on these matters; I am sure that nothing but good can come of discussing them. And in any event I feel that it says much for this journal that we can write calmly of issues that divide us, without annoyance and without rancour. That is more than could be done in some parts of the world!

JOHN ROWLAND.

THE HEART AND BRAIN

SOME figures of speech, although very current, are inaccurate. One of these has the heart usurping the function of the brain. All thought, emotion, and tendency, are mental. But how often one reads, especially in fiction and sermonising, feeling and emotion as pertaining to the cardiac. A novel with Richard Coeur de Lion as chief actor, informed the reader that he was known as "Yea and Nay," in that when his head said "yes," his heart said "nay"—and vice-versa. To estimate that correctly, it would be that he, as many do, has conflicting interests in his disposition. An author,

whose name I forget, said that, of course, both thought and emotion are mental, but just the same, although the brain deals with the intellect, the heart is disposed to emotion; so that love, hatred, envy, jealousy, etc., are cardiac.

Of course, confined to the actual physical status, such a quibbler would have to surrender his position. The heart has, as we know, only one function, and that, really, is of the greatest importance, even greater than the mental one, since on the heart ceasing to beat, the brain stops instantaneously.

As a figure of speech denoting feeling or inclination, this has been current from time immemorial. But in ancient times it was not a figure of speech. The heart was held to be given to mental effort. "The fool has said in his heart, there is no God." That was meant to be literally accepted. After all, there is a certain reason for this idea of the heart usurping the realm of the mental. Under strong emotion, which, of course, is agitating the brain, the heart beats faster, or seems to do so. It is easy to understand the ancient opinion, therefore, that this was cardiac. But to-day, sometimes, one can't refrain from smiling. How about this, taken from a short story: "Fear swept down on her, then, jumping into her chest." Well, there the heart is located. Suppose we re-state this? "Arising in her head." Not leaping into it, or entering it, since mental operation occurs in the brain.

Again, the Bible tells us that "the heart of man is desperately wicked." Nequiquam! Not at all! It and the stomach are two of the most benevolent organs we poor mortals possess. But the brain can be superlatively beneficent or the reverse. It has invented the atom bomb.

GEORGE F. LAWS.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CLASS WAR.

Sir,—I suspect that Mrs. Matson had "a smack at me" because she rightly sensed my opposition to Marxism (or Communism). But it is a pity she did not read my article first. I said that, "I and all fathers must look with horror at the atom bomb," but this means to Mrs. Matson that I am entirely in favour of its use. Let me, however, add that, against war-mongers, I can see little difference between dropping 100 high explosive bombs or one atom bomb. With the exception of Marxist Russia and her satellites, and Mrs. Matson, the whole world has applauded the United Nations dropping bombs on the Korean war-mongers.

As for the "class war," I said, "The struggle between the haves and the havenots is one which seems to have been pretty evident throughout the ages." This, says Mrs. Matson, is a "muddy statement." She puts it right by saying it commenced "when the first (sic) man acquired the first (sic) slave"! This leaves me breathless.

I am rather intrigued by Mrs. Matson asking me for chapter and verse for the statement I made about Karl Marx. Does she deny it outright or, knowing that I am right, wonders whether I really do know the "chapter and verse"?—Yours,
H. CUTNER.

SCHOOL RELIGION.

Sir,—Mr. Bellamy's little story of his daughter's reaction at God's house may be paralleled with mine.

My daughter, aged 7, had some homework brought from her convent school, to write 20 words of three letters each. She proceeded well: cat, mat, rat, cod, god, log, bog; she appealed to me, but I contented her by merely explaining all early words of a language were mainly one syllable, and she must think them out.

A few days later a Christian friend came to visit us and my daughter said in talking of lessons, "do you know that God is dog backwards." The horror of her listener can be imagined.—
Yours, etc.,
M. COORLEIGH.

OBITUARY

I regret to report the death of yet another of our Newcastle Freethinkers. Mrs. Jeffreys, who was 81 years of age, had been an active Freethinker for a long time indeed. She was the wife of Alderman J. Jeffreys, who is still, at the age of 84, doing valuable work for freethought and humanity. They had been married for 60 years, and both have worked very hard in their locality, where their useful work has endeared them to all. They were well known in Freethought circles, among which were many who owed their introduction to Freethought to Mrs. Jeffreys. A loyal member of Newcastle Branch, she will be sadly missed. She had ten children, all of whom had followed her example in being thoughtful and useful citizens. Our sympathy goes out to Alderman Jeffreys and the family in their loss. A service was read by Mr. W. Rowe. W. R.

LECTURE NOTICES, ETC.

OUTDOOR

Blackburn Branch N.S.S. (Market Place).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: Messrs. ROTHWELL and SHARPLES, a lecture.

Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Platt Fields).—Sunday, 3 p.m.: Messrs. C. McCALL, L. SMITH, R. BILLINGS and G. WOODCOCK. (St. Mary's Gate, Blitzed Site).—7-45 p.m.: Messrs. C. McCALL, L. SMITH, R. BILLINGS and G. WOODCOCK. (Alexandra Park Gates).—Wednesday: Messrs. C. McCALL, L. SMITH, R. BILLINGS and G. WOODCOCK. (St. Mary's Gate).—Lunch-hour Lectures every weekday, 1 p.m.: Mr. G. WOODCOCK.

North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead Heath).—Sunday, 12 noon: Messrs. A. CALVERLEY and F. A. RIDLEY (Highbury Corner).—7 p.m.: Mr. L. EBURY.

Sheffield Branch N.S.S. (Barker's Pool).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: Mr. A. SAMMS.

INDOOR

Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Science Room, Mechanics' Institute).—Sunday, 6-45 p.m.: W. BARTHOLOMEW, M.A., "Crime and Punishment—Yesterday and To-day."

Conway Discussion Circle (Conway Hall Library, Red Lion Square, W.C.1).—Tuesday, October 24, 7 p.m.: W. E. SWINTON, Ph.D., F.R.S.E., "Some Prehistoric Monsters."

Glasgow Branch (McLellan Galleries, Sauchiehall Street).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: GEO. COLEBROOK, President, Freethought Society, Cumberland, "Workers and War."

Kingston Branch N.S.S. ("The Fighting Cock"), London Road, Kingston-on-Thames.—7-30 p.m.: Mr. F. A. RIDLEY, "Political Catholicism."

Nottingham Cosmopolitan Debating Society (Technical College, Shakespeare Street).—Sunday, 2-30 p.m.: Mr. D. W. HEALD, "Mind and Will in the Universe of Matter."

South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1).—Sunday, 11 a.m.: Professor G. W. KETTON, M.A., LL.D., "Law, Reason and Justice."

West London Branch N.S.S. (The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.1).—Sunday, 7-15 p.m.: P. VICTOR MORRIS, N.S.S., "Religion the Intruder."

PAMPHLETS for the PEOPLE

By CHAPMAN COHEN

What is the Use of Prayer? Did Jesus Christ Exist? Thou shall not suffer a Witch to Live. The Devil. Deity and Design. Agnosticism or...? Atheism. What is Freethought? Must we have a Religion? The Church's fight for the Child. Giving 'em Hell. Freethought and the Child. Morality without God. Christianity and Slavery. Gods and their Makers. Woman and Christianity. What is the use of a Future Life? Christianity and Ethics. Price 2d. each. Postage 1d.

Complete Set of 18, Cloth Bound. Price 5s.

Postage 3d.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND MORALS

IV—THEOPNEUSTIC AUTHORITY

- (1) In the first part of these notes the essential feature of religion was defined as a belief in the extra-natural.
- (2) This seems the logical and reasonable division between religion and any system of secular science or philosophy.
- (3) If one believes Nature includes everything and God is part of Nature this is a form of Natural Pantheism.
- (4) If Christianity is not one form of Pantheism, Christians must believe in something extra-natural.
- (5) These hypotheses will not be discussed here, but an extra-natural God will be accepted as the Christian thesis.
- (6) This extra-natural God may not be ostensible to humans, but the bridge from Him to them is theopneustic.
- (7) This is Divine Revelation and operates in many ways, in history, in institutions and personally.
- (8) It operates in human minds and gives them knowledge which is outside and beyond the natural sphere.
- (9) It is that Divine authority which singles out and separates humans from all other created things.
- (10) It is one of the features of Christianity which distinguishes it from non-theopneustic Pantheism.
- (11) The word "Authority" has very varying meanings and covers many very different forms and types.
- (12) It is used to indicate legal, intellectual, scientific, cultural and personal powers, rights or knowledge.
- (13) Theopneustic Authority is something quite different from any of these, something restricted to religion.
- (14) It is alleged that there exists a special and exclusive Authority which has a definite extra-natural source.
- (15) This alleged bridge, or stream, or connection, of psychic inspiration is what is here termed Theopneustic Authority.
- (16) Some special esoteric insight and resultant authority has probably been claimed on behalf of many religions.
- (17) In primitive religions it was assumed by medicine-men, by priests and by kings as an exclusive possession.
- (18) It existed in the forms of prophecies and oracles and extended particularly all through the Old Testament.
- (19) Here it is not necessary to follow its curious history but only to consider its forms as Christian Revelation.
- (20) Three examples of its alleged operation are the authority of Jesus, of the Church, and of the Individual.
- (21) The reputed evidence of the divine authority of Jesus is the Gospel Story of his life and teaching.
- (22) It is claimed that this historical record is divinely inspired and his teaching is divine guidance.
- (23) Owing to these claims Christians generally treat the Bible as something more than ordinary history.
- (24) They accept its statements, both of history and teaching, as something more than human records.
- (25) Difficulties for the inquiries are increased by the arbitrary extent to which its statements are accepted.
- (26) Extra-natural inspiration in the form of Theopneustic Authority is not confined to the Bible.
- (27) Some bodies claim a contemporary interpretative authority in their corporative capacity as churches.
- (28) For example, the Roman Church claims this divine authority for the Pope's "ex-cathedra" statements.
- (29) In other Churches this divine Revelation or "inner light" is claimed mostly on behalf of individuals.

(30) Whatever its form the claim is for a knowledge and authority which transcends ordinary human powers.

(31) This corporate authority was exhibited in those early Church Councils which determined the Canon of the Bible.

(32) Having fixed this Canon, other similar authorities have been called to determine what the Bible means.

(33) While in the Roman Church the supreme authority on the Bible is corporative, in other Churches it is individual.

(34) It may be noted, however, that the latter accept the Bible which the Church they repudiate made canonical.

(35) The result is that these "channels of divine inspiration and revelation" are many and often conflicting.

(36) One comes, therefore, to inquire what is the source and validity of any of these claims to Theopneustic Authority.

(37) An impartial observer will finally conclude that the only source is the assertions of the claimants themselves.

(38) Even granting the improbability of objective evidence of this authority, no other reasonable proof is exhibited.

(39) Medicine-men, kings, priests, and others have put forward their own claims to Theopneustic Authority themselves.

(40) All through history there have been many who believed in these claims without further proof of their validity.

(41) In its psychical form this Theopneustic Authority differs from other authorities such as that of the State.

(42) In the latter there is physical power of enforcement on all, whether they are believers or unbelievers.

(43) Authority in the State is merely a method of working; authority in Science is merely accumulated knowledge.

(44) Authority in Art is the result of its study; in all these the authority and power is within the human sphere.

(45) Theopneustic Authority, however, is quite different; it is knowledge and power given to humans from outside Nature.

(46) It may be manifested objectively, but generally it is a mental process operating in receptive minds.

(47) Christian apologists have frequently distinguished between what they termed Natural and Revealed Religion.

(48) This distinction seems to be becoming less emphasised as considerations merge from revelation to science.

(49) It is not necessary for present purposes, however, to enter into detailed examination of these differences.

(50) All that is required here is to note the Christian allegations of this special process termed Theopneustic Authority.

W. EDWARD MEADS.

HOW THE CHURCHES BETRAY THEIR CHRIST. An Examination of British Christianity. By C. G. L. Du Cann. Price 9d.; postage 1d.

INFIDEL DEATHBEDS. By G. W. Foote. Revised and enlarged by A. D. McLaren. Price 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

LIFT UP YOUR HEADS, An Anthology for Freethinkers. By William Kent. Price, cloth 5s., paper 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.