

The Freethinker

Vol. LXXIII—No. 16

Founded 1881

Editor: F. A. RIDLEY

Price Fourpence

THE work of that distinguished European author, Mr. Avro Manhattan, has become increasingly familiar to the Rationalist and Freethought public all over the world during recent years. In his magnum opus, *The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century*, Mr. Manhattan wrote what is probably destined to remain the standard account of what may be described as the era of Catholic - Fascist alliance, 1922-1945. In his recently published *Catholic Imperialism and World Freedom* our author both dots the i's and crosses the t's and provides supplementary matter to the tremendous indictment drawn up in his earlier book: from Communism to Father Christmas, the destructive zeal of the new Catholic crusaders extends!

These two substantial volumes paint in broad perspective what we have elsewhere termed the Catholic counter-formation of the 20th century. Nor would a complete estimate of Mr. Manhattan's hitherto published works be complete without some reference to the series of informative pamphlets compiled by our industrious author, which relate to the varied activities of the Vatican in different parts of the world: that on Latin America we found particularly enlightening upon Vatican activities in that southern American continent of incalculable potentialities for the future of civilisation.

All the above works of Mr. Manhattan were, so to speak, studies in wide perspectives. In his most recently published book the author has devoted himself to the study of a single theme and of a limited and precise area. In *Terror Over Yugoslavia* (Watts, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Manhattan's subject is the short-lived Catholic State of Croatia (1941-45) set up under the auspices of Hitler and Mussolini and with the blessing of the Vatican, during the course of the Second World War. As Mr. Manhattan taught us to expect from him, he handles his theme not only as an historian but, equally, as a philosopher. Not only does he describe in grim and, often enough, sickening detail the bloody record of the Catholic State of Free Croatia and the bloody Catholic-inspired terror which accompanied it, but, simultaneously, our historian "points the moral and adorns the tale" by indicating both the background to the whole episode in Catholic power-politics and in European diplomacy and, still more, its fundamental significance as "the shape of things to come," the rehearsal, as it were, for a future Catholic Dark Age, if and when the Church can eventually break down the restraints imposed upon her by our secular and democratic civilization.

As a philosophical historian our author commences his survey by giving us the historical background and the ultimate perspective of the Catholic intrigues against Yugoslavia during the Second World War. The enemies of the Vatican are not only outside the Christian camp. Inside it, the struggle between the Church of Rome in

the West and the Greek "Orthodox" Church of the East has raged bitterly for some nine centuries. As Mr. Manhattan shows, the Austro-Hungarian empire of the Habsburgs had been recognised by successive Popes as the modern bulwark of the Roman Catholic Church against the western advance of the Greek "Orthodox" Church and of its political protector, the Russian empire of the Tsars.

When the Austrian empire collapsed at the end of the First World War, the then "Orthodox" Serbian State expanded into the present State of Yugoslavia and, in so doing, absorbed the immemorably Roman Catholic province of Croatia. To liberate the Catholic Croats

and to disintegrate the heretical Yugoslav State henceforth became a major aim of the European diplomacy of the Vatican. This diplomatic and ecclesiastical background is lucidly explained by our author. Our only criticism of this part of his narrative is that it appears to judge the aspirations of Croat Nationalism rather harshly. In itself, the aspiration of the Croat Nationalists for an independent Croatia was quite legitimate and represented the common pattern of Balkan Nationalism in the era in question.

The methods by which the Croat Nationalists sought to achieve their ends were the reverse of scrupulous. Abroad, they sought help not only from the Vatican, but also from the then rising Fascist dictatorships of Mussolini and Hitler. Mr. Manhattan gives chapter and verse for his charge that Mussolini was personally privy to the assassination by a Croat terrorist of King Alexander in Marseilles (October 9, 1934). Though King Alexander himself had not been noted for kid-glove methods in his dealings with subversive forces—as, amongst other inmates of his prisons, one Josip Broz, alias Marshal Tito, would, no doubt, testify. Amongst those privy to the regicide was the future Croat dictator, Anton Pavelic, who succeeded in escaping.

The collapse of Yugoslavia before the German invasion—April 6, 1941—gave the Croats their longed-for opportunity. Taking advantage of the Yugoslav military debacle, Pavelic and his Croatian Nationalists proclaimed the Free State of Croatia on April 10, 1941. The Croatian State lasted for some four years until the final downfall of the Fascist powers in 1945, under the nominal rule of an Italian king handpicked by Mussolini from the House of Savoy, but actually ruled by Pavelic as dictator with the combined and, indeed, often actually identical support of the Catholic Church and Pavelic's own bands of Croatian terrorists, known locally as the Ustashi.

Mr. Manhattan describes this régime as the ideal clerical-Fascist dictatorship which maintained itself by a permanent reign of terror and, indeed, was, in our author's estimation, quite the most ruthless of all modern Fascist régimes, not excepting even those of Hitler and Franco. The Catholic Croats set to work both to pay off old scores

—VIEWS and OPINIONS—

Terror Over Yugoslavia

—By F. A. RIDLEY—

and forcibly to kill or convert the "Orthodox" Serbs. In a four-year-long terror here described, often in sickening details, a round million Serbs perished, and at least a quarter of a million were forcibly converted to "The One True Church" of Rome. Throughout this orgy, unmatched, perhaps, since the days of the Albigenses, the Vatican gave full support to Pavelic, as it had done previously to the Franco terror a few years earlier. Whilst the Croatian hierarchy under the primate, Archbishop Stepinac, collaborated fully with the terrorist régime in its wholesale massacres and in its forced conversions. Indeed, the Archbishop himself, with the full approval of the Vatican, held high office in the régime.

The terrorist régime of Pavelic and Stepinac would still be in existence, along with its leaders, but for the Allied victory, which restored Yugoslavia and disintegrated the Fascist empires. Stepinac, after a last-minute attempt to save the régime, got sixteen years for "war crimes" and is still under house-arrest, and the Vatican's Pius the 12th

has just made Stepinac a cardinal, whilst he secured the release of Pavelic, who eventually found his way to Peron's Argentine, where he has restarted his Ustashi military organisation for, presumably, a new "crusade" against the enemies of Holy Church in a not-distant future.

Such was the bloody and dramatic Catholic Terror *Over Yugoslavia*. However, insists our author, this brief and bloody episode was important not primarily for what it was, but for what it portends for the future. This model Catholic State, founded on systematic religious terrorism, argues Manhattan, derives its world-importance from the fact that it was a kind of rehearsal for a new Dark Age for which the Vatican is preparing and in which alone it can hope to exist. The long record of clerical Imperialism, backed up by its still immense political power, renders such a supposition only too plausible. You have been warned!

Mechanism and Emergence

By G. H. TAYLOR

A HUNDRED years ago anyone calling himself a materialist would mean, simply, a mechanistic materialist. He based his position on the mechanism of science, featuring strict causality through and through. This was determinism or, to use the terminology of to-day, co-variance.

But although determinism is enough for science it is not enough for philosophy, because some philosophers, of a religious turn of mind, said in effect, "Yes. We accept your determinism, but it merely proves that our God works through law. Your scientific mechanism is the *modus operandi* of our God. Events follow one another in deterministic sequence, granted, not because they are being pushed blindly from behind but because they are being pulled intelligently from in front."

This challenge to scientific mechanism is Teleology. It claims to interpret mechanism. It conceives all events to be moving purposefully to a divinely appointed End. If the universe is a machine there is a *deus ex machina*, a God outside it working it by external decree. Its mechanism thus runs co-eval with the purpose of this outside management. The simple is, therefore, to be explained by the complex, and the pyramid of sciences to be interpreted from the apex. That is, the way matter behaves is determined by the requirements of Life, the next stage. And the channels into which living organisms evolve are decided by the needs of developing mind.

Thus according to the teleologists the mechanism of science is *only descriptive*, not interpretative.

I shall not stay to dispose of the argument; my purpose is to show what scientific mechanists were faced with. (Actually the teleological argument boils down to that of the preacher who extolled the almighty wisdom and foresight of the Lord in mechanically determining the course of the Thames so as to pass London on the way.)

The mechanists were faced with this: their mechanism had to be shared with philosophers who found room for the supernatural. Therefore mere determinism was not enough, because when they came to refute the teleologists it was common ground with them. And so, when they proceeded to show how their opponents were misusing mechanism they had to make assertions which overstep the mere statement of mechanism. In fact they had to build up a philosophy on scientific mechanism. This philosophy was mechanistic materialism.

It was the first form taken by materialism in the modern

scientific age. It gave a rational sanction to the mechanism of science, and raised it to philosophical status. That is it provided an ontology, a materialistic one, not one lying in the realm of "final causes." Its ontological datum was matter. This was the ultimate matrix, not an outside agent or evolver.

The revolt against mechanical materialism, from inside the materialist camp, came from two sources independently: from emergent materialism and from dialectical materialism.

The term emergence did not come into the regular parlance of philosophy till the present century, when it was used in a semi-religious sense by Lloyd Morgan, and it was then taken over by religionists, but the term was used in 1874 by Lewes.

Similarly, dialectical materialism, though it waited for systematic presentation, may be said to date from Engels (1877) in its general basis. In Parts 12 and 13 of Lenin's works, the ideas are coming to fruition.

Now both emergent and dialectical materialists had the same fault to find in mechanical materialism, but each had their own way of dealing with it. The fallacy in mechanism, as they saw it, was that a mechanical process yielding mere resultants could never yield new qualities, but only give more of those already existing. In the case of hydrogen and oxygen, their association under certain conditions yields water, and so the new quality of wetness comes from two dry gases. According to its opponents mechanism offers no clue whatever to the arrival of new qualities. H. and O. ought to mix together like two different sorts of birdseed and the result should be simply H² plus O. But in fact they give a new liquid with its own distinctive characteristics, distinct from those of its factors in isolation. Hence the need for a new concept: "emergence," according to the emergent materialist, "transformation of quantity into quality," according to the dialectical materialist.

The chief emergent materialists in the universities have been Prof. C. D. Broad, of Cambridge, and in the States Prof. Ray Dotterer, of Harvard. For our present elementary purposes, however, the dispute between mechanism and emergence can be treated by considering not any of the professional philosophers who have championed the respective positions, but two laymen whose works are well known to readers of *The Freethinker*. I refer to Mr. Joseph McCabe, as represent-

17, 1953
ured the
way to
Ustashe
rusade
t-distant
Terror
his brief
or what
s model
rorism
from the
rk Age
h alone
clerical
political
ausible
hanism
hat is
e lying
m was
outsid
inside
depen
ectical
egular
it was
it was
sed
ed to
Engel
enin's
ad the
h had
nism
elding
only
se of
con-
tiness
ments
new
like
hould
iquid
those
con-
alist.
ng to
have
itates
esen
ween
ring
have
men
The
sent

Friday, April 17, 1953

to believe that consciousness is an emergent in the materialist sense."

McCabe agrees that H. and O. give no clue as to why they should in combination produce wetness, but thinks this is only in our present state of knowledge. He stoutly maintains that a more adequate knowledge of the factors would enable us to predict the outcome of their combination.

And so the issue between the mechanist and the emergentist is quite clear-cut. The emergentist contends that our knowledge of the factors, however perfect, would never enable prediction until the thing had actually happened. The mechanist conversely maintains that an adequate knowledge of the factors would tell what new qualities they were capable of yielding in synthesis. I think the issue is clear-cut in such a way that one must be right and the other must be wrong. I am content to leave the outcome to the future of science, but, whichever is right, materialism does not suffer basically in any way. As I don't label myself either mechanical or emergent materialist, my interest in the solution is only academic. If I were asked to decide at the point of the pistol I think I should plump for Cohen and emergence.

ing the mechanistic materialists; and Mr. Chapman Cohen (formerly editor of *The Freethinker*), the materialist who has championed emergence.

Mr. Cohen found himself faced with the task of rescuing the term emergence from the semi-religious use to which it was being put. His position* was that emergence is "a perfectly materialistic concept." He contended that an emergent has a quality that cannot be foretold from a knowledge of its constituents the first time it appears. Taking the stock example, he says, "the combination (of H. and O.) produces a result, water, the qualities of which cannot be foretold from a knowledge of the qualities of its components." We therefore name it an emergent. The output of hydrogen and oxygen is not a calculable result of them, not a mere resultant.

He took this notion from Lewes, who said: "Every resultant is clearly traceable in its components. . . . It is otherwise with emergents. . . . Add heat to heat and there is a measurable resultant, but add heat to different substances and you get various effects qualitatively unlike." (*Problems of Life and Mind*.)

"In the one case," observes Mr. Cohen, "we can predict because the consequence is the known factors in operation (the resultant). In the other case (the emergent) it is not predictable." That is, if we didn't know that H₂O produced water we couldn't tell that they would, no matter how long we brooded over them. In Cohen's words, "Oxygen will not indicate water; hydrogen will not imply water. It is their conjunction that brings about a new thing."

That is, we can only predict what will happen when we have seen what does happen. In the case of a purely mechanical resultant we can predict from the known qualities of the factors: with an emergent we can only predict from their observed consequences.

Though not predictable the first time we experience them, emergents become predictable, because like causes give like effects, and this, says Cohen, "establishes the materialistic nature of emergence." Applying the principle to evolution he develops the argument thus: just as water with its quality of wetness emerges from two dry gases, so do life and mind emerge from conditions that are neither living nor mental. Therefore, he concludes, "emergence is part of the materialistic world. It is as inescapable as evolution itself."

"Indeed," he says, "emergence is not so much a theory as a statement of fact."

McCabe will have none of this. He calls emergence "a dishonest phrase," "a piece of verbiage," "a new name for a medieval view," "a jack-in-the-box theory," only fit for bishops. (See *Riddle of the Universe To-day*.) "It means," he says, "that the human mind was evolved but not evolved from the mind of the ape. It means in short that the mind was not evolved from anything. It 'emerged' from some obscure region."

Life, he says, is not an "emergent," but a consequence of the chemical evolution of matter. Emergence denies this, he maintains. And it denies that mind arose from brain development.

When McCabe was reminded that scientists were starting to use the term emergence, he replied that it was based on their religion, not on their science. I rather doubt whether he is quite justified here. Biologists like H. S. Jennings and Sir P. Chalmers Mitchell used the concept of emergence, both of them Freethinkers. Mitchell, in fact, tended to change from mechanism to emergence. In one lecture he called emergence "that blessed word Mesopotamia," and in a later lecture said: "I am disposed

The Parish Drunkard

THE facts concerning the following poem are these: In the parish of Dunkeld, in a far away time, the Minister was actually hanged. The Precentor was drowned in attempting to cross the river Earn. The steeple was taken down and the bell was sold to the parish of Cockpen, near Edinburgh. The poem was written by an Edinburgh tailor named Adam Crawford over a hundred years ago, but the legend or facts of the story were long familiar in Scotland before that time.

O, what a parish, a terrible parish—
O, what a parish is that o' Dunkel'
They hangit the Minister, drooned their Precentor,
Dang doon the Steeple and fuddied the bell.
Though the steeple was doon, the Kirk was still staunen.
They bigget a lum whaur the bell used ta hang;
A stil-pat they gat, an' they brewed Hielan' Whisky;
On Sundays they drank it, and ranted and sang.

O, what a parish, a terrible parish—
O, what a parish is that o' Dunkel'

O, had you but seen how graceful it lookit,
Tae see the crammed pews sae socially jine;
Macdonald the piper stuck up in the poopit;
He made his pipes skirl out music divine.

O, what a parish, a terrible parish—
O, what a parish is that o' Dunkel'

When the heart cheerin' spirit had mounted the garret,
Tae a ball on the green they a' did adjourn;
Maids wi' coats kilted, they steppit and lilted.
When tired, they shook hands and a' hame did return.

O, what a parish, a terrible parish—
O, what a parish is that o' Dunkel'

Wad the kirks a' ower Britain haud sic social meetings,
Nae warnin' they'd need frae a loud clangin' bell,
For true love and friendship wad ca' them thegither.
Far better than roarin' o' horrors o' Hell.

O, what a parish, a terrible parish—
O, what a parish is that o' Dunkel'

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CHURCH. By Colonel Ingersoll. Price 2d.; postage 1½d.
WHAT IS RELIGION? By Colonel R. G. Ingersoll. Price 2d.; postage 1½d.

* See *Primitive Survivals; Materialism Re-stated*, enlarged ed., etc.

This Believing World

The B.B.C., as we all expected, let itself rip on religion this Easter—a perfect Feast of Piety and the Cross, with music and hymn singing and Meditations though, we must admit, a little sport reporting was allowed a peep, as well as “those you have loved” introduced (as was befitting) in a regular parsonic voice. Wagner was represented on Good Friday, not by his naughty Venusberg music, but by his solemn Parsifal; while TV got in Les Sylphides ballet as a sort of prelude to “Behold the Man,” a play narrating the Passion story. It must have done Lord Reith’s heart good to see how our feelings were lacerated by all the recitals of the sufferings of poor Jesus on the Cross.

Almost a similar mixture of piety and sport was hurled at us on Easter Sunday, though there were lighter items which, in turn, must have lacerated the pious feelings of Lord Reith. After all, the people wanted their circus as well as hot cross buns, and so the irreligious side of the B.B.C. gallantly kept in many familiar and joyous comedy acts which were far away from anything the devotees of Jerusalem and Jesus would expect on such a solemn occasion as the Christian Easter. We say “Christian,” though really Easter is a Pagan holiday and was, like other Pagan feasts, gobbled up by the Church.

That great Revivalist, Dr. Sangster, has been putting some inconvenient questions to Christians whether they are “converted” or not. In the *Daily Express* he has been asking whether they speak the truth, whether they “fiddle” with their income-tax returns, do they like “blue” jokes, do they back up the Church, and so on, finishing up with “Shall I follow the example of the Queen?” We fancy lots of people would follow the example of the Queen (even Dr. Sangster would) if they had the Queen’s income—but why drag her in at all? Even if this is the Coronation Year, she could be given a little rest.

Dr. Sangster is delighted at the mass meetings he arranges for Christ, but he is a little worried why there are so many people still about who think no harm would arise if “all places of worship were closed overnight.” Perhaps these people have discovered that the Christian religion, to which the places of worship are dedicated, is no more true than Mithraism which also had many temples and hosts of worshippers. In other words, that God Almighty, His Son and His Miracles, together with the Devil, Hell, Heaven and Angels are all myths. What evidence is there that this is not so?

Sunday worshippers and misery-mongers must have had a shock at the letter sent out by the Rev. Glyn Jackson, of Accrington, to the effect that “the Church is not opposed to healthy and decent recreation on Sunday” provided—this is the snag—“it does not supersede or interfere with man’s primary duty of worship.” This is, of course, the Roman Catholic way of making Sunday a less miserable day. The Church of Rome knows that to make the day one of worship only would make it hell, so that, provided a little worship is indulged in, a good R.C. can play as much as he likes the rest of the time. Mr. Jackson has come to the same conclusion—but it is not the conclusion of the other Churches, no matter what he says.

In proof of this take Accrington’s Nonconformists? The Town Council has been asked to keep the parks open on Sundays for games and for the children’s play equipment. Strongly opposing this, is the Accrington and District Free Church Council, and it would surprise us if the Town

Council dared to oppose this bunch of Sabbatarians who must be horrified at anyone wanting to play on the Lord’s Day. Their slogan is “Be Miserable,” and most Town Councils agree with them. By the way, why do so many misery-mongers manage to get elected so often on Town Councils? Why so rarely do we get somebody who knows the meaning of “tolerance”?

Ready-Made

Oh, I instruct young Reverends in giving out their stories
(In any case, their listeners won’t boo!);
Oh, let your faces gleam and glow when telling Heaven’s
glories—
For Hell!—your natural looks will do!

A. E. C.

Theatre

“The White Carnation.” Globe Theatre.

This cannot rank among the best plays that R. C. Sherriff has given us, but it has excellent character parts and above all an amusing idea. That is, provided it is not taken seriously, for the main character is a ghost. Freethinkers can indulge in this as a little playful nonsense.

On Christmas Eve, 1944, a party was held at the house of John Greenwood, a stockbroker, and they were all unfortunately enough to die through a flying bomb falling on the house. So the same time every year the ghosts of these people have gathered to celebrate the approaching season. Then, in 1951, by an unfortunate mishap John Greenwood is shut out of the house just as the ghostly guests have left. He can make nobody hear and finally breaks in, finding the house badly damaged and empty, and is finally discovered by a policeman. In other words, he is the ghost who was left behind.

He is visited by the coroner, the police surgeon, the vicar and neighbours, and finally by a Home Office official in an effort to get rid of him. In fact the poor ghost, in a remarkably lively performance by Sir Ralph Richardson, spends a very uncertain year as one risen from the dead. Another well-studied performance was given by Campbell Singer as a police constable, but it would be a change to see this fine actor out of the police force and in another milieu. Meriel Forbes was at her best as a visitor, and Meg Maxwell made much of the small part of Greenwood’s wife.

The play has been carefully cast and goes with a swing under Noël Willman’s production, despite a tendency to lag in the latter part of the first half.

RAYMOND DOUGLAS

Question: Is it a grave sin to subscribe to a Liberal newspaper?
Answer: Yes, because one’s money is spent on evil, one’s hope placed on disorder, and a bad example is given to others.

—Official Catechism taught in Spanish schools.

Correspondence—

(From page 128)

THE LOOM OF LANGUAGE

SIR,—May I reply to B. Hoey’s letter in your issue of March 27 that very few Esperantists would claim that Esperanto is the best possible language that could be constructed. The point is that Esperanto is the language which has been adopted for the purpose in question, and it has stood up to every test. No other language or proposition has attracted any equivalent international following. A search for the most superior artificial language can only lead to dispute and division of effort.—Yours, etc.,

B. SEYMOUR WHIDBORNE.

ans wh
e Lor
st Tow
o mang
n Tow
o know
stories
eaven
E. C.
sherr
above
taken
inked
house
all un
ng of
these
eason
wood
have
fin
y dis
ghos
vic
ial in
in
dson
dean
pbel
ge to
other
and
body
wing
y to
S.
per
hope
is.
1-27
best
that
nos
age
ing
to

THE FREETHINKER

41, Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C. 1.
Telephone: Holborn 2601.

To Correspondents

In reply to B. J. EDGECOMBE, Mr. Cutner meant that Hebrew did not originate as a spoken language but was "made up" first and later became the Holy Language of the Jews.
H. W. BROWN.—No doubt the Christian Scientists themselves would supply you with details of their cures. Why not apply to them?
JOHN HALL.—We have handed your pamphlet to Mr. Cutner, who will deal with it as soon as possible. In passing, we should like to point out that the pamphlet is a mass of unsupported statements—most of which were exploded years ago.
THE FREETHINKER will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad): One year, £1 4s. (in U.S.A., \$3.50); 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.
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.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

Blackburn Branch N.S.S. (Market Place).—Sunday, 3 and 7 p.m.: JACK CLAYTON, a Lecture.
Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Deansgate Bomb Site).—Every week-day, 1 p.m.: Messrs. WOODCOCK and BARNES.
North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead Heath).—Sunday, 12 noon: L. EBURY.
Sheffield Branch N.S.S. (Barker's Pool).—Sunday, 7 p.m.: Mr. A. SAMMS.
West London Branch N.S.S. (Marble Arch).—Every Sunday at 3 p.m. and 8 p.m. Sunday, April 19: F. A. RIDLEY and other speakers.

INDOOR

4th Conway Memorial Lecture (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C. 1).—Tuesday, April 21, 7-30 p.m.: LORD CHORLEY, "The Concept of Liberty To-day." Chairman, PROF. BARBARA WOOTTEN. Admission Free.
Junior Discussion Group (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C. 1).—Friday, April 17, 7-15 p.m.: Annual Meeting. Discussions on communications.
South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C. 1).—Sunday, 11 a.m.: ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, M.A., "Can we Love our Enemies?"

NOTES AND NEWS

The capricious nature of the Deity has been again clearly indicated over the Easter holidays. From countless churches and chapels and, no doubt, from millions of Christian workers the petition for fine weather went up in a steady stream to the Throne of Grace. The result, as we all know, was atrocious weather over the holidays. A steady downpour of rain. For millions, their well-earned holiday must have been completely ruined; since, if there is any place on earth more dreary and depressing than a seaside holiday resort in really wet weather, we do not know where or what it is! However, no sooner was the holiday completed than the sun again shone brilliantly "on the just and on the unjust." Has the Lord a malicious sense of humour? Or is it merely that, as a well-known hymn phrases it, he "moves in mysterious ways his wonders to perform," and should not "wonders" actually read "blunders"?

It is a sad but undeniable fact that the world demonstrates a singular lack of discrimination in the way in which it selects its heroes. Compare, for example, the disproportionate space given in our history books to

generals, kings, and to their disreputable hangers-on, as and when compared with the heroes and martyrs of advanced movements who, too often, suffered neglect and oblivion on account of their disinterested efforts to improve the lot of their fellow men and women. Amongst such neglected figures the Freethought movement can claim a high percentage who, after the conclusion of their too-often stormy and unhappy lives, have been allowed to fall into quite undeserved neglect. Even modern Freethinkers, we suspect, often know far too little about their heroic predecessors, the sufferings and sacrifices of whom have secured for them the liberties which they enjoy to-day.

We are, this week, commencing the serial publication of a short and, we hope, illuminating biography of one of the most brilliant and neglected figures in the annals of the English Freethought movement, Robert Taylor (1784-1844). Taylor was, simultaneously, one of the finest orators of his day and one of the earliest Freethinkers to deny the historical existence of the alleged Founder of Christianity: a point of view, one may add, not at all popular, even amongst Freethinkers of the era, most of whom believed in a human and historical Jesus, "the Carpenter of Nazareth." Our Taylor biography is written by our well-known contributor, H. Cutner, who is a recognised specialist in early Freethought literature. We have no doubt that it will add greatly to our readers' knowledge of the early history of our movement.

To-day's Great Thought: "Money is the life-blood of the Church."—The Rector of St. Mary's, Woodford.

N.S.S. Executive Committee, 31st March

Present: Mr. F. A. Ridley (in the Chair), Mrs. Venton, Messrs. Griffiths, Ebury, Johnson, Hornibrook, Filey, Cleaver, Corstorphine, Gibbins, Taylor and the Secretary. A letter from Mr. J. W. Barker informed the meeting of his ill-health and an impending operation, and the Secretary was instructed to write a letter expressing the Committee's sympathy and wishes for a speedy recovery.

Twenty-one new members were admitted to the Parent, Glasgow, North London, Nottingham and West London Branches. Bradford Branch submitted a healthy report and financial statement, upon which it was congratulated.

The Secretary reported that the Sub-Committee had completed the arrangements to hold the Annual Conference at Leicester at Whitsun. The Sub-Committee was proceeding with agenda and other details. He also said that he had received requests for badges, of which there was no stock, and submitted a design and a quotation for a new one. It was decided not to order for the time being.

The acceptance of an invitation for Mr. Ridley to debate with a clergyman before the Laleham Forum was approved. Mr. Ridley suggested the concentration of special efforts on Hyde Park as a forum of open-air propaganda, and it was agreed that Mr. Cleaver's arrangements for keeping continuous meetings going there on Sundays be supported for a trial period.

P. VICTOR MORRIS, Secretary.

Sabbatarians

They want their "place of business" to be open all day Sunday.
They claim the Legislatures' recognition;
They want to shut up all their rival firms upon that one day,
It's a job for the Monopolies' Commission.

A.E.C.

Robert Taylor

The Devil's Chaplain (1784-1844) By H. CUTNER

INTRODUCTION

A FEW scattered notices of Robert Taylor will be found in such journals as the *Annual Register*, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and *Notes and Queries*, as well as in one or two Freethought periodicals. Many of these notices seem to be mostly inspired by malice and venom against a redoubtable Freethinker, and can in no way be depended upon. Even the well-known *Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers*, by Joseph Mazzini Wheeler, while giving as far as it goes an accurate account of Taylor's life, forbears any criticism of his work. In Mr. Joseph McCabe's *Dictionary of Rationalists*, the *Diegesis* is described as giving an account of Taylor's sun-myth theories when actually it deals with, for the most part, the documentary evidence of the origins of Christianity—the sun-myth theories being developed mainly in the *Devil's Pulpit*.

Allibone's *Dictionary of English Literature*—in general, most valuable, though not always accurate—treats Taylor with marked venom, and utterly absurd criticism; while the long article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, fair and accurate as far as what is known of Taylor's life is concerned, shows the same bitterly hostile account of his anti-Christian work. The unbiased reader must surely ask himself the question: If Robert Taylor's work was so utterly negligible as is claimed for it by the Rev. A. Gordon, the writer of the article, why should the *Dictionary of National Biography* devote four columns to its author? Many far better-known names have much less space devoted to them. The answer is surely that Taylor and his work must have had far greater influence than Mr. Gordon wished to show, and could not, in any comprehensive account of Britain's great men and women, possibly be ignored.

In the following pages an attempt is made, not only to show Robert Taylor the man, but to give, perhaps for the first time, a fair and unbiased estimation and criticism of his work. As in the case of Thomas Paine, the passage of time has brought with it a juster view of a great Freethinker. For example, in *British Authors of the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1936 in New York, and which contains 1,000 biographies, will be found a very sympathetic appreciation of Taylor occupying a column of matter. Its writer claims for the *Diegesis* that it "contains much valuable material and is still a classic in Rationalist literature." The point to note is that Taylor is mentioned in a book which contains notices of very few other Freethinkers, that his work is not dismissed with the usual Christian sneer, and that there is no other indication of any prejudice in favour of Freethought in this modern American publication. Robert Taylor was a remarkable man who fought hard for "the greatest of causes," and suffered years of imprisonment for his opinions. It is fervently hoped that real justice will be given him at last.

PART ONE

BIOGRAPHICAL

Among the number of priests, parsons, and pastors who left the Christian Church to join the ranks of Freethought, one of the most celebrated was Robert Taylor. He was not only an ordained Church of England clergyman, but a fully qualified surgeon; and he was able to bring to the Freethought movement exceptional gifts in the way of learning, original research, oratory, and—by no means the least—a sense of humour.

Robert Taylor was born in Edmonton on August 18, 1784, the second son of John Taylor, a prosperous iron-

monger, and Elizabeth Jasper, who were first cousins. Four sons and one daughter followed his birth, the father dying in 1791. The family were very comfortably off, a typical well-to-do of the industrial classes in the eighteenth century; and the widow who was left considerable property and an income, suffered little hardship in the management of her large family.

Robert was a favourite with his father and felt his loss very much, especially as his uncle, who took charge of him, treated the boy with marked unkindness. That did not prevent him from being quite the cleverest in the family. This was early recognised, and in Robert's unfinished autobiography, the *Life and Opinions of Talasiphron*, he tells us that at the boarding school in upper Edmonton, kept by the Rev. Morgan Davis, to which he, at the age of 10, and one of his brothers, were sent, "he very soon became distinguished as possessing the most extraordinary memory in the school." He was able to learn the whole of Gray's *Elegy* at one sitting, and repeat it without missing a word. Later, he went with his brothers to another school in Enfield, leaving at the age of fourteen. He showed definite poetical promise, but his uncle decided eventually to send him as a pupil to Mr. Samuel Partridge, the house surgeon of the General Hospital near Birmingham—the first of his family to claim, "who was brought up to a profession." He was bound, in 1801, apprentice for four-and-a-half-years, and in addition had a private tutor, the Rev. Mr. Farriday, so that "he might continue an uninterrupted course of classical erudition."

Mr. Partridge turned out to be one of the best friends if not the best, Robert Taylor ever had, and he very gratefully records the many kindnesses received at the hands of this kind-hearted and amiable man. He adds:

"The four and a half years in the Birmingham hospital, were, perhaps, the happiest of his life. I formed juvenile friendships—early loves—went to plays—shooting, fishing—wrote poems—and invented systems—to the sufficiently good effect, that the quiet happiness of his employments formed in him a strong and vigorous constitution."

Unfortunately, fate intervened in the last year of his happy apprenticeship. He "got religion" rather badly through hearing a Calvinist, Edward Burn, preach at St. Mary's Chapel, Birmingham. It made him change from being a gay Lothario to a melancholy Jacques; so much so, indeed, that his faithful friend and master, Mr. Partridge, "often admonished him almost with tears—'My dear young man, whatever you do, for God's sake, never give your mind to religion'—the best advice that was ever given to a man: but the bite had been received, and the wholesome advice came too late to cure it."

On the day Taylor came of age, he tells us that he "was fool enough to receive the sacrament," which was undoubtedly an act of the most passionate sincerity. It was the cause of the complete change in his career, which, if it proved an unhappy change for him later, was actually of the greatest value to Freethought in the ultimate. However, he came, in 1805, to London to pursue his medical studies, and entered, under Cline and Cooper (later the famous Sir Astley Cooper), Guy's and Thomas's hospitals. Here he worked hard for two years, passed his examination, and became a M.R.C.S. It should be added that he received high compliments from the Examiner, and also special notice by Sir Astley Cooper, who took great interest in his future career.

(To be continued)

The Community and the Criminals

By C. H. NORMAN

(Concluded from page 119)

IT IS not easy to prove the extent of this evil, as so many people wrongly convicted are dazed by their fate and have little idea how to proceed to remedy their misfortune. A few undoubted facts may be useful on this side of this complex problem. There was the recent case where the Bow Street magistrate, Sir Lawrence Dunne, convicted a poor man of stealing a wallet. After the trial and conviction the accuser discovered that he had not lost the wallet at all, so the conviction was obviously wrongful. Sir Lawrence Dunne then proceeded to hold another trial in which he arrived at the opposite conclusion to the one previously reached and the man was released from prison. Supposing the wallet had not been discovered for some weeks that man would have been an innocent man in prison for that period. Then there was the shocking case of Mrs. G. This unfortunate woman was twice convicted of writing improper letters. The trial judge in the one case was Mr. Justice Avory and in the other case Mr. Justice Roche, now Lord Roche. She appealed against both convictions to the Court of Criminal Appeal, and the appeals were dismissed. She served the first sentence in full, and the second sentence in part. While serving the second sentence the objectionable letters again began to circulate, which put the police on a further inquiry with the result that the leading Crown witness admitted the authorship of the letters. Mrs. G. was released and granted £200 compensation. Whether there was any whipping round among the judges concerned in this deplorable miscarriage of justice, history does not relate!

Those who watch the papers closely have observed with some concern that, tucked away in little paragraphs in the past few months there have been a number of cases in which police officers ranging from inspectors to constables have been convicted at Assizes and Quarter Sessions for breaking and entering and various forms of theft. One would like to know whether any inquiry is made by the authorities concerning cases in which these officers previously have been witnesses accusing other people of similar crimes. Such officers have a great weapon with which to shield themselves under the strange procedure by which persons known to the police can be apprehended on the charge of being "suspected persons," or "loitering for the purpose of committing a felony." In a grave case of this character the writer inquired of Mr. Chuter Ede whether any investigation of this type was directed as a matter of general principle, and the reply was a negative one. It must be remembered, too, that Adolf Beck was wrongly convicted three times, the prosecuting Counsel being the late Horace Avory.

In examining the responsibility for the state of crime one has to consider also the anomalous attitude of the State. All States are spending large sums on what is called Secret Service. These funds are under the control of the Foreign Secretary and the Permanent Head of the Foreign Office secretariat. One main purpose of the expenditure of these funds is to corrupt people to disclose secrets of foreign governments. The same government which is carrying on this kind of conduct will put on trial and pass heavy sentences upon its own subjects, who are bribed by some foreign government to act in a similar way. Years ago the present writer tried to get the subject of the treatment of spies discussed at the League of Nations with a view to some reasonable code being laid down for these people who are bribed by State funds to commit their offences.

The British delegation, however, declined to raise the question. Since then, it has become a graver evil, as the amount expended on the procurement of this type of crime by the British Government, by the United States Government, by the Russian Government has increased considerably. The trials of these people in all countries are usually scandals of the first magnitude in the administration of justice.

A second point is the low standard of honesty in the community among the educated and well-to-do. Some little time ago an inquiry was proceeding which involved the investigation of the integrity of certain individuals engaged in City of London finance and commerce. One of the accused called an accountant connected with one of the largest firms of auditors in the City of London to testify to his character. The witness was asked whether, in his opinion, Mr. X was an honest man. The reply was remarkable. The witness said: "If any person engaged in commerce, finance or trade in the City of London can be an honest man, Mr. X is one."

The fact is that the criminal law only operates against the scapegoats. It was admitted in the House of Lords that the overcrowding of the prisons was due to the long sentences being passed under the Criminal Justice Act, 1948, which is being maladministered in this respect. The vice of that Act is the underlying assumption that two or three relatively trivial offences should properly add up to a very serious offence warranting the imposition of long terms of imprisonment. This view does not protect the community: it endangers it. The purpose of the administration of justice should be to prevent serious crime, not to encourage it by the introduction of erroneous principles in its administration. The prisoner has already been punished for the earlier offences. The theory that these offences which separately may justify sentences of six months' imprisonment each should add up on the third and fourth occasion to a sentence of seven or ten years' corrective detention is a repellent one and contrary to all the principles laid down in such an ancient book as Montesquien's "Esprit des Lois." The knowledge that these heavy sentences are being passed has led to the young criminal resorting to violence in an endeavour to escape, or avoid identification. It is not merely a coincidence that the wave of violence has followed on the practice of filling the prisons by passing long sentences under the judicial administration of the Criminal Justice Act. The failure of the policy is complete. Having assiduously filled the prisons by this policy between 1949 and 1951, the judges are complaining that there are more criminals at large of a dangerous character than ever! The truth is that the community which permits such enormous inequalities to exist in riches and poverty must put up with some crime, for the crime is rooted in these inequalities. Comfortable-living judges never draw attention to the fact that the calendars at Assizes and Quarter Sessions are concerned in the main with people of whom one finds under the heading "Address" the significant words "No fixed abode." Never for many years are so many people living in conditions and places where the rent is collected per day or per half-day at a commission of nearly thirty per cent. on the amount collected.

Finally, Lord Jowitt should be interested to know that, whatever the lady may have told him about Aylesbury

Prison, the bells attached to the cells in the men's prisons generally do not ring. If one does ring, there is no reply, or, if there is, the prisoner ringing it risks being put on the governor's charge list for the morning, which often means three days' punishment diet. Therefore, the wise prisoner does not ring the bell, even if seriously ill, but will wait till the morning opening of the cell door. That is the fact about that side of "the attendance" in prison life.

Correspondence

FREETHOUGHT AND RUSSIA

SIR,—Permit me to express my sincere appreciation of your splendid and timely article in *The Freethinker*, March 20, 1953, on "Freethought and the Russian Revolution."

Few editors in the U.S.A. have the courage and honesty to write as you always do. In Boston (Catholic dominated), where I live, we have editors and radio commentators who hate Russia (and the atheism of its leaders) with every breath they take; and it is sickening to observe how our national government and its praying president surrounded by "men of God" are catering to religious superstition and mythical nonsense.

Again thanking you for your superlative article.—Yours, etc.,

E. L. DWIGHT TURNER.

ENCOUNTERS OF BELIEF

SIR,—Many thanks for sending me your issue dated April 3, 1953, with complimentary reference to my letter in *The Times*. I agree with you that there is no present likelihood of free and adequate debate over the radio on the fundamental questions of religion, ethics, politics and the like—but that is no reason why we shouldn't demand it!—Yours, etc.,

C. H. R. MEREDITH.

ESPERANTO HAS IT

SIR,—Your correspondent, B. Hoey, says there are artificial languages in existence much superior to Esperanto. Theoretically that may be so. But which of them can boast of a practical record of 37 world congresses with attendances from 30 different countries of 1,500 persons? Which of them has representatives in 62 countries. If an international language is to be judged on performance and not on theory, as in Bodmer's "Loom of Language," which I have read, Esperanto has no competitor.—Yours, etc.,

FRED PARKER, F.R.G.S.

SPOKEN ESPERANTO

SIR,—I was particularly interested in a sentence of Mr. Cutner's article "The Israelites and Egypt" (April 3). Referring to the language used for the Hebrew Old Testament he writes: "I also hold that the 'Hebrew' in which it was written is a made-up language, like Esperanto, and was never spoken."

I feel sure that Mr. Cutner does not intend to infer that Esperanto itself is not a spoken language for, whilst Esperanto is certainly a constructed language, it can be spoken with as much ease and fluency as any national tongue.—Yours, etc.,

BASH J. EDGECOMBE.

REPUBLICANISM AND FREETHOUGHT

SIR,—I would like to support the suggestion of Mr. A. P. Perrin that a "British Peoples Federal Republic" should be a plank in the Freethought platform.

Kingship is as much a religious as a political institution. Republicanism has always been traditional in the Secular movement and Coronation Year would be a good time to emphasise that fact.—Yours, etc.,

L. HANGER.

THE EDITOR, THE "MANCHESTER EVENING NEWS"

SIR,—Good Friday evening I went to the Manchester Gaumont cinema. After the feature picture the manager came on the stage and introduced a Methodist Minister to talk to us for a few minutes.

I thought he was going to make an appeal for some charity, as I had noticed some women in the foyer with collecting boxes. To my amazement, however, we were subjected to a five minutes religious sermon.

I protested to the manager, in the presence of the minister, against this high-handed action, pointing out that the public were not warned there was to be a religious sermon. It had not been advertised. The manager's reply was that it was the policy of Mr. J. Arthur Rank to have a sermon preached in all his cinemas on Good Friday and he was merely carrying out his instructions.

May I ask when has the ownership of cinemas conferred the right to impose the owner's special branch of religion upon

his patrons, among whom are Roman Catholics, Hindus, Jews, Chinese, unbelievers and members of various other religions?

I would like to know what members of the above-mentioned faiths think of this invasion of their rights to the entertainment which they paid to see.—Yours, etc.,

(I append my name and address as evidence of good faith and not for publication.)

RELIGION IN CINEMAS

SIR,—I enclose a copy of a letter I sent to the local press. It explains itself.

I don't know that it will see the light of day, as I neither own the paper nor its views. I do think, however, that it is an intolerable impertinence on Mogul Rank's part to file time for which his patrons have paid to be entertained, to inflict on them his religious views—but when have these "religious goodies" played fair?

Well, we must carry on our good work, whatever the odds.—Yours, etc.,

N. CASSELL.

SIR,—I read with considerable interest Arthur Wild's article on Hauer, in yesterday's *The Freethinker*. Of Hauer's "Aryan Nine Commandments" Wild says: "Unlike the Christian Commandments, they are not valid for all." I assume that what is meant by that is that the Ten Commandments of Judaism, which Christians (as well as Moslems?) acknowledge, are to be read in an inclusive sense—that is to say, that the God who is to be revered is the God of all mankind and the people who are not to be murdered or have their property or wives stolen are people in general. I very much doubt whether a careful reading of "The Hebrew of the Decalogue" bears this out. It seems to me that the Yahveh of the decalogue is a tribal deity and that those who are protected by the decalogue from murder, theft and covetousness are members of the tribe whose god is Yahveh. On this view the Ten Commandments would be parallel to Hauer's Nine Commandments and would represent precisely the same stage in moral development.—Yours, etc.,

J. S. K. PATRICK.

MR. YATES REPLIES

SIR,—It will come as a disappointment to M. B. Drapier to be told that I did not write "clearance of thought," but "clearness of thought." I did not bother to correct the misprint because I thought the intelligence of most readers would make it unnecessary. That there *might* be a few exceptions, such as M. B. Drapier, I thought possible, but did not anticipate by any means. My article is scarcely a book or paper printed that does not contain some errata. No one but a "critic" of M. B. Drapier's memoirs would regard them as other than mere slips of inadvertence on the part of writer or printer.

As I have already stated my views on Freethought and suppressed them by arguments that have not yet been answered; and as there is nothing in M. B. Drapier's letter to indicate that he has "clearness of thought" on the subject, there is no occasion to prolong the discussion.—Yours, etc.,

A. YATES.

(More letters on page 124)

PUBLIC MEETING

Broadcasting and Religion: A Protest

Chairman: J. REEVES, M.P.

Speakers:

LORD CHORLEY OF KENDAL	M. PHILIPS PRICE, M.P.
FENNIE BROCKWAY, M.P.	R. W. SORENSON, M.P.
R. H. S. CROSSMAN, M.P.	C. BRADLAUGH BONNER
PETER FREEMAN, M.P.	F. A. RIDLEY

CAXTON HALL

(Court Room), Westminster

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1953

Doors open at 6.30 p.m. for 7 p.m.

Admission Free

1,000 envelopes, 6 x 3½, manilla 13s., white 16s. 9d.; ream quality duplicating paper, 10s. 10d.; typing paper, 10s. 3d. — WARRINGTON, 7, Newton Avenue, London, N.10.