

The Freethinker

Vol. LXXV—No. 32

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Fourpence

IN his amusing book, *Arcadian Adventures of the Idle Rich*, the Edwardian humourist, Stephen Leacock, once referred to "the solitary elephant who dashed off in all directions," actually, this acrobatic feat is more common amongst theologians than zoologists! and it is particularly evident in the current situation of Anglicanism, of "the Church of England by law established" as the Catholic and Protestant Church of Christ in this realm.

On The Rocks ?

Under the above caption, one of our "great" daily newspapers recently reviewed the present situation of Anglicanism *vis-a-vis* the present ecclesiastical crisis that is, nowadays, agitating clerical circles over the recognition or non-recognition of the recently formed church of Southern India, a current controversy which may not sound very exciting, or important, to the lay mind not versed in the niceties of theological reasoning, but which is, nevertheless, just at present, causing severe headaches in Lambeth and Canterbury, and which, indeed, according to the newspaper already cited, is just at present threatening to split the none too solid ranks of Anglicanism from top to bottom.

A Theological Dilemma !

The relevant facts appear to be briefly as follows : A number of formerly separated missionary congregations in Southern India, recently decided to amalgamate into a single "Church of South India," at least that is how it is popularly described. The present crisis in ecclesiastical circles has arisen over the present proposal to afford this newly-constituted body full recognition by the Anglican Church, or as it is technically described, "full inter-communion," between the two churches, the old Anglican and the new Indian Church. Well and good! What a layman might relevantly inquire, *What is the row about ?* Are not both churches Christian in claim and character, and is it not the most natural thing in the world for them to be "in communion" with each other? However, the matter is not as simple as that. An acute theological dilemma is involved which has aroused the latent *odium theologicum* and threatens to shake the Anglican Church to its foundations.

The Apostolic Succession

Again briefly, this is the precise question at issue, the High Church or Anglo-Catholic party in the Anglican Church claims that the "Church of England" represents a *bona fide* branch of the "universal" ("Catholic") Church of Christ and that it is constituted as precisely such by the "apostolic succession" of its clergy from the first Christian apostles. Further, the medium, the theologically indispensable medium of the sacrosanct "apostolic succession" is to be found in episcopal ordination in unbroken succession from the apostles. It is precisely this unbroken succession from the apostles that, claim the anglo-catholics, constitutes the Church of England as a valid branch of the "universal" church along with the other "Catholic" churches of Rome, Greek "Orthodoxy" and the "Old Catholics." Now the

newly-formed Indian Church consists largely of members of ex-Protestant congregations, who have no bishops and consequently no "apostolic succession" and accordingly no claim to be a valid branch of the universal Catholic Church, "inter-communion" with such a theologically constituted abortion would, loudly proclaim the Anglo-Catholic critics, mean pollution of the Anglican communion by heresy and schism."

"Authoritarian Anarchists"

The Anglo-Catholic or "High Church" party constitutes, perhaps, the most influential and certainly the most active and noisy of the several competing factions amongst the Anglican clergy, though nominally owing obedience to the See of Canterbury and to the Anglican

episcopate, *in practice*, the Anglo-Catholic clergy show little respect for their bishops when, as sometimes happens, these Right Reverend successors of the apostolic display markedly Protestant or even "modernist" leanings. The late Bishop Barnes, that *enfant terrible* of the Church of England, was always having trouble with his Anglo-Catholic clergy. This curious combination of official respect for the office of bishop with a practical contempt for their actual ecclesiastical superiors, caused a witty Roman Catholic theologian to describe the Anglo-Catholics as "authoritarian anarchists"—a brilliant description! At present, the Anglo-Catholics appear to be ready to make a test case, a "theological *casus belli*," of the question of "inter-communion" with the non-episcopal Church of South India, a major ecclesiastical crisis appears to be in the offing.

Parties in the Church of England

Our established church—of which we are *all* officially members!—is a somewhat peculiar heterogeneous body held together by its endowments as an established church rather than by any recognisable logical principles! One could even say that, whilst this church has never known whether it is Catholic or Protestant, it has at least, always known that it is *English!* Within its comprehensive formularies, this church combines Catholic, Protestant and "Modernist" factions, who appear to have little in common except their clerical profession and its emoluments, the only theological formula binding, on all ordained Anglican clerics is that masterpiece of theological, facing bothways, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, of which it would seem to be no exaggeration to say that it can be interpreted in thirty-nine ways! Held together in uneasy communion inside these flexible formulae are Anglo-Catholics who do not believe in papal infallibility, but otherwise are more papal than the Pope, Protestants, to whom Rome is "The Scarlet Woman, foretold in the Apocalypse, and to whom every comma in the Bible is verbally inspired, and "modernists" who accept most of the conclusions of modern science and historical criticism and who sometimes write critical articles which would be considered "advanced" in, say, our contemporary, *The Literary Guide*. In short, a happy band of brothers!

— VIEWS and OPINIONS —

The Church of England and the Reformation

By F. A. RIDLEY

The Church of England and the Reformation

The crux of the whole problem is actually to be found in the relationship between the Reformation of the 16th century and the then English church. It is well known under what tragically spectacular circumstances, first Henry the Eighth and again Queen Elizabeth, repudiated the authority of the Vatican in England. The Thirty-nine Articles still declare roundly that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." The further question, however, is much less clear; how far did the Reformation go in England? Were the reformers Protestant or Catholic? Did they, as the Anglo-Catholics still assert, intend merely to reform an admittedly corrupt church of the period in "morals and manners"? or did they achieve a theological revolution which turned the English church into a Protestant church, opposed in doctrine to the Catholic Church, as the Protestants and "modernists" contend?

The Future of Anglicanism?

On the thorny problem of the doctrinal character of the Anglican Church, a pretty hot controversy may be expected

with "inter-communion" with the Indian Church as merely the present test-case, already the theologians are sharpening their knives! But the Anglo-Catholics look further than the mere recognition or non-recognition of a few doubtfully ordained Indian converts. The whole future of Anglicanism is at stake. The ultimate Anglo-Catholic aim is to get the Church of England disestablished, once Parliament can no longer restrain them, the Anglo-Catholics believe that they can get rid of their Protestant and "modernist" colleague and, perhaps, subsequently, "do a deal" with Rome. Though so far it must be conceded, Rome has not indicated much intention of meeting them half-way. However, the present controversy may bring the eventual disestablishment of the Church of England a stage nearer, who knows? In its campaign for the disestablishment of the church the National Secular Society may find unexpected allies, "extremes meet." At any rate at the rate things are going at present, the disestablishment and, perhaps, the ultimate disappearance of Anglicanism as a separate force may eventuate sooner, perhaps, than even its critics anticipate.

A Century of Fossil Finds

By G. H. TAYLOR

IN 1855 at Ipswich was found a fossil human jaw. The story of anthropological discovery since then has been a continuous one, and this despite the fact that the earth's surface has so far been only speculatively scratched.

The main finds pertain to four areas; W. Europe, the Chinese coast, Java, and the south and east of Africa.

WEST EUROPE

1856. *Homo Neanderthalensis*, Dusseldorf.

Found three years before Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published Neanderthal Man was not well received. A great controversy arose, and certain religiously inclined scientists did not take kindly to the idea that the Biblical Adam could possibly have ancestors. There were, however, corroborative finds later, indicating a cave dweller who lived by hunting and fishing, though mentally far below *homo sapiens*. There have been opinions that Neanderthal is ancestral to us: Professor Hrdlicka was probably the last to advance this view, and it now appears certain that Neanderthal was merely a blind alley in human evolution. He was wiped out by the axes of the tall virile Cromagnon race, who, incidentally, were themselves similarly obliterated by the Azilians from Asia. Controversy about Neanderthal has been practically resolved by the abundance of subsequent discoveries, such as whole skeletons reassembled from finds in the Grotto of Spy in the Meuse valley, and others at Krapina and elsewhere. Neanderthal was a tool maker, right handed like us, and probably used fire and crudely dressed skins for wearing. His thumbs were not opposable, however—quite a biological handicap. He slouched along with heavy protruding jaw and low forehead, from which hung the characteristically heavy brow ridges.

—A skull found at Ehringsdorf (1925), according to Wiedenreich, takes us to the point where Neanderthal branched away from our line, in which case (Ehringsdorf being the less primitive) certain pithecoïd traits in Neanderthal must be taken as recessive.

1863. Abbeville, France.

A jaw came to light in a sand deposit, later investigation finding many almost complete skeletons in the West European area. Again it is unlikely that we have here an actual ancestor.

1907. Heidelberg, Germany.

A jaw was found in an old sandpit at a depth of 80 ft. The possessor of this massive jaw, resembling a gorilla's, nevertheless shows characteristically human, though primitive, teeth. He flourished, it is thought, during the second interglacial period in conditions eminently favourable to life. Controversies have not been entirely dispelled by later discoveries. Bonarelli and other experts have taken Heidelberg (or Mauer) Man as a separate extinct genus, while Lull considers him ancestral to Neanderthal. Keith also regards the leg bones as more anthropoid than Neanderthal's (*Ency. Brit. article, Evolution of Man*), and rejected Duckworth's suggestion that the great chinless manible could be articulated to the Java skull to give similarity of type.

1926. London.

The major part of a skull was recovered during excavations for a new building at the junction of Lime Street and Leadenhall Street. Professor Elliott Smith spoke of certain australoid affinities; others regarded it as a contemporary of Neanderthal.

1936. Swanscombe, Kent.

A year intervened between the discoveries of two main pieces of skull, articulated and taken from the same datable stratum with datable flint tools, picked from undisturbed soil 24 ft. from the surface in the 100 ft. Thames Terrace, associated with Acheulian flint tools of the second period of the Old Stone Age. The crown of the head is inhumanly low and the brain print indicative of a very primitive sort of mind. Another clue to his lowness is a dimple on the outside of the skull, the kind of hollow a fair-sized muscle attachment makes, and at the spot where, in our skulls, runs the almost atrophied muscle which enables some to move their ears. Marston was the finder. The term *Eoanthropus*, Dawn Man, would include this find, going back at least a quarter of a million years. (to be concluded)

The smallest atom of truth represents some man's bitter toil and agony; for every ponderable chunk of it there is a brave truth-seeker's grave upon some lonely ashheap, and a soul roasting in Hell.

—H. L. Mencken.

—NEXT WEEK—

ON POLTERGEISTS

By H. CUTNER

The Basic Cause of War

By R. READER

WAR—as old as mankind and common to all mankind—is always associated with territory and natural resources (or representative financial units). It is moreover, irrational, without results, differing profoundly from aims, and costs far outweighing the value of the issues involved. Belief in its divine origin is a facile evasion of human responsibility and an excuse for inaction. The theory that it is only an extension of human peacetime aggression is likewise untenable. The pleasures of modern war are vastly less than the satisfactions of a personal, individual rough-house, and aggressive men often succumb more rapidly in battle than their timid companions. We must conclude that war arises from a human peacetime activity, itself irrational, linked with the economics of human living, and common to all human races and history, despite the never-ending rise, decline, and fall of widely-differing social patterns and political regimes. Only one thing satisfies all these conditions: *the attitude of mankind to human procreation.*

In precarious early day, procreation was man's best weapon for survival. The critical period for survival passed, but anticipation for future events led us to try to look beyond death. Religious neurosis; an irrational flight to worship death's antithesis, especially money, possessions, and children; developed, being bolstered up by religions which, however great their superficial differences, were all alike in one thing; namely, that they were, in essence, commercial contracts. ("Do this on earth, and I will see that you receive that after death.") The normal urge to reproduce soon bore no relation to material limits to human existence. Always, therefore, in every age, the earth was overpopulated having regard to the techniques of human living in use at the time. Our present society is simply an aggravation of the same thing. Today as in the days of the caverns, the most important act that two individuals can perform, and one that has economic and social repercussions on every human being in the world, is regarded as a strictly private matter between the two people concerned. Nearly always it is an accident, and not an act of volition, based on entirely artificial economic situations bearing no relation to the fundamental production and distribution of the earth's resources.

World population, in 1650, had reached 500 millions; in 1750, 725 millions; in 1850, 1,000 millions; in 1950, over 2,000 millions. War's ravages kept well nigh in phase with and increased in proportion to this progression: 5,000 dead in 18th century battles; 500,000 dead in the Napoleonic campaigns; millions dead in the World Wars of our time.

The relation between war and population, however, is not the simple direct one suggested by such figures. Aggravating over-population are medical science with child welfare, vaccination, antibiotics; marriage allowances; militarists whose strategy lags one war behind realities; industrialists hypnotised by the 1850-1900 procreation dividends, and who cannot see that consumers with empty pockets cease to be "interesting" even in the limited commercial sense of the word; and religious neurotics who deliberately stimulate and provoke young people to have large families.

Working against these things, but owing their existence to them, were pestilence, fire, and infant mortality in early times, and, more latterly, the 20th century political regimes based on imprisonment, robbery, torture, and murder; traffic accidents; cancer; poliomyelitis; crime; the rising costs of living; and the enhanced chances of dying. (Of what importance are life expectation statistics compared with the possibilities of nuclear warfare?)

These two contending forces are controlled by a third, greater than either of them; namely, biology. The balance between the numbers of the living things of the earth is not disturbed with impunity. The unimpeded growth of Mesozoic reptiles ended in their extinction. It is this biological consideration which, in the long run, obliges individuals irrationally to co-operate in killing, and in being killed by, others whom they have never met, and against whom they have no conceivable personal grudge. It is this biological law, rather than the natural cruelty of any particular race, which bred the abominable extermination camps of the last conflict.

"If overpopulation produces war," it will be objected, "then war fails its purpose. A decade after a major conflict, humanity is more numerous than before it began." This is true, but let us not delude ourselves. Quantitatively, war has so far failed. But qualitatively it has scored resounding "successes," seriously decreasing humanity's potentiality for happy living. It has produced that triumph, contemporary civilization, with at least 30% of most populations manifestly degenerate. It would take three days and nights to count Britain's estimated 500,000 syphilitics; psychotic insanities and neuroses are many times this number; and other countries are in worse plight. Yet still the hospitals, full to overflowing and unable to pay their way, welcome multiple births and "bumper years for babies." Still the popular Press applauds what it describes as the unselfish instincts to rear a family, despite the observable fact that many parents desire children only to be able to use them as sounding-boards for their own conceits, foolishness, and egoism.

And so, at last, biological evolution has found the complete, irrevocable answer: the hydrogen bomb.

Nor is biology the whole story. Tedium; boredom; the desire for change at any price; and the deliberate frustration of certain ambitions, all favour war by inducing religious neurosis. Religious neurosis, in fact, is the foundation stone, not only of the monstrous edifice of war, but of all minor distresses, the economic dislocation, paradox, booms, slumps, trade cycles, crime, etc., that so preoccupy the politicians. And until it is recognized for what it is—a mental affliction—no effective action can be taken.

At least, however, the situation can be made quite plain. No sane unbeliever objects to abstract belief in a deity—the believer has a perfect right to construct fairylands to satisfy his personal make-up and temperament. But when believers herd together in groups, something silly and dangerous always emerges, defying all previous human experience and reason. The religious attitude to human procreation is the classic example of this.

In a sense, both freethinkers and believers are now on trial for their lives before nuclear fission. But our criminal code entitles a man arraigned on the capital charge to speak on the issue affecting his life or death: freethinkers who attack the outworn dogmas and stupid acts of the believers are, in effect, doing that. Further their intentions are to make human life something better than the present tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing—the present accidental arrival; shortlived welcome; increasing redundancy; and never-absent threat of a violent, painful, and premature exit.

This Believing World

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, that very voluble Catholic priest doing his utmost to uplift America, hates the idea of putting Christianity alongside of Buddhism, Judaism, Islam, Shintoism, and the hundred-and-one other religions we are blessed with "as one of them." "In all other religions," he obligingly tells us in the *Chicago Sun-Times*, "man moves to God as the first of all movements. In Christianity, God moves to man . . . no other religion except Christianity even makes this claim."

It would of course be futile to reply to the know-all Bishop that whether one claims man moves to God, or God moves to man, the result is just the same; for there is literally no difference whatever between Bishop Sheen and an African witch doctor on the question of God. Neither knows anything at all about the elusive Spirit, and anybody can claim anything he likes about the Almighty with exactly the same authority.

But we do agree with the Bishop in one thing. "The present tendency," he complains, "to identify Christianity with Freud, labour unions, playing at benefits, tolerance and social service takes the heart out of the religion of Christ." Of course. Jesus may well be the greatest Cricketer, the greatest Psycho-analyst, the greatest Labour Union Leader, and the greatest Social Worker that ever lived, but these things don't make Christianity. And well he knows it.

Another Chicago journal, the "Daily Tribune," asks its readers to name the passage from the Bible which gave them the greatest consolation in times of trouble? The winning entries don't seem to aid much. One gentleman finds "great peace" in "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want . . ."; but then he was in a good job. Would he have hailed this as a masterpiece if he belonged to an army of unemployed with no chance of earning anything? Another believer preferred, "Ask and it shall be given to you . . ." though he was very careful not to state whether he had ever asked and got what he wanted.

The all-believing supporters of "spirit" healing—that is, the absolute curing of quite incurable diseases and ailments through "spirit" doctors by people like Mr. Harry Edwards, must have got the shock of their lives when they heard him and two orthodox doctors discuss his cures on T.V. the other day. Instead of confronting his medical opponents with fool-proof concrete cases, Mr. Edwards went into generalities—no names, no pack drill, so to speak. His boast has always been that, after competent doctors have diagnosed a patient as quite incurable, he (or she) has been cured by spirits, and that the doctors have been literally staggered in every instance.

There was nothing like this in the T.V. discussion. In fact, when he was asked, did he follow up his wonderful cures, Mr. Edwards countered by saying that that was the job of his opponents—not his. He made such a poor showing that even spiritualists have had to admit that he did their cause infinite harm. Even the ineffable Pope of Fleet Street, Mr. Hannen Swaffer, quite unable to justify Mr. Edwards, felt that the best attack was defence; so he

triumphantly declared (according to *Psychic News*) that "the profession to which the highest proportion of lunatics belong is the medical one." Always abuse your opponents if you have a rotten case was a maxim of other Popes, too.

In the "Monthly Record," the organ of South Place Ethical Society, there is a plea from Mr. O. Deakin, B.A., that we ought to consider "a mean" between "traditional theism with its unanswered problems, and pure humanism which seems to evade these problems." What "pure humanism" really is we are not prepared to say; but we all do know "traditional theism"—and whenever "a mean" is suggested, it always (or nearly always) means going over to "theism" traditional or not. However distasteful it may be to people like Mr. Deakin, we on this journal do not want any "mean." We are out to fight Theism which is completely out-dated. It belongs to a primitive age born in ignorance, and we want to substitute for it Freethought and Science.

CHAPMAN COHEN ON CHRISTIANITY'S DECLINE

THE fight that Christianity is waging is a continuation of the warfare that has been proceeding ever since its rise to power. It is a contest of superstition against scientific knowledge and cultural development. The first battle in this war ended in favour of Christianity, and the science of antiquity went down before its assault. For centuries the Church was strong enough, using its favourite weapons of slander, persecution and misdirection to hold the enemy at bay. A change came with the revival of learning, and antiquity took its revenge by sapping the cosmic scheme on which Christianity rested. For, like all other systems of religious belief, Christianity was the expression of a definite view of the world and of man. The astronomy of Copernicus, the physics of Galileo and Newton, the geology of Lyell, the biology of Darwin, all combined to shatter the Christian cosmos into fragments. Sociology followed by showing the nature of economic and ethical processes, Anthropology helped the disintegration by showing the origin and nature of religious ideas; historical criticism by exhibiting the way in which the Christian religion had developed. Man ceased to be the weak, helpless creature Christianity had depicted. He gave the gods gaze for gaze. And to look closely at the gods is unhealthy—for the gods.

It is hopeless for Christianity to expect to repeat its triumph of the earlier centuries and to see modern science go down in the welter of a revived superstition. It cannot train the coloured races to march under its banner, and so call in a new world to redress the balance of the old. It may twist and turn and procrastinate and revise, but that can only delay the end, not avert it. Christianity is becoming an impossible creed for civilized intelligence.

(*The Freethinker*, Nov., 1928.)

CONSCRIPTION

All over the continent conscription prevails. Young men are withdrawn from industrial life at the very time when they should be settling down to their careers. They are removed from domestic influences—from the sagacious eye of the father, the loving eye of the mother, the appealing eye of the sister—at the most critical time of life, when such influences are the most precious, seeing it is then often decided whether the youth shall be a man or a beast. They are herded together in barracks, and what that means is better left to imagination. Evil always springs from the separation of the sexes. . . .

—G. W. Footc.

THE FREETHINKER

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

Telephone: Holborn 2601.

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. Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

To Correspondents

Correspondents may like to note that when their letters are not printed or when they are abbreviated, the material in them may still be of use to "This Believing World," or to our spoken propaganda.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

Blackburn Branch N.S.S. (Market Place).—Every Sunday, 7 p.m.: F. ROTHWELL.

Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Broadway Car Park).—Every Sunday, 7.30 p.m. Sunday, August 7: HAROLD DAY and other speakers.

Kingston Branch N.S.S. (Castle Street).—Every Sunday at 8 p.m.: J. W. BARKER and E. MILLS.

Manchester Branch N.S.S.—Every Sunday, 3 p.m., Platt Fields: 7.30 p.m., St. Mary's Blitzed Site: Speakers, Messrs. MCCALL, MILLS, or WOODCOCK. Every weekday, Deansgate Blitzed Site, 1 p.m.: G. A. WOODCOCK.

Merseyside Branch N.S.S. (Pierhead).—Every Wednesday and Sunday at 8 p.m. Messrs. PARRY, THOMPSON, and other speakers.

Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Old Market Square).—Every Friday at 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead).—Every Sunday, noon: L. EBURY and H. ARTHUR.

West London Branch N.S.S.—Every Sunday at the Marble Arch from 4 p.m.: Messrs. RIDLEY, EBURY, O'NEILL and WOOD. *The Freethinker* on sale at Marble Arch.

INDOOR

Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Trades Hall, Thurland Street).—Thursday, August 18, 7.30 p.m.: K. COOKE, "The Value of Marx for the Workers."

Birmingham Branch N.S.S. (Satis Cafe, 40 Cannon Street, off New Street).—Sunday, August 14, 7 p.m.: Mr. MANKLEY, "Rome or Reason?"

An Eminent Victorian

by COLIN MCCALL

MATTHEW ARNOLD, by J. D. Jump; Longmans 1955; 10/6.

Mr. Jump differs from many in not rating Arnold's poetry very highly. There are times, he writes, when we are glad to make "a brief escape from the human predicament on the viewless wings of Poesy". . . But the fact remains that the greatest poetry is that which confronts and in some sense masters the predicament." Arnold, he suggests, achieves poetic greatness only on one or two exceptional occasions: in parts of *Empedocles on Etna*, for instance, but above all in *Dover Beach*, "his one great poem." Consequently, Mr. Jump does not regret Arnold's turning from poetry to criticism in early middle life. It was as a critic that he excelled.

Arnold defined criticism as "a disinterested endeavour to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world." It must, he said, be "sincere, simple, flexible, ardent, ever widening its knowledge." He never fully realised this ideal in his own efforts but that, as Mr. Jump remarks, was merely due to human imperfection, "he did, to a remarkable degree, make his criticism an expression of disinterested curiosity" and "he clearly perceived that the critical attitude is of value not only in the writer's or reader's study but also in the world outside." That, I think, is important. Matthew Arnold was no scholarly recluse. He was a school-inspector for over thirty years and came in close

The Chapman Cohen Memorial Fund

Previously acknowledged, £902 0s. 3d.; A. V. Peries (Ceylon), £1; A. Hancock, 1s.; W.H.D., 5s.; L. Lewis, £1; Miss D. G. Davis, £2; Mrs. N. Rutherford, 10s.; R. Lewis, Manchester, 6s. 3d.; S. Clowes, £2. Total to date, £909 2s. 6d.

contact with middle-class life and culture. Appalled by the lack of genuine culture, he did his best to repair the deficiency.

Culture and Anarchy is perhaps his most important book, and it was written during a period of social and political unrest. Gladstone's Reform Bill was defeated in 1866, but protest was so widespread that Disraeli's bill was passed the following year. There were also trade union disturbances, acts of violence by Irish nationalists, and anti-Catholic riots. Arnold sympathised with the democratic demands but quite rightly held that order was essential in society. And he related social and political anarchy to intellectual and "spiritual" anarchy. "I am a Liberal," he wrote in his Introduction, "yet I am a Liberal tempered by experience, reflection, and renouncement, and I am, above all, a believer in culture."

Arnold recognised that culture is distinctively human. He thought that religion had a contribution to make towards it but he never regarded the two as synonymous, much to the chagrin of the pious. The contemporary philosopher, Henry Sidgwick, described him as extending to religion a "languid patronage." In our own time, T. S. Eliot has regarded the rescuing of the word "culture" as "the extreme of my ambition." Rescuing it, that is, for religion. "Arnold gives the impression," says Mr. Eliot, "that Culture (as he uses the term) is something more comprehensive than religion." To anyone not under the spell of mediaevalism, it would be clear that such is the case.

Borrowing terms from Heine, Arnold called the two main forces in human culture, "Hebraism" and "Hellenism." Since the Renaissance the latter has been ascendant but the fanatical Puritan form of Hebraism has hindered man's cultural advance. The Puritan is "a victim of Hebraism, of the tendency to cultivate strictness of conscience rather than spontaneity of consciousness. And what he wants is a larger conception of human nature. . . ." He concluded that "the development of our Hellenistic instincts, seeking ardently the intelligible law of things, and making a stream of fresh thought play freely about our stock notions and habits, is what is most wanted by us at present." I think it will be agreed that this holds good today; it is essentially a freethought viewpoint.

Arnold realised that belief in the supernatural was incompatible with a modern outlook. He ceased to believe in the divinity of Jesus, denied the possibility of miracles and dismissed the doctrine of the Trinity. God he defined as "the enduring power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," and religion, in his equally vague words, was "morality touched with emotion." Yet he attended church regularly, took the sacrament and recommended the use of the Bible in education. He was, as J. M. Robertson remarked, "an anomaly incarnate." He resembled those persons, so common in our midst today, who no longer believe in the truth of the Bible but interpret Christianity as "doing good." There was more excuse for Arnold but it is not my present purpose to find excuses.

And now I must part company with Mr. Jump. He commends Arnold's attempts at "disinterestedness" and considers this to be the critical ideal. In this he follows the dominant academic trend of our time: the insistence that literature must be judged purely (or as nearly as possible) as

literature. "Dispassionate appraisal" sounds very nice, of course, but—risking the epithet Philistine—I suggest that it is undesirable as well as impossible. Poetry that "confronts" the human predicament, let alone "masters" it, must necessarily receive more than a literary treatment. Arnold attempted to relate his criticism of literature to a criticism of society—of life. But he was too anxious about dispassion and disinterest. And, in the words of Robertson, "he kept with him something of the intellectual atmosphere of the vicarage."

"Sane, confident, urbane, and fair-minded; experienced and perceptive; free from any compulsion to crush his notions into a system—Arnold is indubitably the central man of letters of his age," writes Mr. Jump. Personally, I would wish for some systematisation of ideas and I consider that in Arnold's case it was needed. But his works were a civilising force in Victorian society and they are still worth reading.

The Soul

By WILLIAM McCARTHY

(continued from page 243)

Now let us look into this modern mysterious, imaginary something called *soul*⁴. What is a soul? Where does it come from? Where does it go? Is there in fact, a soul? No one has ever seen or heard a soul—it is a stranger to the five senses. Yet, by reason of this mythical something, billions in money have been, and now are, extorted from the poor by religious parasites pretending they can explain the soul and induce gods to benefit or favour it. Thousands of great temples have been built by the poor to house the gods that these church parasites pretend they can influence. Most of these temples were built to honour false gods—now extinct gods—gods whose names fill the pages of mythology. Truth and time destroyed them. But as soon as one clan was exposed, the self-appointed soul-expounding charlatans created and foisted upon the gullible world a new tribe of gods. The Japanese have theirs, the Chinese theirs, the Hindu his, and the Jews and Christians are fighting over Jehovah. Jehovah says he is the god of the Jews and "none other"; but the Christians declare this god didn't know what he was talking about when he told the Jews that, and claim him as the saviour of Christian souls.

As already stated, our prehistoric ancestors knew nothing of a soul. Curiosity was necessary for its invention. Curiosity and reason came to man long after he had advanced from fish, through the lower animals, to man. Evolution gave man curiosity, and curiosity with reason enables him to imagine he possesses a soul. At first, it was not the soul millions of clergymen preach long sermons about. There was no heaven to reward a good soul, nor hell to punish a bad one. Man was simply a double, two parts. One was tangible, one intangible—a something that made the body click. Man saw his shadow on the ground, his reflection in the stream: he heard his voice echoed from the hills, he dreamed of hunting, fishing, fighting and straying far afield with a friend he knew was dead, as formerly stated. How could these things be, he reasoned, unless man has two parts. Time and faulty reasoning joined the parts as "body and soul." Chicanery propagandized the

⁴—Man belongs to a cycle of life—a system of existence embracing all living things. All come into being, all grow, all develop, all mature, a decline and die similarly, their places being taken by those "who in their turn shall follow them." If souls for men, why not for all living things?

soul, and avarice exploited it. The imposters pass up the body—it is tangible—but specialise on the soul, something mysterious. Ignorance feeds on mysteries.

Souls cannot be described; yet hundreds of millions of the unthinking pay billions to have the religious fakers talk about them. The Bible tells how the first soul was created, but is silent as to the origin of the countless numbers of souls the quacks assert man's flesh has since imprisoned.

According to the Bible's first account of creation (Gen. 1), only animals were given souls. (Marginal note to verse 30.) Elohim (the gods) discovered their mistake, destroyed their first creation, and constructed a second creation, the one described in chapter 2 of Genesis. To perfect the second creation, Elohim (the gods) called in Yahweh (the Lord) and together the "Lord-Gods" made a different man and gave him a soul. They did it this wise: "Yarweh-Elohim (Lord-Gods) formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2. 7.) What became of the first soul is not stated⁵. Nor do we know anything about the billions of souls that followed it.

It is now admitted by all educated people, even by the Church of England, that the two biblical creations are mythological, and that life evolved from a common source in the sea.

As formerly stated, from the anatomical growth and structure of man, science traces him back to the fish. In fact man's body still possesses anatomical parts like those of its fish ancestors. All human beings have the rudiments of the fish gills in their throats. A human embryo in its mother's womb, around three months of age, has both a fish's gills and a fish's heart. The embryo also possesses an animal's tail. Before birth, the fish's heart changes to the human organ, and the tail is absorbed; but the rudiments of the fish's gills stay with man through life. Did man's fish ancestors have souls? If not, at what stage of man's evolution did he acquire a soul? Did evolution develop in man a soul as it changed him from fish to man? Or if man, in his fish stage, had a soul, was it the same kind he has now? And as man during this early stage knew nothing of right and wrong—never heard of a bible, church or god—did his soul go to heaven or hell? If not, what became of it? Was there a devil then to seduce the flesh into damning its soul, or a god to drive off the devil he had created, and thus save the soul? There being no Christ's blood to wash away the flesh's sins, did God then ameliorate the flesh's shortcomings? But as man had no sense of good or evil, how could he have had shortcomings?⁶

Now let's be more definite. Biblically, the first man was called "Adam," a human. The words "adam" and "human" mean dirt earth. The Bible forgers changed the common noun "adam" into the proper name "Adam," the first man, and the churches for two thousand years have been so preaching him to those who don't know any better and who fill the contribution boxes.

As already referred to, these same charlatans tell us the gods gave to this Adam the first soul. They do not tell us

⁵—The reader should know the Bible forgers changed the text. A correct translation gives souls to all living things. The reader should also know that, biblically, woman has no soul. The soul expounders should have their gods correct that oversight.

⁶—The thinking-reasoning lobe of man's brain is separate and distinct from the brain's lobe of life. The thinking-reasoning lobe can be and sometimes is destroyed without injury to the life lobe, and man lives on without the power to think or reason. He cannot distinguish between right and wrong. Does his flesh still imprison his soul? Or does his soul escape with the escape of the power to reason? What becomes of man's soul? Ask your priest.

how the thousands of billions of souls since then got into their prisons of flesh. Neither do they tell us where these souls came from. They are, however, quite voluble in guessing where they go. They are paid for that.

Then, too, does the soul exist before the body, and then, at some particular period of the body's development, enter its prison of flesh? Or how does it get into the body? Science tells us a human being—all animal life for that matter—starts on its development the instant the sperm of the male comes in contact with and fertilizes the ovum (egg) of the female. Does the fertilized ovum at that moment have a soul? If it does, how does it get it? Does the union of the male sperm with the female sperm create the soul, or has the soul existed forever, and spent its time waiting for the sexual act that it might join it with the result thereof? If neither of these theories is true, then where does the soul come from? When and by whom was it created? If there be a soul, one of three theories is true: (1) It comes into existence with, and when, the human embryo began; or (2) some power creates it and assigns it to its particular body; or (3) it existed forever, and at some-time during man's life joins its body.

Now, as to the first theory. If it is true that the soul comes into being with the body, matures with the body, absolutely depends upon the body, then does it not decline, decay, and die with the body? All life that begins on earth dies on earth⁷.

(To be concluded)

⁷—In the sixteenth century, Pomponazzi, an Italian philosopher, declared: "As the soul is the form of the body, it must, by hypothesis, perish with the body; form, apart from matter is, is unthinkable." The church failed to burn Pomponazzi—he got away—but his follower, Vanini, the theologian, who, in the seventeenth century, accepted Pomponazzi's doctrine, failed to escape. The church caught him, cut out his tongue, submitted him to slow strangulation, then finished the murder by burning him.

Romanism and History—I

By E. H. GROUT

I HAVE heard bright young things recently emerged from "Varsity Honours Courses declare boldly, "History is now an exact science!" This showed that with all their expensive education they had failed to learn that most important fact: What Science Is. An exact science is a body of systematized knowledge arrived at after the facts concerned have been subjected to the processes of observation, classification, experiments, verification, and prediction. Most of these processes cannot be applied to historical material.

The first concern of the historian is to discover what were the facts. This is such a difficult task that the honest historian is left with little time for his second task—the interpretation of the facts. For there are many like Bassanio who wish to wrest matters to accord with their own ideas. Dr. Samuel Johnson, for instance, was not a notorious liar, but he wrote so-called reports of parliamentary debates that he never heard, and "took care that the whig dogs should not have the best of it." (When near the end of his life he regretted having written these fictitious speeches, and so misleading people.) He also said, "In lapidary inscriptions a man is not upon oath," thus suggesting that a certain amount of exaggeration is allowable when writing epitaphs. This is in accordance with the Latin proverb, *De mortuis nihil nisi bonum* (Say nothing but good of the dead), which probably arose from fear of reprisals by the ghost of the departed.

No such fear of or "respect for" the dead prevents Roman Catholic "historians" from blackening prominent Protestants. Thus Dr. Agnes Muir Mackenzie in "Scottish Pageant 1513-1625" asserts that Walsingham deliberately sacrificed "the lives of several young Englishmen in order to lure Mary (Queen of Scots) to her death." She goes on to declare that "we know" that (page 192). Theodore Maynard in "Queen Elizabeth" (271) says that Walsingham "devised that Babington plot." What we are asked to believe is that Sir Francis Walsingham, secretary to Elizabeth, and ardent Protestant having devised a plot to murder the Queen Elizabeth, was able to find out fourteen young Romanists, bring them all together, and get them all to agree to conspire against Elizabeth, persuade Babington to write an incriminating letter to Queen Mary, and somehow or other induce Mary to write in answer a letter written in an elaborate code. I have not yet found a Romanist with the effrontery to suggest that Walsingham had invented that code and had made Mary use it by some mysterious power that he wielded over her. Nor has it been suggested that the cunning device by which Mary tried to carry on a secret correspondence with the outside world was the invention of Walsingham. This Secretary of State made discreet use of the opportunities for espionage and interception in order to forestall the continuous plots that were made against Elizabeth and Protestantism. If he had shown the same zeal and resourcefulness on behalf of Romanism he would probably have been by now a saint in the Roman calendar. But as Walsingham was a Protestant and Mary Queen of Scots was a Romanist, it is of course the duty of all good Romanists to slander the former and to boost up the latter (even if it be only by piffing little poems about "She loved little things").

Similarly, Queen Elizabeth must be disparaged at all costs. Theodore Maynard must needs trot out the story that Francis Tregian "had incurred Elizabeth's displeasure by repulsing her amatory advances." (It seems a pity that his name was not *Joseph!*) The full story as written by Francis Plunkett, a Cistercian monk, has been given in Vol. XXXII of the Catholic Record Society, and its value may be estimated from the following extract. After having resisted the Queen's solicitations.

"Tregian stole secretly away. But the traces of his virtue were not so easily concealed, as witness a miracle afterwards discovered by his wife, and testified by his sister. One night when the wife and sister of Francis were retiring to bed, on the upper and lower sheets, and on the pillow in that part where he used to sleep, sixty-five crosses were seen, so vividly and artistically drawn that they seemed the finished work of some skilful artist. And though the pillow was washed repeatedly, these crosses with miraculous persistence were there resplendent for six months."

No precise date is given for these occurrences, nor any indication as to which of the Queen's palaces was the scene of the alleged incident. An author must be hard-up for copy who has to found upon obvious fiction of this kind, and the Catholic Record Society might surely have found something more evidential on which to lay out its subscribers' money.

So anxious was Theodore Maynard to disparage Elizabeth that he enlarges upon the "curious fact" that Elizabeth "was superstitious enough to consult the astrologer, Dr. Dee, about the most lucky day for her coronation. . . . The handsome young Welshman—of Arthurian descent, as he claimed—was perhaps a genius, but as his alchemical experiments were not productive of much gold, he was obliged to seek it by other means. After all, he did have eight hungry children and painful Jane to provide for."

There Maynard has gone astray, for Dee did not marry until 5/2/1578; his eldest child (Arthur) was born 13/7/1579—over twenty years after the coronation of Queen Elizabeth. I know of no evidence for asserting that at any time John Dee was dependent upon horoscope fees.

Just as the Romanist must needs idolize the mother of Jesus, so must he belittle the mother of Elizabeth, Anne Boleyn. Garrett Mattingly does this on page 200 of his *Catherine of Arragon*. According to this writer Anne Boleyn's complexion was sallow, her neck too long and slender, her mouth wide but sly rather than generous; she had a rudimentary sixth finger on her left hand—a devil's mark to the superstitious. Her accomplishments, according to this writer, were noting special: and, horror of horrors, her descent was from the tradesman's class! The interested reader is invited to compare Mattingly's prosecution speech with the very different account of Anne Boleyn's qualifications in Vol. II of Strickland's, "Lives of the Queens of England."

The prosecutor over-reaches himself. If Anne Boleyn was such a poor catch, how was it that Thomas Wyatt, Earl Percy, and Henry VIII found her so fascinating! They were there, they had the opportunity for observation and classification denied to us, including Mattingly. Seeing that with all their unscrupulousness and undying hatred the Romanists have been able to produce so little against Elizabeth and her mother, I conclude that there was little to be found. Judging from the letters of Anne Boleyn in the *Harleian Miscellany*, I consider her one of the best prose writers that had appeared in England up to that time. Her sentence-structure is more lucid and harmonious than that of the professional, Dr. Thomas Wilson in *The Arte of Rhetoryke* (1560), a generation later.

Of course, historians who are not Romanists have had to be besmirched. J. A. Froude has received more than his share of sneer, and not only from Romanists; but the American professor, Conyers Read, and the Scotch professor, J. B. Black, regard Froude's twelve volumes as the best authority on the period. Father Thurston, Jesuit, wrote a pamphlet on "Catholics and Divorce," wherein he sneers at "undocumented assertions, borrowed from Dr. H. C. Lea or other writers equally reckless and prejudiced." Dr. Lea is well known to us as the learned and careful author of the *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, and of other books objectionable to the Roman Catholic Church because they reveal some of the hideous truth about that very vulnerable body. Other Romanist writers have written in the same insulting strain about Lea, for they are usually ready to come to one another's support. Some of them have been shown up by Dr. G. G. Coulton in *Sectarian History*, especially Cardinal Gasquet and Hilaire Belloc. For "undocumented assertions" Belloc was unbeatable, and consequently his books are useless to the genuine historian.

ON GOD

Nowhere does there exist a civilized deity.

To many people "God" is no more than a dust-bin for their unsolved problems.

Imagine a number of farmers ruined by a bad season attending a harvest thanksgiving. If the Almighty had a sense of humour he would label them for Hell for poking pun at him.

—Chapman Cohen.

Branch Line

BRADFORD

The recent enforced inactivity, through illness, of the principal speaker, Mr. Harold Day, has had the effect of stimulating others to try their hand at outdoor speaking in the Broadway Car Park. July 24th saw the resumption of outdoor activities with the first venture as a team of speakers.

The famous "Oyez! Oyez! Oyez!" this time emanated from Mr. Norman Taylor. A good crowd was collected and it is pleasing to record that Mr. Day was sufficiently recovered to act as chairman and general "manager," the other speakers being Messrs. N. Taylor, H. Wharrad, M. Murphy and a valuable guest speaker, Mr. Newton, of Leeds.

The meeting held together against impinging Christian opposition and promised well for the future.

Mr. Day has since been visiting Norway and is slowly recuperating, but must avoid unnecessary exertion and is not expected to be restored to full speaking powers this summer.

Correspondence

EATING GOD

Roman Catholics and (alas!) Anglicans, claim to turn bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. If they think they have done this, they become cannibals by consuming it.

ELLA DIXON.

THE FREETHINKER IN IRELAND

Here in "Holy Ireland" we Atheists have to lie low and keep our mouths shut. I look forward to *The Freethinker* every week as a great source of learning and our main source of enlightenment. I greatly admire the articles of H. Cutner and wonder if he would give us one on Poltergeists.

A DUBLIN READER.

CONTRACEPTION AND WORLD POPULATION

The easy access to contraceptive methods and materials should be a right, not only for the married, but also for those unable, or too poor, to marry.

Catholics refuse to limit their numbers, aiming at "souls for Heaven"—and vast numbers to make them top dog on earth. Many States also like to extend their populations for the purpose of exploitation, and the world is still using its inhabitants as cannon fodder. This is a vile perversion of human nature, and the foulest of man's barbarities.

Many modern physical ailments are being caused by psychological troubles and stresses, and considering the teaching of religious and moralists it is easy to see where these troubles originate. Your paper cannot call itself *The Freethinker* and ignore these things. It should discuss matters of population and contraception in the light of these vital facts. In a barbaric, war-mongering and grossly hypocritical world it is up to you to spread enlightenment and not merely debunk ghosts.

R. L. HUMPHRIS.

[One might add that many psychological troubles are due to undebunked ghosts. However, see article by R. Reader on the basic cause of war.—Ed.]

MORALS WITHOUT RELIGION

By MARGARET KNIGHT

(of B.B.C. fame)

Price 6/-

Postage 3d.

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

Special Book Offer

While stocks last we can offer the following parcel containing: *Lift Up Your Heads* (Kent) published 3s. 6d.; *Has Humanity Gained from Unbelief* (Bradlaugh) published 1s.; *Marriage, Sacerdotal or Secular* (Du Cann) published 1s.; *Rome or Reason* (Ingersoll) published 1s.; *Age of Reason* (Paine) published 2s. 6d.; *What Is The Sabbath Day* (Cutner) published 1s. 3d. The whole parcel (valued 13s. 3d.) offered to readers of *The Freethinker* for 7s. 6d. post free. Cash with order. Strictly nett.