

The Freethinker

Volume LXXVIII—No. 44

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Fivepence

THE PASSING OF PIUS XII has been unanimously hailed as the passing of "a man of peace," "a Pope of peace," "the Saint of peace."

In a century already torn by two world wars and under the incubus of a third, thermonuclear and, perhaps, final one, the peace apotheosis of Pius XII is a frightening reminder of how truth can be, not only adulterated, but slaughtered altogether.

The vast, unthinking public, with their usual bovine passivity, mourned the Pope of Peace, as their press, radio and television brainwashing masters had so carefully planned. History, however, will judge Pius XII in a less flattering light:

as an enemy of democracy, as an active supporter of dictators, and yet, even as an instigator of war. These are serious accusations. But they are supported by facts.

The entire life of Pius XII proves them. Pius XII was a born diplomat. He thought, lived and acted diplomacy. Diplomacy is the artful management of international affairs. Pius used diplomacy to further the power of the Catholic Church in politics, and the religious power of the Catholic Church to strengthen his diplomacy. The two being inseparable, he used this double-edged sword ruthlessly. (a) to fight ideologies inimical to the Church, (b) "to make terms with movements . . . dangerous to the point of anarchy," as the over-cautious *The Times* put it (10.10.1958)—namely, Fascism and Nazism, and (c) to extend, with the help of the latter, the political stranglehold of Catholicism upon contemporary society. To achieve these three aims, he was ready to support or to betray men, nations and ideologies—which he did, in a long span of forty years, with the dedicated perseverance of a fanatic.

Pacelli and Hitler

He began early. In 1917, as the mouthpiece of Pope Benedict, he made abortive efforts to save the Kaiser, a move specifically directed at nullifying three years of bloody war by the Allies. For the next twelve crucial years, first as a Nuncio in Munich (the cradle of Nazism), and then in Berlin, he became the "grey eminence" of German domestic and foreign policy, by acting as the brain behind the drive to power of the powerful Catholic Centre Party. While directing German political Catholicism there, he helped his own brother, Lawyer Pacelli, his protector, Cardinal Gasparri, and Pope Pius XI to destroy the Italian Catholic Party, which was disbanded to pave the way for the alliance between the Vatican and Fascist Italy, which culminated in 1929 with the Lateran Treaty and a Concordat. The latter, besides forbidding the clergy to oppose Fascism, compelled all Italian Bishops to take an oath of allegiance to Mussolini (Art. 20 Concordat). Pacelli, though in Germany, was one of the chief inspirers of it all. As a reward for his policy-making in both countries, he was made a Cardinal in that same year; then, in 1930, he reached the apex of Vatican diplomacy and was promoted Secretary of State.

From then onward, Vatican diplomacy, having consoli-

dated Fascism in Italy, set out to help erect an authoritarian regime in Germany. Cardinal Pacelli, using all the weight of the religious-diplomatic machinery now at his disposal, became the main inspirer behind the reactionary forces in Germany, led, as usual, by the Catholic Party. At first it was to back up a monarchy, then an authoritarian regime led by the Catholic Party itself. The Nazis, however, had become too powerful to permit the plan to be implemented, having already 107 deputies in Parliament (1930). Pacelli changed tactics and counselled the German Catholic Party secretly to negotiate with Hitler. The goal? The formation of a Catholic-

Nazi Coalition Government. Negotiations failed, owing to Hitler's intransigence. When, however, in 1932 Hitler obtained 12,000,000 votes (13,000,000 for the Reds and 5,000,000 for the Catholics), the Vatican decided to support the Nazis.

Secret negotiations began once more. A *quid pro quo* was agreed upon. The Vatican—or, rather, Pacelli—would (a) help Hitler to get into power, (b) order the Hierarchy to support Nazism, and (c) remove the Catholic Party. In return, Hitler would (a) share his Government with Catholics, (b) grant a privileged status to the Church, and (c) sign a Concordat with the Vatican.

The third and last German Catholic Premier (it is not without significance that the last two Premiers who tried to steer Germany towards authoritarianism were both pillars of the Catholic Party) was charged with the task of seeing that Hitler be called to rule.

Chancellor Von Papen a personal friend of Pacelli, set to work upon the German President Hindenburg and, in his double quality as a leader of the Catholic Party and German Premier, tried to persuade him to ask Hitler to form a Government. Hindenburg having fallen into Von Papen's trap, Von Papen resigned, to leave room for Hitler.

Hindenburg duly asked Hitler to form a Government. The Nazis had come into power. Hitler became Premier, Catholic Von Papen, Vice-Premier. (30.1.1933.)

Pacelli Consolidates Hitler

Hitler, however, wanted a popular mandate, to legalise his status. The last free election was held the following March. Cardinal Pacelli issued secret orders to the Catholic Party, instructing its members to vote for Hitler, to the consternation of many anti-Nazi Catholics, a number of whom refused. Result? The Nazis, this time, polled, not 12 but 17,000,000 votes (March 1933). From where did the extra 5,000,000 come? Mostly from the 5,000,000 voters of the Catholic Party. Hitler had got the "popular majority" he wanted.

In spite of this however, Hitler did not as yet wield absolute power. Legally to exercise it, he needed a *two-thirds* majority in Parliament. Members of the Catholic Party in that assembly were instructed to vote for Hitler, which they did. Hitler at last had become a full-blooded dictator.

The Fuehrer kept his word and a few months later

— VIEWS and OPINIONS —

Pius XII

Man of Peace or Ally of Dictators?

— By AVRO MANHATTAN —

signed the Concordat negotiated directly between the two old friends, Cardinal Pacelli and Hitler's Catholic Vice-Premier, Von Papen. Soon afterwards, Cardinal Pacelli repeated what had already been done in Fascist Italy and ordered the German Catholic Party to disband. The most serious obstacle to Hitler, next to the Communists, thus was removed by a single word from Rome.

Pacelli's Alliance with Hitler

The German Hierarchy praised and prayed for the Fuehrer, as laid down in Clause 30 of the Hitler-Pacelli Concordat: "On Sundays and Holy Days special prayers will be offered . . . for the welfare of the German Reich, in all episcopal parish and conventual churches of the German Reich." They swore allegiance to the Nazi regime, in conformity with Article 16: "Before Bishops take possession of their dioceses, they are to take an oath of fealty to the Reich . . . according to the following formula: Before God and the Holy Gospels, I swear and promise, as becomes a Bishop, loyalty to the German Reich. . . ."

The Hitler-Pacelli Concordat went further and compelled all German Bishops to swear that all the clergy under them would neither oppose nor endanger the Nazi regime. Here are the textual words: "I swear and promise to honour the legally constituted Government, and to use the clergy of my diocese to honour it. In performance of my spiritual office, and in my solicitude for the welfare and the interests of the German Reich, I will endeavour to avoid all detrimental acts which might ENDANGER it." (Art. 16.)

Cardinal Bertram, head of the German Hierarchy, in an open letter to Hitler (August 1933) was jubilant: "The Episcopate of all the German Dioceses is glad to express . . . its sincere readiness to co-operate to the best of its ability with Your Excellency's New Government. . . ." Thus, thanks chiefly to Pacelli, the Vatican become one of the main forces to catapult Hitler, the warmonger, into power.

Pope Pius XII, Hitler, and Aggressions

Nazism and the Vatican eventually quarrelled. But on what grounds? Because of Nazi concentration camps? Because of the Nazis' tearing up of international treaties, or Nazi aggressions? Not at all. Mainly because each partner wanted the monopoly of German Youth. Notwithstanding this, they faithfully supported each other until the outbreak of the Second World War, and after. Whenever Hitler disrupted a country, there was to be found the hidden hand of the Vatican co-operating with him, either via diplomacy or through the active help of local Catholics and Hierarchies. A cursory glance at Hitler's war career during the next few years should suffice to show this.

Hitler got into power in 1933.

In 1934 he attempts to incorporate Austria and murders pocket-dictator Dolfuss. Austrian Catholics and the Vatican begin secret negotiations with the Fuehrer.

In 1935 he gets the Saar, with the support of Catholics. Mussolini begins the Abyssinian War, with the blessing of the Church.

In 1936 Hitler occupies the Rhineland, again with the full support of Catholics. Mussolini unleashes war in Africa. A Catholic junta unleashes civil war in Spain. The Vatican helps Mussolini in the European Chancelleries and asks Catholics the world over to help Catholic Franco.

In 1937 Hitler disrupts Austria, with the direct help of Catholic Seyss-Inquart, the Home Secretary, and of Catholic Von Papen and Cardinal Innitzer.

In 1938 Hitler annexes Austria. Cardinal Innitzer welcomes Hitler in Vienna as a man of Divine Providence. Hitler turns to Czechoslovakia. Again, disrupters from within are Catholics. The Sudeten Germans help Hitler to cut his first chunk off the Republic. The Munich crisis.

A Catholic priest, Tiso, in direct contact with the Vatican, attempts to give a mortal blow to the Republic.

In 1939 Hitler occupies Czechoslovakia. Monsignor Tiso becomes head of Catholic Slovakia. Albania is attacked by Mussolini. The Vatican protests because the attack is "carried out on a Good Friday." The Spanish Republic is destroyed; the Vatican gives solemn thanks to God. Poland is invaded. Beginning of Second World War. Pacelli becomes Pope Pius XII.

From the outbreak of the Second World War, the new Pope never condemned Hitler or Mussolini or Japan. At the bloody invasion of Poland, Holland, Belgium and France, except for a few inane words of sympathy with these countries, Pius XII never said anything against the invader. Throughout the long period when the triumphant Nazi guns boomed in the European battlefields, the voice of the Pope was conspicuously silent. Indeed, on more than one occasion, Pius XII openly recognised Fascist conquests, e.g., when he chose to open diplomatic relations with Japan, after the latter had occupied the Philippines. This in contrast to his refusal to condemn Hitler's attack upon Norway, on the grounds that Norway had only 2,000 Catholics.

Again, who were the Trojan horses which so mightily helped Hitler to topple the political and, yes, even the military structures of Belgium and France?

Once more, we find Catholics or Catholic groups intimately connected with the Hierarchies, and, therefore, with the Vatican and hence with Pius XII. In Belgium, we find a Leon Degrelle, the Catholic Fascist leader, we see a Cardinal counsel the Belgian King and thus decide the fate of the country. In France, we meet a Papal Knight, Laval, a Jesuit-trained general, Weygand, and another Catholic, Marshal Petain. When, finally, Hitler attacked Russia, Catholic volunteers from all Catholic countries rushed to the Russian fronts, with the blessing of the Church.

Pius XII's Hate Crusade

It was only when the tide of war began to turn in favour of the Allies (1943-44) that Pius XII turned in their direction. Even then, however, his diplomatic war against one of the Allies, Russia, went on as fiercely as ever.

After the war, Pius XII continued his campaign of hatred, interfered in European politics, and compelled Catholic voters to vote for this, and not for that, political party, under pain of excommunication (1948—Italy, France). Then, in 1949, he officially excommunicated any Catholic helping or voting for the Communists. And, finally, in 1956, after a crescendo campaign of hatred, he openly called the world to a crusade, telling Catholics everywhere that it was their duty, and that they were under an obligation, to take part in "a war for effective self-defence . . . against unjust attack. . . ." (Pius XII's Christmas message, 1956), at a time when U.S.A. atom and hydrogen-carrying bombers were scouting Western skies, ready to atomise Russia and China. A significant call to war, in view of the fact that the same Pope of Peace never thundered against Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and Japan.

Consoaction with a warmonger is belligerency; co-operation is warmongering. Pope Pius XII not only co-operated with the bloodiest Fascist warmongers of the century, he actively helped them, first to get into power, so that they could start a war, then by supplying them with quislings and the silent blessing of the Church, to wage it. Neither all Pius XII's mellifluous protests against Nazism (only after Nazism had been rendered powerless) nor his inane Christmas platitudes about peace can obliterate the harsh reality of his assistance to the Fascist dictators.

If Pius XII had truly been a man of peace, he would

(Concluded on page 348)

The Messenger of Mush

By COLIN MCCALL

SOME THINGS remain a source of wonder to us all our lives. Such are Roman Catholic—and particularly Irish Roman Catholic—publications to me. No doubt because I was deprived of the infinite blessings of Holy Mother Church, I can never quite appreciate the appeal of these paranoiac publications—they cannot be called literature—that are served up and lapped up in profusion. I have referred before to the essentially unæsthetic nature of the Sacred Heart; I have now a copy of *The Irish Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, bearing a typically bathetic image of this subject on the cover and containing, if that be possible, even more bathetic reading matter inside.

The magazine is published by the Irish Messenger Office, 5 Great Denmark Street, Dublin (the address may prove useful to students of abnormal human psychology), after being censored by a Jesuit and endorsed by the Archbishop of Dublin. Not that censorship of such a paper is really necessary: its offences against good taste and common sense are grave indeed, but theological offences are inconceivable in its hallowed pages. "Thank God for the Irish!" must be a constant exclamation on the lips of the Holy Fathers, for the Church of Rome owes the Emerald Isle a debt that can never be assessed. Duly and dutifully, Ireland produces priests and laymen to swell the ranks of the clergy and their congregations throughout the English-speaking world. The Apostleship of Prayer—of which the present paper is the organ—numbers on its register forty million members. No mean figure. Let us take a look at the intellectual feast they are given in the pages of the September issue.

There is, it goes without saying, an article on Bernadette—the ninth in a series; but we will leave that poor, suffering saint at rest. There is philosophy, albeit "homespun," on which the Rev. S. J. Brown, S.J., writes on the importance of friendship and, not altogether surprisingly, suggests that the best kind is that through common membership in "some good Catholic cause or movement such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Legion of Mary, or the Knights of St. Columbanus." And there is a "Young Crusaders' Corner," where it is trusted that you will "say your special prayers and go to Holy Communion as often as ever you can."

The fiction is interesting for its complete absence of originality or literary quality. I do not read the poorest type of girls' or women's novelettes but I cannot believe they are worse from any standpoint than the "stories" in the *Irish Messenger*. One would have to think hard to outdo the cliché, "a great fear was clutching at his heart," but there are others that come near to it. Even worse, though, are the plots. "Emergency Call" tells of a sick boy "tossing feverishly on the bed" in a poor Irish household in London. Only a specialist, Dr. Stephen O'Leary, might save his life. So the mother goes to see Dr. O'Leary after hours. "The doctor cannot see you," says his butler, but the kind doctor does and, being a childhood friend of the mother, he accompanies her and saves the child's life. Or rather, God does. "Only His intervention saved your boy's life!" says the doctor. "Don't give me the credit," he said quietly, and his eyes were fixed on the lamp in front of the Sacred Heart picture. "Believe me, it was your prayers . . . they wrought a double miracle tonight. They saved a boy's life . . . and . . . your example has restored to me something which I thought I had lost for ever."

We are at least spared a holy ending in the other story, simply because it is a serial. But its direction towards such

a goal is clearly indicated. Not a lax Roman Catholic in this, but a downright opponent: Uncle Leslie, "a well-known anti-Catholic author," who regards statues of Our Lady as "outmoded, old-fashioned," and who bans them from his house. Besides, the small paraffin lamps in front of them might start a fire. But author John J. Dunne ambitiously strives for tragic irony. In vain, needless to say; but let us be generous and give him a mark for trying, even if we have to deduct it and many others for the utter banality of making Uncle Leslie fall forward into the fire in the hearth.

I am sure that is enough of that. We may note an interesting concern for Africa and Asia, where the Church is making a strong bid at present. Africans and Asians who go to University to study Science run the risk of "developing a materialistic mentality," so let us pray for them, we read on one page. A morning offering on another page includes such a prayer: "that Asiatic and African university students know and esteem God. Amen." The thought of *Irish Messenger* readers praying for university students in this manner is an irony far beyond Mr. Dunne's capabilities. That is, if a paper's readership may be judged from its contents.

Mind you, I did learn something from the *Messenger*. I learnt that the "Crowned Virgin" statue near the Rosary Square in Lourdes has rosary beads with six decades, I learnt, furthermore, that this "has no special significance" but is due to a mistake on the part of the sculptor. Can he have been a non-Catholic then? The paper doesn't say. But my thanks to it for that bit of information.

And it is fitting to end on a note of general thanksgiving. Two "Unworthy Sinners"—as well as a "poor" one and some sundry "grateful" ones—thank the Sacred Heart of Jesus for favours they presumably didn't deserve: otherwise they would at least be "worthy" sinners. The favours are delightfully diverse: here a husband ("excellent Irish Catholic"); there a break of engagement averted. A safe confinement; jobs, of course, and—noteworthy this!—a house to rent ("which is almost impossible here") and then a house of their own nine months later. The Heavenly Doctor cured, among other odd ailments, carache, tonsillitis, rheumatism, foot trouble, diabetes, mental trouble, pleurisy and pneumonia, depression, nervousness and a broken leg; while a feared serious disease turned out to be a "simple appendix" and a family escaped 'flu. But my therapeutic favourite is "safe removal of unsightly mark from neck."

Reverting momentarily again to the economic, there is "satisfactory assessment of Income Tax"—a miracle indeed! But our final glance is into the schoolroom. "We were expecting the Annual Religious Examination and the mistress got sick." She was away for three weeks, not counting the Easter holidays and "things did not look any too good." However, the grateful "sinner" made a Novena to the Sacred Heart and "promised publication if we did well." The promised publicity seems to have bribed the Lord (never one to hide his light under a bushel) and "We did better than last year and were rated Excellent." The moral, I think, is clear: Do away with teachers of religion.

—NEXT WEEK—

GERMANY REVISITED

By WALTER STEINHARDT

This Believing World

Shocked by the widespread "Bible illiteracy" all over America, the Churches there are organising "a college-level Bible course" on TV. Naturally, there have been many courses on the Bible televised, but this one is the first on "college" level. It means, in plain language, that the other courses have completely failed, and something more drastic must be done to bring all good Americans back to the Bible, that is, back to an Oriental hotch-potch of myths and legends. But there is a fly in the pious ointment. It is simply that the new approach to the Bible will be a little more on "modern lines" than the Billy Graham—and other—types of Fundamentalists like.

★

In any case, this course of Bible study will not be merely talks, but "stiff reading assignments," written "homework," and other ways of impressing the "historical facts" of the life and teachings of Jesus. We would dearly like to learn a little more about these "facts," and a little more about the evidence for the "facts." We suspect that most, if not all, the facts will dissolve in "faith." After all, the teacher is the Assistant Professor of Religion at a U.S.A. University, and if he doesn't know the facts and the evidence, who should? One thing, however, is certain. No Freethinker will be allowed to answer or to attack the "facts," and to show that the Bible is no longer necessary for moral teaching.

★

Whether our own TV will follow and provide Bible courses for our Bible "illiterates," we cannot say—perhaps there is no reason why it should, for the Churches here can sit back and smile complacently at the way they have captured both the radio and TV. In the meantime, we note that a Hampstead vicar, Canon A. Rogers, is asking for an "army of 70 evangelists" to conduct a mission in Hampstead, and "to all mankind." We earnestly hope he will get the 70 enthusiasts. There is nothing we should like more than one of them to visit us and "expound" the Gospels.

★

Of course, Canon Rogers is really living in a medieval world of his own. He still thinks that a little persuasion and the wonderful example of Christ are all that are needed to bring the erring sheep back into the fold; but at least some people know a little of modern Bible criticism and very little is necessary completely to smash the Old, Old Story. We often wonder how an unmarried lady evangelist manages to persuade a married lady to believe the story of the Virgin Birth? And how many of the 70 know the Precious Message of Obadiah, Habakkuk, or Nahum?

★

Lest any blatant infidel pours scorn on the way our Christians love one another, we are pleased to put on record how the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool and the Anglican Archbishop of York solved a religious problem of vital importance the other day. Which of the two had to go on first at a religious Congress in Oxford held recently was the momentous problem? Amid loud applause, they mounted the platform *simultaneously* and both sat down at precisely the same moment. That ought to show up blatant infidelity for the awful thing it is.

★

We cannot help wondering what has happened to what the *Methodist Recorder* calls "the biggest Christian Campaign conducted in Liverpool for many years" which was launched by Dr. Donald Soper and no fewer than 150 "Christian Witness Campaigners" to help him in a one-week drive? How many Irish Catholics did they bring to the Methodist Church—or did they leave Catholics severely alone? It is interesting to note that the very religious Chief

Constable in Liverpool, Sir C. Martin, pointed out how necessary was this campaign, for crime was going up "by leaps and bounds," and he himself could never have achieved anything without the "help and guidance of God." But why did crime in Liverpool go up by leaps and bounds? Perhaps God only looks after Chief Constables.

SCHOPENHAUER ON RELIGION

RELIGIONS admittedly appeal, not to conviction as the result of argument, but to belief as demanded by revelation. And as the capacity for believing is strongest in childhood, special care is taken to make sure of this tender age. This has much more to do with the doctrines of belief taking root than threats and reports of miracles. If, in early childhood, certain fundamental views and doctrines are paraded with unusual solemnity, and an air of the greatest earnestness never before visible in anything else; if, at the same time, the possibility of a doubt about them be completely passed over, or touched upon only to indicate that doubt is the first step to eternal perdition, the resulting impression will be so deep that, as a rule, that is, in almost every case, doubt about them will be almost as impossible as doubt about one's existence. Hardly one in ten thousand will have the strength of mind to ask himself seriously and earnestly—is that true?

Religions are like glow-worms; they shine only when it is dark. A certain amount of general ignorance is the condition of all religions, the element in which alone they can exist. And as soon as astronomy, natural science, geology, history, the knowledge of countries and peoples have spread their light broadcast, and philosophy finally is permitted to say a word, every faith founded on miracles and revelation must disappear; and philosophy takes its place.

Perhaps the time is approaching which has so often been prophesied, when religion will take her departure from European humanity, like a nurse which the child has outgrown: the child will now be given over to the instructions of a tutor. For there is no doubt that religious doctrines which are founded merely on authority, miracles and revelations, are only suited to the childhood of humanity.

ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER (*Religion: A Dialogue*, 1851).

PIUS XII (*Concluded from page 346*) have come out, unambiguously, openly and actively, against the black dictatorships which eventually were to plunge Europe into the Second World War. He had the means and the power to do so.

Why, for instance, did he not ask Catholics to withdraw their support of Franco, Hitler and Mussolini? Why did he not excommunicate any Catholic voting or fighting for them? Why did he not order the Hierarchies and the Catholic Parties actively to oppose them? Why did he not openly condemn Fascism as an enemy of mankind? Did not Pius XII repeatedly and persistently take such steps against the Red dictatorships?

If Pius XII had been a genuine man of peace, he would have opposed the dictatorships of the extreme Right as fiercely as he opposed those of the extreme Left. But Pius XII never did anything of the kind.

His vociferous crusade against the hammer and sickle, and his ominous silence about the bloody aggressions of the Swastika, are the best proof that he was, to say the least, greatly partial to the latter.

Why? Because Pius XII, so mendaciously canonised the Pope of Peace, far from believing in Peace, believed in War as a direct instrument for crushing the enemies of the Church and thus imposing the Church's dominion, via Fascist arms, upon the nations.

His whole career was inspired by it.

History cannot give any other verdict.

THE FREETHINKER

41 GRAY'S INN ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1.
TELEPHONE: HOLBORN 2601.

Hon. Managing Editor: W. GRIFFITHS.

Hon. Editorial Committee:

F. A. HORNIBROOK, COLIN MCCALL and G. H. TAYLOR.

All articles and correspondence should be addressed to THE EDITOR at the above address and not to individuals.

THE FREETHINKER can be obtained through any newsagent or will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad): One year, £1 10s.; half-year, 15s.; three months, 7s. 6d. (In U.S.A.: 13 weeks, \$1.15; 26 weeks, \$2.25; 52 weeks, \$4.50.)

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

Details of membership of the National Secular Society may be obtained from the General Secretary, 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1. Members and visitors are welcome during normal office hours.

TO CORRESPONDENTS

RUPERT L. HUMPHRIS.—Your many correspondents will be sorry to learn of your recent serious illness. We trust you are making a steady recovery.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

- Edinburgh Branch N.S.S. (The Mound).—Every Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN, MURRAY and SLEMEN.
London (Marble Arch).—Meetings every Sunday from 5 p.m.: Messrs. L. EBURY, J. W. BARKER and C. E. WOOD.
London (Tower Hill).—Thursday, 12-2 p.m.: Messrs. J. W. BARKER and L. EBURY.
Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Deansgate Blitzed Site).—Every weekday, 1 p.m.: G. WOODCOCK. Sunday, 8 p.m.: Messrs. WOODCOCK, MILLS and WOOD.
Merseyside Branch N.S.S. (Pierhead).—Every Wednesday, 1 p.m.; every Sunday, 7.30 p.m.: Various speakers.
North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead).—Every Sunday, noon: Messrs. L. EBURY and A. ARTHUR.
Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Old Market Square).—Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY. Sunday, 6.30 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

INDOOR

- Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Mechanics Institute).—Sunday, November 2nd, 7 p.m.: F. J. CORINA, "Damnation and Darwin."
Central London Branch N.S.S. (The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.1).—Sunday, November 2nd, 7.15 p.m.: S. E. PARKER, "Limitations of Science."
Conway Discussions (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1).—Tuesday, November 4th, 7.15 p.m.: Mrs. F. LINES, B.Sc., "Humanism in Everyday Life."
Guy's Hospital Debating Society (Lecture Theatre, London Bridge, S.E.1).—Thursday, November 6th, 5.45 p.m.: Debate—"That religious belief and a scientific outlook are compatible." Negative: G. H. TAYLOR (N.S.S.).
King's College, London (Room 6n.C).—Friday, October 31st, 1.15 p.m.: COLIN MCCALL, "Scepticism."
Leicester Secular Society (75 Humberstone Gate).—Sunday, November 2nd, 6.30 p.m.: C. BRADLAUGH BONNER, "The World's Need of Freethought."
Nottingham Cosmopolitan Debating Society (Co-operative Hall, Upper Parliament Street).—Sunday, November 2nd, 2.30 p.m.: J. V. A. LONG, F.B.S.I., "Science and Religion."
Oxford Humanist Group (Taylor Institute).—Tuesday, November 4th, 8.15 p.m.: Prof. H. H. PRICE, "Apparitions."
South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1).—Sunday, November 2nd, 11 a.m.: G. VON HILSHHEIMER, B.A., "Religious Education in America."

Notes and News

READERS in Hertfordshire may be interested in the formation of a Letchworth Humanist Group. The acting Secretary, Sergeant C. H. Tedman, Sergeants' Mess, R.A.F., Henlow, Buckinghamshire, will be pleased to send particulars.

IF we must have a House of Lords, then by all means let us have ladies in it, particularly ladies like Barbara Wootton. Baroness Wootton of Abinger, as she now is, shook the Upper Chamber when she presented herself for the first time on Tuesday, October 21st, announcing that she had a conscientious objection to taking the oath, and going on to affirm. As she and the Baroness Swanborough were the first two women Peers to take their seats in the House, Baroness Wootton's affirmation received welcome publicity. And it set us wondering again how many Members of Parliament avail themselves of the right that Bradlaugh won for them. It would be interesting to know!

★

"THE more Hitler's 'Thousand Year Reich' fades in the memory of West German citizens"—says the Hamburg *Der Spiegel* (27/8/58)—"the greater becomes the number of office-holders of that epoch who penetrate the framework of the young Bonn Republic and climb into higher positions." We have never held a vengeful view, and we are aware that every country has its quota of would-be Nazis. But the number of former officials of the Nazi party who hold administrative positions in West Germany is alarming. And now *Der Spiegel* informs us that the Bavarian Christian Social Union, the Bavarian branch of Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party, has named "a real live concentration camp guard" for election to the Bavarian Provincial Parliament. He is Peter Pruecklmayer, 49, and he was an S.S. prison guard at Mauthausen concentration camp. It was more difficult, he claims, to get into the Nazi storm troops than to be adopted by the Christian Social Union. And he adds: "Let's be honest. We all knew at that time [1939] that Jews were being shot." But he says he never saw anything like that happen at Mauthausen. All the same, he wouldn't get our vote.

★

CONSIDERABLE secrecy has surrounded the UNESCO executive's recommendation for the post of Director-General. No doubt there was some embarrassment over the difficulty of getting a man of sufficient stature to tackle the job, but there seems to have been more over the actual choice. And no wonder! He is Professor Vitterino Veronese, 40-year-old Italian Social Science professor at a Roman Theological Seminary, and—in the words of the *Evening Standard* (6/10/58)—"an active member of Catholic Action." This, continues the *Standard*, "will ensure that the Russian bloc and most of the Eastern countries will vote against him." We would too.

★

ONE of the regularly noticeable absurdities as one travelled the country a few weeks ago was the announcement of Harvest Thanksgiving in the churches. Not for many years has there been such a bad harvest, but God must be thanked—presumably that he didn't make it worse! And on October 5th, in the middle of the Iceland crisis, when British warships were escorting our trawlers inside the 12-mile limit, St. Mary-at-Hill Church, Eastcheap, was the scene of a harvest of sea thanksgiving service. A large fish stall containing kippers, smoked haddock, cod, skate, wrapped fillets, fish cakes, shrimps, whelks and lobsters, was laid out in the church porch. But, asked the *Daily Express* (6/10/58): "How many housewives know that once a year in the City of London a big congregation assembles to thank God for this bounty of the sea as well as of the land?" We don't know. Not many, we suspect. But we do know—thanks to the *Express*—that those present sang Psalm 65, praising God "Who stilleth the raging sea; and the noise of his waves, and [though the *Express* rather tactfully omitted this] the madness of the people."

The Jesus of Schweitzer

By G. I. BENNETT

ALTHOUGH THE THEOLOGY of Albert Schweitzer has been hailed by some as giving new depth, meaning, and life to Christianity, it is nonetheless curious. How curious becomes evident from any study of his theological views. A portrayal of nineteenth-century thought, the Jesus of liberal theology has become a familiar figure. This is Jesus the exalted ethicist with an exalted ethical gospel for the world: the inspired teacher who believed that human brotherhood would follow the active recognition of God as the Universal Father; the visionary who, when he spoke about the Kingdom of God, meant the Kingdom of Righteousness that would be realised here on earth through a change in the hearts of men, and who gave his life in impassioned consecration to this ideal.

To Schweitzer this Jesus is fanciful; he "never existed."

Schweitzer likewise disbelieves in the apocalyptic Jesus who was, in literal truth, the Christ, come upon earth as God's vicegerent to bring the people to a becoming humility and penitence in preparation for the impending end of the world and the coming of the Divine Kingdom.

On the one hand are those thinkers who hold that the words of Jesus are to be interpreted as simple but profound moral truths, often figuratively and allegorically phrased. Inevitably they find that some parts of the Gospels will not fit into this theory. In particular, the Gospel of St. John, with its preoccupation with the Person and the claims of Christ, can in no way be harmonised with the idea of Jesus the high-souled Galilean, full of lofty moral fervour and spiritual vision. The St. John Gospel is, in fact, discrepant at so many points with the Synoptics that it cannot be considered of biographical and historical value. Moreover, as it is a late writing—probably second century, when the life of Jesus was the subject of gnostic speculation—what historical trustworthiness can it have? Is it not to be regarded as tendentious?

The liberal conception of Jesus implies this kind of thinking.

On the other hand, there are the conservative students of theology who aver that Jesus was indeed of God, and that he came to found an eschatological Kingdom. They would accept the literal meaning of the recorded apocalyptic utterances of Jesus—only their difficulty is the unfulfilled prophecy of the end of the world and of the Messianic coming. How is so important, so vital, an aspect of the Galilean's teaching to be regarded? How could one who was the Son of God, and *ipso facto* endowed with knowledge and understanding far exceeding ours, make so signal and inconceivable a mistake?

Schweitzer's case is that Jesus, as much a human being as we are human beings, was a child of his age, cleaving in every fundamental to the illusory late-Jewish eschatology and Messianic expectations. Hence he was committed to the errors of his time, although nevertheless leavening the existing theology with the spirit of his intensely ethical nature. So Schweitzer, while taking the words of Jesus in their literal sense, and urging that they be judged against the apocalyptic ferment of his period, gets over the difficulties of their interpretation—difficulties so trying to theologians of both the liberal and conservative schools.

Now it may seem somewhat unusual for a theologian—as Schweitzer is—to accept the literality of the sayings recorded of Jesus, whilst holding that he was bound by the thought limitations of his day, so that in consequence he entertained false hopes. Theologians are not prone to con-

vict Jesus of error. They aver either that he came of God and was by that fact infallible, or that he was indeed purely human, but with a peculiar sort of perfectability apparently beyond the attainment of any other man, however elevated in nature and character.

Actually, Schweitzer's own position is rendered difficult in that he considers Jesus intellectually limited by the ethos of his time and yet ethically and spiritually above reproach. He does not believe that Jesus was God in the flesh, and yet his attitude is one of uncritical reverence; he does in effect treat Jesus as God! Thus more than forty years after the publication of his outstanding *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, he wrote in a lengthy epilogue to Colonel E. N. Mozley's book, *The Theology of Albert Schweitzer**: "To me, Jesus remains what he was. Not for a single moment have I had to struggle for my conviction that in him is the supreme spiritual and religious authority, though his expectation of the speedy advent of a supernatural Kingdom of God was not fulfilled, and we cannot make it our own."

Also: "He is so great that the discovery that he belongs to his age can do him no harm. He remains our spiritual Lord."

How extraordinary does such high esteem appear when we consider what is Schweitzer's view of the nature of the ethics of his eschatological Jesus.

In the Sermon of the Mount and elsewhere, he says. Jesus was not preaching a code of conduct to be practised in the normal conditions of day-to-day living. It was an "interim ethics" to be practised in singular circumstances—in the expectation of the imminent coming of the Kingdom when the world of our experience would be supernaturally swept away, but preceded by a time of heavy tribulation and woe brought upon believers by the God-opposing forces. Hence this "interim" code was to be observed in order to hasten the dawn of the Messianic Kingdom, and so that, in the Day of Judgement following the close of temporal history, those who had been called to the Kingdom, and had answered the call by living in accordance with the "interim" code, would be admitted to the blessedness of the Kingdom.

We might question whether ethics of such expediency, formulated in anticipation of eschatological fulfilment, are particularly noble. If this life of righteousness and love that Jesus urged upon his hearers was to be lived only in expectation of the impending Kingdom, what life, one wonders, would he have counselled if no such expectation had been present? This is a question of greatest importance arising from Schweitzer's theology but one on which, not unnaturally, he sheds no light.

The historical Jesus, he points out, belongs to his own time; and because he is to us a strange figure, we could not if we would bring him forward into our age, with its vastly different world-view. It is in the singleness of his purpose, in the strength of his will, and in the imperious power of his ethical spirit, that he so completely transcends his own time and has a sovereign contemporary significance. Schweitzer's claim is that this will and this spirit working in the minds and souls of men would transform life individually and as a whole. But this is hard to see.

According to Schweitzer, Jesus never preached the brotherhood of man, but merely the brotherhood of the believers in him, and only Jewish believers at that. With the great Gentile world he was not in the least concerned.

*A. and C. Black, 1950.

He was a Jew, sharing the Jews' particularistic notion that they were God's own people.

Moreover, and still more repellent to our thinking, Jesus (Schweitzer holds) believed in predestination—that the Kingdom of God would be inhabited by the few who were "chosen." They would be the "elect," not simply by virtue of having earned that privilege through goodness of life (though that was a prerequisite), but by virtue of having an intuitive understanding of the parables in which Jesus habitually spoke. When the Kingdom was proclaimed they would enter into eternal blessedness; the rest would go to damnation.

When, therefore, Schweitzer tells us that the religion of Jesus "is a religion of love" we cannot but wonder. When he further tells us that, once Jesus's ethical thought is freed from the eschatology in which it is wrapped up, and which is so alien to us, it is seized with new life and "a mighty spiritual force streams forth . . . and flows through our time

also," we are hardly convinced.

Schweitzer, discarding the liberal conception of Jesus, quested for a truly historical Jesus, and then asserted that the Jesus of his discovery is a greater and more dynamic figure. He is wrong. His Jesus is a lesser figure than the liberal Jesus, true or false, that he complains is "so extraordinarily lifeless." There are many nobler characters in history than the imperious, misguided, crudely fanatical mortal Schweitzer portrays.

But we have no need to go to other times for a man of surpassing moral excellence. Schweitzer himself is such a man. He has never laboured as a medical missionary in French Equatorial Africa all these long years with any self-regarding motives. In fact he is one of the most selfless humanitarians the modern world has known. He is easily a greater personality than the Jesus in whom he evidently believes, and whom he somehow finds cause so profoundly to admire.

Election of a Pope

By F. A. RIDLEY

NOWADAYS the election of a new Pope is a solemn and rather dull affair, the details of which are minutely regulated by protocol and precedent, elaborated over centuries by the Roman Curia. In such bureaucratic circumstances it is most unlikely that the colourful, if disedifying, scenes of past ages are ever likely to recur. One no longer sees a train of mules, laden with a golden load of ducats, proceeding discreetly to the apartments of their Eminences, the Cardinal-electors, for the simoniacal purpose of bribing the mouthpieces of the Holy Spirit into voting for a particular candidate! This was a common enough sight in the past, perhaps most notably at the Renaissance, when Borgia and Medici Popes—who made up in colourful villainy what they lacked in monotonous sanctity—frequently secured election as Vicars of Christ. No doubt, as in all elections to high office, intrigue and personal and party manoeuvres still play a conspicuous part, whilst the real motives for a particular election often remain unknown until long after. In the current Papal Election, whilst no Jesuit takes part, it would be interesting and instructive to know what role is actually played by the famous "Company." The axiom of Francis Bacon—"all climbing to great place is by a winding stair"—is no doubt as true in this case as any other.

Nonetheless, even in ages where distance fails to lend enchantment, some comic opera incidents have periodically recurred to enliven elections. We recall the pleasant episode in the 1740 Conclave, when the Cardinals had duly elected Cardinal Lambertini but were unable to find Christ's newly-elected Vicar. His Holiness-to-be was asleep in a dark corner and when aroused begged their Eminences to go away and let him sleep again as he had not had a wink during the whole Conclave on account of the vermin which infested his bed! It is pleasant to recall that Pope Benedict XIV, as he became when the Cardinals insisted on crowning him, turned out to be a cultured Pontiff to whom even Voltaire dedicated a play, and of whom Frederick the Great spoke with respect. This Pope's one recorded fault, a violent tendency to profane language, may perhaps be charitably ascribed to the vermin?

Then, in the present century, we have two gems of unconscious humour ascribed to Cardinal Sarto. At the Conclave of 1903 which "translated" him into Pope Pius X (more recently he procured entry into paradise as a canonised saint!) he was a dark horse. A French Cardinal asked him if he spoke French and, when Sarto answered

no, the Frenchman said that this ruled him out as possible Pope, since every Pope must speak French. "Elect me Pope," exclaimed Sarto, "the Holy Spirit would never make such a mistake"!

When the Holy Spirit—assisted by the Austrian Emperor, who vetoed the election of the "favourite," Cardinal Rampolla—did make Sarto Pope, the latter exclaimed, "I cannot accept. I have a return ticket to Venice!"

One must add that it was a great pity he did not use that ticket. For St. Pius X combined holiness and stupidity to a very marked degree. He proved to be one of the most stupid and reactionary in the whole series of Popes; very unlike the estimable, if vermin-ridden, Benedict!

However, perhaps the most unusual recorded election was that at the dawn of the Italian Renaissance in 1458, which, after a stormy prelude which involved physical violence, made Cardinal Piccolomini the 212th successor of St. Peter. (For the following account I am chiefly indebted to Mrs. Valerie Pirie's admirable volume, *The Triple Crown*).

Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, to give him his full name, was a remarkable representative of a remarkable age. Before being made a Cardinal by the learned Pope Nicholas V (founder of the Vatican library), he had already achieved fame as a scholar, historian (he wrote a history of the contemporary Hussite war) and diplomat. In this last capacity he visited Scotland and left a lurid account of that country's morals which, incidentally, reflect an equally lurid light on his own. He had been an opponent of the Papacy, but was brought over by a Cardinal's hat. On the death of Calixtus III, the first Borgia Pope, Piccolomini stood out as the most obvious candidate. His chief rival was the French Cardinal of Rouen, D'Estoutville, who did not possess anything like the talents of the Italian but did possess the more tangible assets of practically unlimited funds for bribery. There was originally a third candidate, a Greek Cardinal Bessarion, who, however, stood down in return for a Rouen bribe. Another Cardinal, Rodrigo Borgia (later Pope Alexander VI) accepted a similar huge bribe but appears to have double-crossed the French party. It was then a straight fight between Italy and France, with 12 votes needed for election, the College being much smaller than today. The Italians accused the French Cardinals who counted the votes of falsifying the returns—a proceeding repugnant to Piccolomini if not to

the presiding Holy Spirit—but at last the Italian got eleven votes and needed only one more.

Let Mrs. Pirie describe the scene. "It is said that Piccolomini's gaze travelled slowly round the assembled prelates and came to rest on Colonna with such a power of concentrated authority and promise that he rose like an automaton to obey the unspoken command. But before he could utter a word Rouen and Bessarion had flung themselves upon him in an attempt to silence him by main force. There was a violent scuffle, during which Colonna managed to free himself sufficient to pronounce the necessary formula. In a moment, the panting, dishevelled Cardinals fell apart and were prostrated in adoration before the new Pope." (*The Triple Crown*, page 20.)

The Holy Spirit had spoken! The Pope was elected! Here again it is pleasant to recall that the former critic of the Papacy made a good Pope, Pius II (1458-64). He was the first Pope to state that the earth was round and the last to call a crusade against the infidel.

Triumph

IN NEW YORK a sweeping victory for the cause of planned parenthood has just been won.

A medico-religious volcano which has been rumbling there for twenty-five years as to whether or no physicians may prescribe birth control appliances to patients in city-operated hospitals erupted recently over the case of a married diabetic woman who is a Protestant, and whose physician is a Jew. The case put the Hospitals Commissioner, Dr. Morris A. Jacobs, in a delicate position.

A substantial minority of New York's population is Roman Catholic. In a letter to the New York Academy of Medicine last April Dr. Jacobs wrote that there would be no interference with "proper and accepted therapeutic practices."¹ On the strength of this, an obstetrician at Kings County Hospital, the medical policy board of which approves the practice of contraception, moved to provide a contraceptive device for his patient.

Dr. Jacobs refused to sanction this and was therefore accused of "double talk." When asked to do so he reported privately on the matter to the Mayor of New York, Mr. Robert F. Wagner, who is a Roman Catholic, but refused at the same time to discuss it with the press or with members of the Protestant Council of the City.

Though several Roman Catholic groups supported him more than 20 Protestant, Jewish and other religious organisations voiced their disapproval of the ban imposed by the Commissioner and the Mayor referred the matter to his legal advisers.

The "nettlesome issue"² was thrashed out when the Board of Hospitals—consisting of five doctors, five laymen and Dr. Jacobs himself—met on September 17th. At this meeting the Board decided that contraception on medical grounds was proper medical practice and that contraceptive advice and materials should be provided in city-operated hospitals for patients who needed and wanted them.

¹New York Times, U.S.A., July 27th, 1958.

²Newsweek, New York, August 4th, 1958.

[From *News of Population and Birth Control*, October 1958.]

CORRESPONDENCE

"ART THOU DEAD?"

Perhaps your readers noticed a report in the *Daily Express* on the day following the Pope's death. It gave a description of the ritual used to enable those concerned to be assured of the reality of the

extinction of life. The Pope is, according to the report, struck three times on the head by an official of the Vatican using a silver hammer, who enquires "Art thou there, Eugene?" Not until then is he officially dead.

This newspaper item caused considerable hilarity amongst all those to whom I showed it, and the usual comment was "Don't they trust their doctors?" H. A. ROGERSON.

EXIT PAPA

There has been outrageous adulation of the man called a pope who recently died, yet on the day he died so did thousands of others. It is childish nonsense to make such a fuss about the death of this one man who while living wallowed in luxury. What useful thing did he ever do? Thousands went short to maintain him in this state, idiotically praying to and worshipping a mere postulation, a noun without substance called god.

In this day and age the idolatry of the man's followers is disgusting. They worship rosaries, crosses, candles, names, virgins, fonts, altars, wafers and wines. It is understandable that people enjoy fairy tales but why make a religion of them? P. TURNER.

FREEMASONRY

It would, I think, greatly help in the controversy on Freemasonry if it were remembered that the movement started as a secret society of the mercantile bourgeoisie and the Free Citizens of the Middle Ages. In those circumstances initiation rites, secrecy and all the trappings and paraphernalia were necessary.

When with the attainment of Capitalism the bourgeoisie became the ruling class, Freemasonry degenerated into a social club; void and emptied of their meaning, the secret rites became an attraction for idle snobs and the whole movement a partly puerile, partly reactionary affair.

Quite recently the first convention since 200 years of all German Freemasons has been held in West Berlin; its focus was a general confession to Christianity in Europe and the beneficial activities of the Churches. No atheists are accepted in German Lodges. P. G. ROY.

CAN MATERIALISM EXPLAIN MIND? By G. H. Taylor. Price 3/6; postage 6d.

THE PAPACY IN POLITICS TODAY. By Joseph McCabe. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

A SHORT HISTORY OF SEX WORSHIP. By H. Cutner. Price 2/6; postage 6d.

FREEDOM'S FOE—THE VATICAN. By Adrian Pigott. A collection of Danger Signals for those who value liberty. 128 pages. Price 2/6; postage 6d.

THE DOLLAR AND THE VATICAN: Its Character, Methods and Aims. By Avro Manhattan. 2nd Edition—Revised and Enlarged.

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING. By Chapman Cohen. Series 1, 2, 3, 4. Cloth bound. Price 21/-; postage 1/3.

PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS IN MODERN THOUGHT. By Chapman Cohen. Price 7/6 each series; postage 7d. each.

MATERIALISM RESTATED (Third edition). By Chapman Cohen. Price 5/6; postage 7d.

PAMPHLETS FOR THE PEOPLE. 18 of Chapman Cohen's celebrated pamphlets bound in one volume. Indispensable for the Freethinker. Price 5/6; postage 8d.

WHAT IS THE SABBATH DAY? By H. Cutner. Price 1/3; postage 4d.

BRADLAUGH AND INGERSOLL. By Chapman Cohen. Well illustrated. Now available. Price 6/-; postage 7d.

AGE OF REASON. Thomas Paine's masterpiece with 40-pages introduction by Chapman Cohen. Cloth 4/-; postage 7d.

HOW THE CHURCHES BETRAY THEIR CHRIST. British Christianity critically examined. B. C. G. L. Du Cann. Price 1/-; postage 3d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK (10th Edition). By G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball. Price 4/6; postage 6d.

A CHRONOLOGY OF BRITISH SECULARISM. By G. H. Taylor. Price 1/-; post 2d.