

THE
FREETHINKER

Founded 1881

Editor: F. A. RIDLEY

Vol. LXXII—No. 42

[REGISTERED AT THE GENERAL
POST OFFICE AS A NEWSPAPER]

Price Fourpence

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

The Vatican and United Europe

AS was aptly enough remarked by a French publicist at the time, the First World War "set out to 'Europeanize' the Balkans but ended by 'Balkanizing' Europe." The sombre history of the old Continent from 1914 down to the present year of grace, affords a striking confirmation of the witty Frenchman's thesis. What the children of Israel are alleged to have endured during their forty years' sojourn in the inhospitable wilderness, is a mere bagatelle compared with what Europe has had to put up with throughout the devastating generation in which our contemporaries have lived. That grim definition of the modern State by the Russian anarchist, Alexander Herzen: "Genghis Khan plus the electric telegraph," can be said to have derived much confirmation from the dire events of the past generation.

Under such melancholy circumstances, it is hardly surprising that, upon the time-honoured maxim: "Unity is strength," the post-war world has witnessed many attempts to unite the European continent and (as the famous French freethinker, Ernest Renan, prophesied a century ago would eventually transpire) to supersede the now outmoded anachronism of the national State by some form of European Continental Federation. We are all "good Europeans," nowadays, in theory at least. Even the British politicians, Tory and Labour alike, whilst refusing to participate actively in such a Federation, at least, pay lip service to the current ideal of European unity.

However, "all that glitters is not gold," and not every form of European unity is either itself progressive or is sponsored by progressive forces. Nor, in the present writer's submission, at least, are the positive steps at present being taken towards European unity necessarily of a progressive character, nor are the social forces behind them in all cases animated by progressive ideals. In this last connection, we refer to the Vatican in particular.

Secularists in the Anglo-Saxon lands, who inherit a political outlook relatively free from ecclesiastical influence, are still far too prone to consider politics purely in a secular setting. For example, they tend to think, to-day, purely in terms of the current "cold war" between America and Russia. Some enlightened people tend, indeed, away from this basic political antithesis of our era, and speak hopefully of a political "Third Force." But even they appear to ignore what is, actually, becoming more obvious every day: viz., that this "Third Force," distinct from both Russia and America, and inexorably pursuing its own separate aims and its march towards world power, already exists. It is, indeed, the oldest as well as the most tenacious political force in Europe and in the Western World: "the Black International" of Rome, the power-centre of which is the Vatican, that medieval palace-fortress in the West which still confronts in the contemporary struggle for world power, the rival International to the East, the headquarters of which are, likewise, situated in the medieval palace-fortress of the Kremlin.

It is, perhaps, a symptom of the political insularity of our Press and platforms that, whilst the contemporary first steps towards European unity are, at present, being widely discussed, practically no reference is ever made to the political force which is, probably, the most active factor in the present process of European unity, and which is certainly the greatest beneficiary from such practical steps towards Continental unification which have, thus far, been taken.

The unification of Europe is not a new ambition for the Papacy, contrarily, it is its oldest ambition, and the foundation of all the others. For it was, precisely, by the unification of Europe that Papal Rome was able to become the effective successor of Imperial Rome and a world power. Indeed, as the late Mr. Delisle Burns convincingly demonstrated, the political conception of "Europe" originated under the auspices of the Papacy. The "Holy Roman" Empire (800-1806) bestowed by the Papacy upon Charlemagne and his successors, was, in theory and to a certain extent in fact, the political instrument through which the Church of Rome ruled Europe. That era was the golden age of the Church, and it still tenaciously seeks to revive its vanished glories. (Cf. Delisle Burns, *The First Europe*, Allen and Unwin.) "Other times, other manners."

To-day, the worldly-wise Vatican pursues more indirect methods than the recreation of the old "Holy" Empire. However, its basic strategy remains unaltered. Clerical influence fights hard in the corridors of the "Council of Europe" at Strassburg and, presumably—for the Church is no stranger to Big Business, indeed, the Catholic Church is the biggest business still, even in the present age of combines and cartels!—its influence is powerful in the inner circles of the iron, steel, and coal cartels, founded by, and named after, two clerical politicians, both pious sons of Holy Church, MM. Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet. However, the major victory for the overall clerical strategy is already constituted by the current formation of "little Europe"; the current federation now in process of achievement of six predominantly Catholic lands: Federal (non-Communist) Germany, France, Italy, and the Benelux countries, Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg; a "little Europe" which, incidentally, is largely identical with the old "Holy Roman" Empire.

A brief glance at the political personalities and parties which direct the new European Federation is enough to show how potent is the "hidden hand" of the Vatican. Take, for example, the "Big Three," the political leaders of the new Catholic Europe: MM. Adenauer, Schuman, De Gasperi. Adenauer, ex-Deputy of the old Catholic "Centre" Party, which once nearly brought Bismarck to his knees in the celebrated "Kultur Kampf" (1878), and former Lord Mayor (Burgomaster) of the famous Catholic centre of Cologne." Schuman, ex-officer in a Catholic regiment in the old Imperial German Army—M. Schuman comes from Alsace, a German possession prior to 1914—now a leader of the French Catholic "M.R.P.," but,

formerly, a minister in the Clerical-Fascist Vichy régime of Marshal Petain, which, for four years abolished every trace of the French Revolution and the secular state in France. De Gasperi, former Catholic Deputy (for the now Italian Tyrol) in the old parliament of Imperial Austria; leader of the former Catholic "People's Party," later, Papal librarian at the Vatican. A Catholic Trinity! To which may now be added M. de Menthon, French clerical politician and alleged descendant of a medieval saint, who succeeded the anti-clerical, M. Spaak, as the present President of the "Council of Europe."

Behind all these, guiding and co-ordinating their clerical counter-revolution, Europe's number one politician, His Holiness, Pius the 12th, present Pope and former professional diplomatist, Papal Legate in pre-Hitler Germany and, earlier on, Papal Nuncio in Munich in 1923, when the then unknown Hitler staged his Munich coup: the first open bid of the Nazis for power. With such men and their kind in the saddle of the New Europe, it becomes evident how far the clerical strategy has proceeded.

No doubt "little Europe" is only the first stage: Spain, Portugal and, perhaps, Austria, will be incorporated later, forming a solid Catholic "sphere of influence," already embracing some 200 million people; a population equal to that of either U.S.A. or U.S.S.R.; and, no doubt, ultimately destined to be still further augmented by the "liberated" populations of formerly Catholic Hungary and Poland, when the "Crusade" against "Atheistic Bolshevism," for which the Catholic Church is now busily preparing, has been finally brought to a victorious conclusion. With Russia eliminated and Protestant England outside, what would there be to prevent the restoration of a new "Holy Roman Empire" in a clerical-dominated Europe? At any rate, some such scheme forms part of present Vatican world strategy.

In view of the above state of things in contemporary Europe, we think that Freethinkers everywhere might do well to turn their attention from passing distractions and direct their inquiries to this vast clerical strategy at work under their eyes, and to the new Catholic Empire now being founded within sight of our shores.

F. A. RIDLEY.

THE WONDERS OF NATURE

IN his Gifford Lectures entitled *Man on his Nature* (C.U.P., Second Edition, 1951), Sir Charles Sherrington, O.M., the eminent scientist and humanist, covers an extensive domain. He discusses many themes concerning man's place in Nature from a purely scientific standpoint. As he avers, his survey "stresses the view that man is a product, like so much else, of the play of natural forces acting on the material and under the conditions past and present obtaining on the surface of our planet."

The opening address is termed *Nature and Tradition* in which he compares the conclusions of Jean Fernel, philosopher physician to Henry II of France, with those of our own day. Fernel, although of a speculative turn of mind, was incommoded in the sixteenth century by traditional beliefs which Harvey, Galileo and Newton afterwards negated, while still later, Darwin's discoveries revolutionised the outlook of the intellectual world.

In the sixteenth century and even subsequently, the influence of the stars on human destiny was a virtually universal misconception. As Sir Charles states: "The Church condemned sorcery and magic, but as for astrology, cardinal after cardinal had his astrologer." "At Rome," said Savonarola, writing about the time Fernel was born,

"no prelate, no rich man, but has at hand an astrologer to say whether he should ride forth or do anything. No one takes a step in life without his astrologer." It was assumed that man resided on a fixed earth, with sun, moon and stars revolving around him, and even now, it is a popular belief that the moon's changes influence the weather. Jupiter was to the astrologer deemed friendly; Venus presided over procreation; Mercury fluctuated, while Saturn was saturnine and malevolent.

By the use of the microscope in the seventeenth century, the cells which constitute all plants and animals were revealed. In single-celled organisms, such as the amœba, their activities are relatively simple. But in the higher animals, such as ourselves, the cells exist in countless millions. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon and nitrogen are their chief constituents, while a granular jelly they contain seems indispensable to life. As Sherrington states: "A good many years ago with the recognition that this jelly was 'the physical basis of life,' it was named protoplasm."

The cell, formerly regarded as static, is now known as a seat of energy, as every cell is provided with "a visible kernel called the nucleus. It is directive: a nest of ferments. Remove it from the cell and the cell's rest gets out of gear and dies." Protein threads connect one cell with another.

The unicellular amœba feeds and grows, much as our own cells absorb nourishment from the particles around them and digest them. The wonder is that these cells appear to select some particles in preference to others. These activities vary in health and disease both in man and lowlier animals. Our author asks whether what we term mind is manifested in these phenomena and tentatively replies that this question is "not decisively answerable," although competent observers of free single cells have seen them modified. In other words, that they "can learn."

When surveying *The Wisdom of the Body*, Sherrington furnishes a clear account of the development of the child from a single fertilised cell. He concludes that: "Chemistry and physics account for so much that the cell does, and for so much to which years ago physical science could at that time offer no clue, that it is justifiable to suppose that the still unexplained residue of the cell's behaviour will prove resolvable by chemistry and physics."

Sherrington fearlessly expresses his acceptance of evolution and rejects unequivocally all hypotheses that suggest the genesis and development of organisms to other than terrestrial operations. All that lives, or has ever lived on our planet is the result of our earth's parentage and nurture. As for the reproduction of plants and animals, he suggests that "if our materialist in his old frame of mind to-day submits that he holds the key to it, he can, we may think, go into Court with a good case."

Sherrington's chapter on *The Brain and its Work* is intensely interesting and instructive, coming, as it does, from a specialist on the subject. The problem of mind, he finds it difficult to solve, if the present writer reads his meditations aright. Still, Sir Charles detects no tittle of evidence of its existence or functioning apart from unicellular or multi-cellular organisms.

Acquired characters in animals, he opines, are not inherited as such, and he declares that the domesticated canine's habits have to be re-learned by its offspring. This contention, however, is highly controversial, and our author modifies his claim when he concedes that "Domestication, however, with its training, enters as an element into the domestic dog's surroundings. It, therefore, like

other elements in its surround, can exert selective pressure. Our domestic dog is therefore not to-day born just as much as a Stone Age puppy, as if domestication had never been. A hundred thousand years of domestication may well have left him genetically more disposed to domestication. There is in him something of an inherited disposition toward the social."

Nature having developed us as a combination of energy and intelligence, our scientist recommends as a magnificent undertaking for some future historian a survey of the genesis and evolution of terrestrial life. Such a splendid achievement, for which we already possess the outlines, would, he thinks, prove of inestimable value to humanity. Past and present historians have recovered and recorded much of the events of the previous 8,000 years which cover departed and still existent cultures and our indebtedness to them is immense. Yet, urges Sherrington, "there is yet this other theme at once comprehensive and intimate: the history of our planet, all that it comprises and has done and made. It asks to be written, and so all may read our planet's becoming which contains our own." It would embrace: "Aeons of seething and momentous shaping. A triple scum of rock and tide and vapour—the planet's side swept on through day and night. Then from that tide arising, shape after shape, past fancy. And latterly among them some with thought eager for 'moral values'."

Our sixteenth century physician lost his former faith in astrology as a result of his medical experiences. But Fernel was even more in accordance with modern thought in the views he expressed concerning generation. Sherrington cites the following from his writings concerning the importance of breeding from sound stock: "By consequence it would be a great good for our race if solely those who are sane and sound gave themselves to the making of children. For if a husbandman knows that for the sowing of the land the best seed is to be chosen, having found by experience that from a poor seed we can only expect a miserable harvest, how much more should that be practised in the propagation of our species." This is, indeed, an anticipation of the teachings of contemporary eugenics.

T. F. PALMER.

(To be concluded)

ASTRONOMY AND THE CHRISTIAN MYTHOLOGY

I REALISED that the Earth is merely a petty globe hurtling across the depths of the solar system, which regulates its life and its evolution. Whilst the Sun itself, along with its train of planets, actually represents a star of medium dimensions, a luminous point gleaming in a remote corner of the gigantic constellation that we call "The Milky Way." This self-same "galaxy," the approximate dimensions of which stagger our imagination, is merely a single nebula, a petty cloud amongst untold millions of others, which telescopes of continually augmenting range are progressively opening up to our vision, so that their range continually expands and is measured more accurately, and the light of which, travelling at 186,000 miles a second, takes for certain, centuries to reach us across the abyss. It is infinite space in infinite time.

In a Universe so constituted there is neither depth nor height, right or left, town nor centre, as these are computed by us. It is completely childish to depict a celestial monarch enthroned upon the highest clouds, in the midst of an angelic court of heavenly adolescents who chant His praises and transmit His commands; utterly childish to imagine an "only begotten son" sitting alongside of Him, who, outraged by the insubordination of mankind, becomes man in order to repair the evil done by our species, being

born of a woman, dying on a cross, then returning to his Father with his risen body. Infantile to imagine his mother imitating his ascension and his physical assumption, into Heaven, in order to sit with him upon the summit of the cosmos, whence she descends so as to reveal herself to three small children in Fatima, upon a petty hill, under a budding oak.

Here we have the outmoded survival of bygone times, when it was generally believed that the Earth was the centre of the Universe, that the Sun had been made to lighten the day, as the moon and the stars similarly existed to lighten the night, that man had been created to be the master of nature, and that the Creator anxiously followed the course of his adventure.

We are ruled by a mythology as foolish and as childish as that of the Greeks, and the Romans, the Babylonians and Egyptians, although we have not their excuse of a remote past and an almost complete ignorance of the processes of nature. We must have the honesty to recognise this and the courage to proclaim it. It is solely so as to shed light upon the road and to clear away the superstitions which encumber it, that I have written this critical and objective study to expose the visions of deluded children, subsequently utilised by the Vatican. In so doing, my sole aim was to assist historic truth and human progress.

(Translated from *Fatima*, by Prof. Alfarcic, by F.A.R.)

ONE OF THE SIGHTS OF LONDON

"Dry rot and woodworm threaten
Our rafters and our pews."
An advertising banner tells
The passers-by the news.
The Vicar of St. Pancras
(By God left in the lurch?)
Appeals for twenty-thousand pounds
To save St. Pancras Church.
Surely, unconscious humour
Has rarely been so funny
As is that drainpipe in the porch
To take the people's money,
As if the worthy Vicar
Were anxious to explain
That here's the perfect way to throw
Good money down the drain!
Maybe, by advertising
The *building's* parlous plight,
He camouflages something worse
He'd like kept out of sight?
Look, then, beyond the notice,
And you will find, indeed,
There's rot in his theology,
And worm has sapped his creed.

P. V. M.

SOME JUDGMENT

Joseph Smith and Samuel Rigdon, one of his Apostles, had a vision of the assignment of men on the Judgment Day. The sun would be inhabited by members of the true Church of Latter Day Saints; the moon by those who had never known the Revelations of the Book of Mormons; the earth and stars would be peopled by those who had refused the law of God.

THE CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

By W. A. Campbell. With a Preface by the Rt. Hon. J. M. Robertson. Price 2s. 6d.; postage 2d.

DETERMINISM OR FREEWILL? By Chapman Cohen.

Price, cloth 3s.; postage 2d.

ACID DROPS

So at last Cardiff has definitely voted for Sunday cinemas in spite of the terrific efforts of all God-fearing people. The result of a poll was 55,935 in favour and 21,542 against, and the traditional Welsh Sunday has got the shock of its life. With such a victory, efforts will be made to give the Lord's Day and its Society another smack in the eye, or even more than one, by tackling other Welsh towns who badly need livening up on Sundays. And what can the Lord do with a victorious cinema trade? Nothing!

At last a "get together" band of three Christian sects are going all out to defeat the forces of evil in Hampstead Garden Suburb. A Church of England parson, a Non-conformist ditto, and a Quaker have joined forces in a combined effort to bring everybody possible to Christ—though naturally their Roman Catholic brothers in the Lord refuse to have anything to do with such a noble effort. Everybody in the Suburb will be canvassed, and householders will be asked to fill in a form on which are a number of pertinent—or rather impertinent—questions to be answered.

They will be asked whether they belong to a Church, or any religious body, if not, whether they would like to belong to one, if they are interested or not, if they have any special problem in which they could be helped, and if they would like the Vicar, the Parson, or the Quaker, to visit them. We hope that, in a polite way, these busy-bodies will be told plainly where they can get off. It must be obvious even to the most ultra-pious that, if people don't go to Church, it is because they don't want to, and that is reason enough. In any case—and we have had no little experience—the average religious visitor is, as a rule, hopelessly ignorant of his religion. A simple question from our *Bible Handbook* will utterly floor them.

We noted a passage in *Two Thousand Years of London*, a very interesting history of our great city, which ridicules the idea that the reign of Elizabeth I was a golden age. Its author, Mr. C. Whitaker-Wilson, writing in 1933, says: "To suggest her reign to have been a golden age is mere nonsense." He adds: "On the other hand, it was an era of great men and great deeds." Of course, Raleigh, Drake, Shakespeare and the rest were great men and did great deeds, not because of Elizabeth, but in spite of her.

As an example of incoherent twaddle, the recent address to schools given by Dr. Farrer, who is a chaplain in Oxford, on the existence of God was a masterpiece. After pointing out that scientists had to account for the initial "explosion" which produced the Universe and couldn't, he waded in by insisting that God did it; though later, he admitted that his wonderful argument for the Lord's existence wasn't watertight. As he is going to speak again, we hope that his future arguments will be watertight.

In any case all he could hint at was the long-exploded "design" argument as proof that his God Almighty existed. There was not a line in his silly address which showed that he had even a nodding acquaintance with the real objections known to scientists against the God hypothesis. So long as they cannot explain "why" there was a big explosion, this proved that God did it. And this kind of nonsense is ladled out to schools. Fortunately, few children could hope to follow in the least the muddled thinking of Dr. Farrer.

THEATRE

"Meet Mr. Callahan." Garrick Theatre.

That adaptation by Gerald Verner of Peter Cheyney's novel *The Urgent Hangman* gives us rather too much narrative in the first half and insufficient action. In the second half things start to happen, but in a play of this kind—which involves the plot of a novel—we cannot get away from the fact that many important events take place off stage which, from a dramatic point of view, is unsatisfactory.

However, by paying close attention to every word that is said we unravel the complicated novelish plot and find the evening entertaining. I am not so sure that an evening reading the actual novel would not be more entertaining.

There are excellent performances by Terence de Marney, Trevor Reid, Harriette Johns, Simone Silva and Jack Allen, among others.

"Dial 'M' For Murder." Westminster Theatre.

Frederick Knott proves himself to be an author of some merit by writing one of the best thrillers to come to the West End for some years. This deals with a husband who wishes to have his wife killed by a hired assassin. Every detail is carefully worked out, but one little thing was not foreseen and by ingenious working of the plot the husband is finally found out. This is a play which will grip you every minute of its three acts, until the final curtain which comes down without a spoken word. This is a remarkable scene.

The cast of five are an excellent team and consist of Jane Baxter, Alan MacNaughtan, Emrys Jones, Olaf Pooley and Andrew Cruickshank. John Fernald's production is masterly.

OLD DOCTOR SAM

Old Doctor Sam Johnson was not a bad-hearted man, but Goldsmith was right when he said, "There is no arguing with Johnson, for when his pistol misses fire he knocks you down with the butt-end." Johnson was at his worst concerning Freethinkers. He calls Bolingbroke "a scoundrel and a coward." Yet the doctor had never read the author he so savagely pillories. "I have never read Bolingbroke's impiety," he remarks with an unexpected lack of humour. To Johnson, Freethinkers are vermin, which his windy rhetoric would fain exterminate. Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire are all scoundrels to him. Men like Priestley and Price were an abomination. Boswell tells us that when Dr. Price came into a company where Johnson was, the latter instantly walked out of the room. Small wonder that old Sam said that Rousseau was "one of the worst of men, a rascal who ought to be hunted out of society."

THE GERMAN SOCIETY OF MONISTS

From July 18-20, 1952, there took place in Munich the yearly general congress of the German Society of Monists (Deutscher Monistenbund—an important anti-clerical organisation founded in 1906 to replace Christianity by a kind of natural religion which would be in accordance with science—translator's remark). In the reception party for visitors from abroad there participated also many representatives of other Munich Freethought groups. In the session on July 19 there was welcomed, among others, Walter Bartschi, the delegate of Swiss Freethinkers. The Government Councillor Albert Heuer (Hannover) was elected President, Dr. Ludwig Gross (München 13, Türkenstrasse 76) Business Manager, Dr. Franz Koebner (Stuttgart) Officer-in-Charge of Foreign Business. The President of Honour of the German Monistenbund, Prof. Dr. Gerhard v. Frankenberg (Hannover) gave a public lecture on the "Creative in Nature."—Abridged translation by A.W. from the "Geistesfreiheit," XLVI, September 9, 1952.

"THE FREETHINKER"

41, Gray's Inn Road,
Telephone No.: Holborn 2601. London, W.C.1.

TO CORRESPONDENTS

G. BENNETT.—Thanks for article on Llewellyn Powys. Hope to publish shortly.

J. TOUDIC.—We agree with you entirely on Vatican influence in present-day European politics. Our own editorial covers this precise question independently.

J. MICHAUD (France).—Thanks for letter and article, which we will translate as soon as possible. We are looking forward to the Luxemburg Congress in 1954.

WHIT LIBBY.—Thanks for article. Hope to use this soon. Glad to hear from you.

FRANK HOLT.—We will bear your suggestion in mind. It is, however, extremely difficult to get reliable information about "Jehovah's Witnesses."

THE FREETHINKER will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad): One year, £1 4s.; half-year, 12s.; three months, 6s.

Correspondents are requested to write on one side of the paper only and to make their letters as brief as possible.

Lecture Notices should reach the Secretary of the N.S.S. at this Office by Friday morning.

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

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.

SUGAR PLUMS

Our literary contemporary, the monthly magazine *Argosy*, publishes on the front page of its current issue a poem by our contributor, John O'Hare. Mr. O'Hare had his first volume of poems published recently, and they have received very good notices on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. O'Hare has, indeed, had the unusual experience of having his poetry favourably reviewed in the Jesuit periodical, *The Month*, and in our own *Freethinker*, where, as our readers will remember, they were highly commended by our major Freethought poet, Mr. Bayard Simmons. Mr. O'Hare expresses himself, as we are sure our readers will agree, with equal facility in verse and prose, and we hope that we are being privileged to assist in the creation of an outstanding literary reputation. Our contributor's published poems can be obtained from *The Hand and Flower Press*, Aldington, Kent, for 1s. per copy.

Mr. O'Hare is a member of the North London Branch, N.S.S. We hope that his growing poetic fame will not reduce his contributions to this journal.

Mr. F. A. Ridley has been kept well on the move recently. On October 5 he delivered an address in the bleak and frozen North to the Glasgow Secular Society, a report of which will appear in next week's issue. Last Sunday Mr. Ridley addressed that "Old Guard" of Secularism, *The Leicester Secular Society*, on "The Social Origins of Christianity." The lecturer dealt with the slave revolutions of the Roman world immediately prior to the appearance of Christianity and indicated Christianity as, in its origins, a "wish fulfilment," a spiritual "com-

pensation" in the next world for servile frustration in this one. The power of the Roman Empire, which prevented the emancipation of the masses, forced them to transfer their hopes to another world; in which last respect, the symbolism of the Cross, an instrument of torture transformed into an emblem of salvation, played an important psychological role.

Mr. Ridley also dealt with the social implications of the Jewish Messianic Movement and described the Apocalypse as "*the Communist Manifesto of the Ancient World.*" The lecturer subsequently replied to many questions, and an animated discussion ensued. The President of The Leicester Secular Society, Mr. G. A. Kirk, presided with his usual efficiency.

THE JUBILEE OF THE "HIBBERT"

IN this month of October the *Hibbert Journal* reaches its fiftieth birthday. For some reason the anniversary was anticipated by the publication of a Jubilee Number in July. I must have known all about its birth. It would have been announced in such religious periodicals as the *British Weekly* and *Christian Commonwealth*, both of which I eagerly devoured fifty years ago. I doubt if I saw it for some time. Few public libraries would go to half-a-crown for a quarterly magazine devoted exclusively to matters metaphysical. "Who wants to read it?" many members of Libraries Committees would have asked. About two years later my work was more lucrative; I spent lavishly on literature; and I became a subscriber to the *Hibbert Journal*. Its contents were not exactly milk for babes, and I daresay if my unsophisticated Methodist father had seen me perusing its pages he might have suggested that I was out of my depth. I, however, felt I could swim, though at times a high-browed article would stretch my mind that, so to speak, I had only my head just above water.

It came for me opportunely. I was then kicking over the theological traces of the evangelical mission hall in which at first I had followed the advice, in theological matters, to take what father takes. When I started to sit under a well-known "Liberal Christian" minister—the Rev. Bernard Snell, of Brixton, later to become Chairman of the Congregational Union—I sometimes heard of it from the pulpit. I suspect that all the theological liberals read it. Indeed, the Rev. Bernard Snell so loved the *Hibbert* that, in Charles Lamb's phrase, he found it damned good to steal from. One sermon of his, which I thought most original, I discovered later came almost in its entirety from an article therein. This was a piece of daring on Snell's part. He had an intellectual audience, and there was a strong literary society. He could hardly have been the only reader of the *Hibbert* apart from myself. The one salient point that was not a theft I well remember. Snell said a friend of his once went into a revival meeting and heard a man pray, "O Lord, save us from the perils of modern thought; yea, Lord, save us from all thought."

Such salvation was not to be found in the *Hibbert Journal* and, for that reason, no evangelical would look at it. With good reason, too. Then, as now in the Jubilee Number, the perils of modern thought were amply revealed. If anybody had written to the Editor asking the question of the Philippian gaoler, "What must I do to be saved?" his letter would have found its way into the waste-paper basket.

This Jubilee Number, apart from an account of "Robert Hibbert and his Trust" and some book reviews, is restricted to the republication of notable articles: "Pluralism and Religion," by William James (1908); "Philosophy and Religion," by Leo Tolstoy (1911); "Stopford Brooke," by G. K. Chesterton (1918); "Modern Churchmen or Unitarians," by Rev. Henry D. A. Major, D.D. (1922); "Jesus," by Kirsopp Lake (1924); "Grace, Predestination and Salvation," by Aldous Huxley (1931); "The Interaction of Life and Matter," by Sir Oliver Lodge (1931); "Our Present Need for 'The Moral Equivalent for War'," by L. P. Jacks (1932); "An Old Man Looks at the World," by Rev. W. R. Inge (1948). I suspect that these articles were selected by reason of the distinction of the various writers. Probably Chesterton's review of the biography of Stopford Brooke was chosen because the author of the book, L. P. Jacks, was a son-in-law of its subject, as well as one of the two first editors. G.K.C. has one delicious passage:—

"Since he knew so clearly what he wanted to retain and what he wanted to reject, it is unfair to class him with the confused sceptics who felt so comfortable when they were criticising orthodoxy that they did not care whether they criticised it for being too black or too white. . . . Only the muddlement of modernity could have set men scrubbing at a statue, without being sure whether they wanted to clean an image or obliterate an idol."

Perhaps Chesterton was thinking of those reverent rationalists for whose tails my old friend Cutner has such a liberal supply of salt!

What an example of "the muddlement of modernity" was Dr. Major's article! "Modern Churchmen may not have a doctrine of the Incarnation which satisfies traditionalists, and they may not have a doctrine of the Incarnation which satisfies rationalists, but they do hold the essence of the doctrine of the Incarnation as expressed in the Pauline phrase, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.'" A doctrine of the Incarnation to satisfy rationalists! Dr. Major cannot understand that they are as likely to ask for such a doctrine to satisfy them as to ask a reasonable interpretation of the man in the moon or the fairies that Conan Doyle found at the bottom of his garden. Perhaps Dr. Major is obsessed by the idea that all theological doctrines are expressions of human needs or human yearnings. There was a time—in my callow youth—when I so thought. I would recite with fervour Matthew Arnold's "Progress":—

"Children of men! the unseen Power, whose eye
For ever doth accompany mankind,
Hath looked on no religion scornfully
That man did ever find."

Not only was Arnold oblivious to the specious inventions of priestcraft, he was carefully selecting his religions. He was perhaps thinking of Christianity, Mohammedanism and Buddhism, not of Hinduism or Mormonism.

Here is another example of "muddlement": "In the eyes of the Modern Churchman the doctrine of the Trinity is too lightly dismissed by the Unitarians. The Modern Churchman, whilst he feels the objections to the traditional form of that doctrine, and the ludicrous, not to say devastating, misunderstandings to which it is exposed, yet regards it as the best doctrine of God in existence. . . . The doctrine of a Divine Being transcendent, immanent, incarnate, the God of nature, the God of history, the God of the rational, moral and spiritual consciousness in man,

is preserved in a practical and popular form by its means." The Unitarian might well smile at the suggestion that this doctrine of the Trinity was practical and popular. He might consider that his own dismissal of it was far more honest and lucid than this attempt to twist a modern meaning into an ancient dogma. Dr. Major never mentioned the "third person," variously called the Holy Spirit and the Holy Ghost. I greatly shocked the *Methodist Recorder* by referring, in my *Testament of a Victorian Youth*, to the junior partner in the Heavenly concern! I suppose Dr. Major could not rationalise this.

Kirsopp Lake made the confusion of the Modernists more confounded. Dean Inge, he pointed out, "does not think that Jesus taught that he was the Logos. . . . Nevertheless, he states in *Confessio Fidei* 'that the Incarnation and the Cross are the central doctrines of Christianity. . . .' I greatly doubt whether the youth of the next generation will be willing to accept the proposition that 'the central doctrine of Christianity' is and always must be something which Jesus did not teach himself. What opinion about Jesus is likely to be right? His own? Or that of his first disciples? Or that of a generation which only knew him at second-hand?" Again: "Liberal Christianity does not wish to accept the eschatological teaching of Jesus. Dean Inge rejects it and pours out much scorn on those who believe the Gospels that relate it. But the text of the Gospels are against him, and the Fundamentalists are not likely to allow anyone to forget it." Kirsopp Lake, too, did not spare the moral teaching of Jesus. "The religion of to-morrow, like its predecessors, will assuredly have much to say as to conduct; but it will have to work out its own problems in its own way, not by trying to find a short cut to their solution in the teaching of Jesus or anyone else." Yet I think Kirsopp Lake called himself a Christian!

So also, I think, did most of the contributors to the *Hibbert Journal*. In 1909 there was a Supplement on the historicity of Jesus. Of course, no mythicist was allowed a look in. Yet the Rev. R. Roberts wrote an article scathing enough for the *Freethinker*, under the title "Jesus or Christ: An Appeal for Consistency."

I congratulate the *Hibbert* on its Jubilee. I wish it many happy returns of the day. It is in the train of the *Freethinker*—though the editor will not take this as a compliment—if somewhat far behind. The candour it has encouraged in its contributors must have served our cause. Taken as a whole, it cannot have fanned the faith; rather it has doused the devout. I recall the story of the lady who sat under a Modernist parson and ventured to remonstrate with him for his heresy. "After all, sir, I do think that there be a god." This is about the only point of unanimity amongst the many Christian contributors to the *Hibbert Journal*.

WILLIAM KENT.

THE HEATHEN CHINEE

THAT the Heathen Chinee is "peculiar" in his notions and his ways is a fact that had been remarked by many others long before the illustrious American popularised his amusing failings. "From the thirteenth century," says M. Huc, the French Catholic missionary, "when the first notion of China was brought into Europe by the celebrated Venetian, Marco Polo, to our own day, all parties seem to have agreed in regarding the Chinese as a very singular people—a people unlike all others." Human nature, it is often said, is the same everywhere; but the

racial differences among mankind are so great as to render such a general statement almost meaningless. And, says the Hon. Chester Holcombe, "no amount of general knowledge of humanity, intimate acquaintance with the race, or close companionship with individual members of it, will enable an Occidental to predicate exactly what the Chinese will do under any given combination of circumstances. They are full of contradictions." In fact, John Chinaman, who is at once the hope and the despair of the Christian missionary, is an enigma that is utterly insoluble by any criterion of Western ideas. And on no subject, perhaps, are his notions and disposition in greater contrast with those of the European's than on the subject of religion.

CORRESPONDENCE

"CHRIST'S ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM"

SIR,—The town of Preston, Lancashire, recently spent a whole week celebrating its famous "Guild Merchant." Naturally religious processions loomed large in the proceedings.

In a certain procession there were many striking tableaux, but one, a man in appropriate Eastern costume, astride a donkey, representing the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, a serious subject, turned into comedy at one point en route.

Everything was going well, palm leaf scattering and all, when suddenly the donkey, ass-like, decided to carry his holy burden no farther. It stopped dead and sat down on its haunches in the roadway, and no amount of tugging, pulling, pushing, or other "persuasion" could induce it to budge.

You can imagine the hilarity the donkey's behaviour caused among the onlookers, which utterly ruined the serious aspect of the tableau.

Jesus had to get off the donkey's back and descend to earth once more. Immediately he did this, the donkey, relieved of its load, arose and walked, like Jairus's daughter, with Jesus trudging alongside on foot, continuing the "entry" in less historic fashion.—Yours, etc.,

D. L. WEBSTER.

MITHRAISM

SIR,—Referring to Mr. Palmer's interesting article, there is a fine Mithraic memorial in the British Museum. It came from Rome and has undergone some amount of restoration. There is the bull; its rider plunging a knife into its neck; a dog licking the blood; a scorpion attacking its genitals. In the London Museum there was a similar piece of sculpture, and this was excavated at Walbrook. Only a section of this Museum is now exhibited at Kensington Palace, and probably it is not now to be seen.

The ceremony of initiation was most significant. The initiate stood in a pit beneath a sort of grating. There the blood of the bull poured upon him. Hence "washed in the blood of the lamb" in Christian theology, indicated in a grace I used to sing as a boy which made us thank the Lord more for Jesus's blood than the food we were about to eat. I do not think we really felt so!—Yours, etc.,

WM. KENT.

RUSSIA

SIR,—It is very interesting to know the population in Russia. According to statistics in 1917 Russia had 125 million. In 1920 some parts of Russia became independent countries. Such countries were Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland. I take very approximate number, say 25 million, Russia's population was decreased by new countries. In 1940 Soviet statistics show 180 million. Such number was published in other countries without protests and arguments. In such case we have 125 million - 25 million = 100 million Soviet Russia had in 1920. I have some question marks about the population in Soviet Russia between 1920 and 1940.

The population in 1920 in Soviet Russia was 100 million:
(1) How many millions lost in war 1914-1917? (2) How many millions killed in civil war? (3) How many millions perished during famine? (4) How many millions perished in slave camps? (5) The number killed by China, G.P.U. and N.K.W.D.? (6) The number of colonists leaving Russia—Germans, Czechs, etc.? (7) The number of Russian sectants leaving Russia? (8) Mortality among children? (9) Sickness, hunger, freezing, insufficient medical help?

The difference between population from 1920-1940 is 80 million. Is it possible that in a country where people had civil war, famine and sickness the population reached such increase?—Yours, etc.,

K. LIDAKS.

RUSSIAN INVENTIONS

SIR,—Your correspondent "Lyngtoff" is not funny, but exhibiting a childish attempt at humour over foreigners' names, thereby showing bad taste, gross ignorance, and a marked inferiority complex. Of course, he doesn't know that thirty years ago, before science became subordinate to politics, the pioneer work of the Russian Popov in the field of radio was well known and recognised, along with many others, including the G.P.O., who spent thousands in experimental work at Penarth, long before Marconi perfected the first commercially practical radio transmission. Whilst trying and failing to be funny about the Russians, why doesn't he mention how the American Edison *did* try and steal the cinematograph from Friese-Greene? and how Friese-Greene made himself penniless in lawsuits to protect his invention. How, when the film "Life of Edison" was made the American version showed Edison as the inventor, and these scenes had to be cut from the version shown in England? Why doesn't he tell us how America has failed to pay due tribute to English pioneers in the field of atomic physics and has tried to give the world the impression that all atomic research is American? After all, Kapitza (a *real* Russian) was Prof. Rutherford's assistant at the Cavendish Laboratories way back in the 'twenties, and there *was* a Russian scientist or two, such as Mendeleeef and Pavlov, to whose work responsible scientists have paid tribute.—Yours, etc.,

DR. STUM. DUMMKOPF.

[Mr. "Lyngtoff's" original letter was, presumably, intended as a joke on some of the rather tall stories currently circulated about Russian scientists. As, obviously, we can't turn our columns into a controversy on Russian scientific superiority, this concludes the subject.—Ed.]

LECTURE NOTICES, ETC.

OUTDOOR

Kingston-on-Thames Branch N.S.S. (Castle Street).—Sunday, 7-30 p.m.: J. W. BARKER and E. MILLS.

Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Plattfields).—Every Sunday, 3 p.m.; (St. Mary's Gate, Blitzed Site), every Sunday, 8 p.m.; (Alexandra Park Gate), every Wednesday, 8 p.m.; (Deansgate Bomb Site), every weekday, 1 p.m.: MESSRS. WOODCOCK and BARNES.

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

Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Old Market Square). — Saturday, October 18, 7 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY and A. ELSMERE.

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

INDOOR

Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Mechanics' Institute).—Sunday, 6-45 p.m.: C. W. KEARMAN, "The Influence of Darwinism on Social Thought."

Conway Discussion Circle (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, Holborn, W.C. 1). — Tuesday, October 21, 7 p.m.: MORA BURNET, B.Sc., "What Shall We Educate For?"

Glasgow Secular Society (McLellan Galleries, Sauchiehall Street).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: J. P. MORRISON, "Fun, Faith and Farce."

Leicester Secular Society (Humberstone Gate).—Sunday, 6-30 p.m.: HENRY SARA, "Ingersoll the Orator."

Nottingham Cosmopolitan Debating Society (Large Lecture Theatre, Technical College, Shakespeare Street). — Sunday, 2-30 p.m.: A. TURNER (S.P.G.B.), "Sex and Sin."

South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C. 1).—Sunday, October 19, 11 a.m.: S. K. RATCLIFFE, "The American Presidency."

West London Branch N.S.S. (Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W. 1). — Sunday, 7-30 p.m.: E. S. HILLMAN, "The Middle East and Religion."

A BARGAIN

We have a few copies of THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AGAINST THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, by AVRO MANHATTAN, 470 pp., published at 5s., now offered at 2s. 6d. (postage 3d.).

SELL/Exchange books by Kinsey, Mead, Blanchard, etc. Send s.a.e. for list. Beardsmore, 17, Cotton Grove, Pye Green, Hednesford, Staffs.

PROPAGANDA

EVOLUTION is often considered as if it were a solution of a problem, but in a kind of perennial "Twenty Questions" quiz—animal, vegetable, mineral, or abstract—it is not an answer, it is the problem in question. If the mechanistic materialist thinks of a human being as analogous to a machine, the dialectic or historic materialist uses Hegel's analogy of evolution as the unfolding of a flower; an idea of growth and development. But this beautiful picture of progress ignores the death of the flower in the formation of the seed. The assertion that ideologies arise under particular historic conditions forgets the social inheritance of ideas and customs. Old ideas die slowly, and in a process of constant change, with Marx turning Hegel upside down, historic evolution became social revolution.

This historic-social revolutionary-evolution is an example of the combination of old and new. If Marx adopted the social ideas of the French Revolution, of democratic government together with Rousseau's "general will"; with the medieval militaristic Prussianism of Bismarck and Hegel taken over from the philosopher King Frederic the Great, the "social contract" dies with the "technique of revolution." When the Jesuits were expelled from France they went to Prussia, with Voltaire and Lamettrie, the author of *Man a Machine*, and the atheistic philosopher king also made use of the methods of the Jesuit College of Propaganda. The idea of this is an analogy of propagating a plant, such as Hegel's beautiful flower of Prussian bureaucracy, and Marx took over the idea of propaganda together with Hegelian ideology.

So, previous agrarian economy gave a horticultural analogy in a mechanistic industrial age, while the machine became analogy for a mechanistic philosophy. But the mechanistic idea of a social "movement" loses the analogy of growth of a living thing; and it is questionable if such analogies are scientific. If a branch as a member of a tree gives the idea of growth, movement is better expressed in the animistic analogy of members of a body, as in the "body politic"; and the idea of movement is the age-old problem in Zeno's famous paradoxes, giving movement as an abstraction; and if mechanistic movement is devoid of purpose, is it applicable to human relationships? And if movement is the reality in a "process of becoming" in a world of constant change, the individual material human being ceases to be.

Marx said, in the *Critique of Political Economy*, that he arrived at his principle from the study of law, and then applied it to economics. If he used Jesuitical propaganda methods, he was also using the language of the legal Fiction Theory; used in the Machiavellian glorification of the State; and upon which Rousseau's "general will" is based. This goes back to A.D. 1243, when Pope Innocent IV applied canon law to secular law; according to which there is real presence in a social body conceived as an organised unity with a will of its own; a spiritual as well as a corporate unity. With corporate will, it is a real person, with corporate personality; the personification of a social group. So Marx, with his "personifications of economic categories," was echoing the Pope's theological jargon.

In this, a social group is a personification, with body and soul, but Marx is speaking of individuals as personifications of categories. In our "Twenty Questions," we have surely arrived at the abstract, in mystical

personifications of personifications; with mechanistic "movement" inheriting the theological "will" of a "body." Historic Determinism is involved in St. Augustine's doctrine of Pre-destination, with mystical implications; with the dead hand of the historic past, it involves precedent in doctrinaire assertion; as the will of the deceased is sacred obligation and legal right. And if the personification of Man in a mystical analogue goes back to the *Ecce Homo* of the Easter Ritual at seed-sowing time, the personal dynamic goes back beyond agriculture in a phallic magic idea of inheritance; with the seed of Adam, and as St. Paul said, "ye are the seed."

It is said to be the merit of Karl Mannheim, stating the case for the sociology of knowledge in his *Ideology and Utopia*, that he attempted a clear statement of the problem. He traces the concept of ideology to Napoleon and Machiavelli as an accusation, and to Bacon's idea of idolatry of false notions; but he might have gone back further, to Christian and Biblical iconoclasm. The word "ideology" has been used in three different ways: by Condillac and the "ideologists" of the French Revolution as the study of ideas; by Hegel as a dialectical interpretation of historic evolution; and with Marx forging the weapons of the proletariat, it has been used in a derogatory sense as a false or fictional interpretation of social conditions. The Marxist considers the content and not the form of ideology and asserts deception or self-deception and even downright lying.

But since Marx, ideology has been thrown back at the Marxist; we are under a cross-fire of ideologies; and according to Mannheim the sociology of knowledge has unmasked the unconscious, disclosing it as the collective unconscious, leading under modern conditions to scepticism or faith. Yet according to Mannheim, control of the collective unconscious is the modern problem; but we still have the perennial animistic question, whose is the will, and whose the control? And it is a personal question.

Mannheim says there is no such thing as collective consciousness; so the individual comes in again with social contradictions reflecting an inner conflict in self-contradiction. He believes "resentment" is replete with evaluations; the *élan politique*, thrown back upon itself, begins to subject itself to critical control; life itself elevates itself above itself; relativism and scepticism compel self-criticism and self-control, and lead to a new conception of objectivity. Man attains objectivity and acquires a self with reference to his conception of his world not by giving up his will to action and holding his evaluators in abeyance, but in confronting himself. The criterion of such self-illumination is that not only the object, but we ourselves fall squarely within our field of vision. We become visible to ourselves.

It might be remarked that this is not supposed to be mysticism but scientific sociology. But, lost in consideration of bias and tendentious history, it is as mystical as any Christian mysticism. It seems the problem is psychological. If he is so sure there is no social consciousness, how is he so certain of the collective unconscious? The ideas of an unconscious and a collective unconscious came from the psychologists Freud and Jung, not from Marxian historic-sociologists. To interpret social conditions in terms of motive or personal interest is psychological; the personifications are our own; and the attempt to modernise Marxism is a failure, for the psychology of Marxist propaganda is the antiquated inherited psychology of the historic past.

H. H. PREECE.