

The Freethinker

Volume LXXXII—No. 21

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Sixpence

IT IS INDISPUTABLE that the mutual relationships periodically entered into between the prevailing religious organisation and its contemporary Secular State, constitute an important chapter in human history, particularly in recent centuries. In the following paragraphs I shall endeavour to trace *seriatim* the various stages in this long and chequered relationship, my current standpoint being that of the National Secular Society, of which I have the

honour to be President. For well-nigh a century, 1866-1962, the National Secular Society has proclaimed the separation of Church and State as its primary objective. When viewed from this chiefly juridical angle, Secularism itself may be relevantly defined as the abolition of all religiously privileged groups with relation to the existing Secular State, and the complete equality of all religious and anti-religious propaganda before the legal code of the given State. One may add that, whilst this objective has not yet been realised in this country, despite a near century of Secularist propaganda, yet in the modern world, as evinced in the constitutions of perhaps a majority of contemporary states, the secular principle has undoubtedly made rapid headway during the past century.

Pre-Christian Times

Strictly speaking, there was not, and there could not conceivably have been, any question of mutual relationships between Church and State in the earliest known civilisations, prior to the Secular States of Greece and Rome. For the earliest civilisations were theocratic in character (viz. ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia with their divine Pharaohs and priestly god-kings) and in such theocratic societies the Church was the State. As the French critical scholar, Ernest Renan, aptly noted, before the Greeks there were no secular states or nations; there were only human flocks of submissive sheep browsing under the divine tutelage of god-kings and of "Sons of Heaven", a state of things broadly similar to that so vividly portrayed in the early narratives of the Jewish Old Testament. It was only with the advent of the city-states of classical Greece, and later on with the establishment of the secularly-inspired Roman Empire, that the Secular State properly so-called, came into existence, and along with it, the age-long problems associated with Church-State relationships. Both Greece and Rome had, of course, an official religious cult which, in Rome, centred around the worship of Caesar, but this official cult had little emotional religious significance, and the popular religions of the period which focussed the emotions of the multitude, were officially recognised and tolerated by the State, as were equally, the often anti-religious critiques advanced by such philosophic schools as the Stoics and Epicureans. For example, even during the long Jewish struggle against the Roman Empire that culminated in the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD, Judaism as such, remained a fully legal religion. The principal exception

to this general principle of toleration, was represented by Christianity, a totalitarian creed, the advent of which to power as the official State Church of the Roman Empire, (c. 400 AD), spelt the definitive end of the first Secular era in human annals.

Christianity and the State

Prior to the Reformation (16th century), the Western world witnessed a periodical struggle between the incipient totalitarian principle in Christianity and the still-surviving Graeco-Roman secular tradition. In Western Christianity, the State usually remained more or less effectively subordinate to the Catholic Church, a process that reached its

height at Canossa (1077) when the German Holy Roman Emperor was forced to make unconditional submission to the Pope. Ever since, the term, "Canossa", has stood for the apogee of clerical supremacy over the Secular State, and modern politicians (e.g. Bismarck), have employed the term in this precise sense. In general, medieval theology regarded the State as of an inferior order to the Church.

In Eastern Europe however, this process worked in reverse, since the Eastern (Greek Orthodox) Church remained subordinate to the secular Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire; a state of things identically continued in modern times by the Tsars of Russia right down to 1917, when the Russian (Bolshevik) Revolution finally adopted the principles of Secularism and officially separated the Church from the State. In the West, the Reformation created congeries of mutual relationships between the Secular State and the Protestant Churches created by the Reformation. For example, in England where the national Church of England ("by Law Established") has now been officially established for over four centuries, the Church has remained effectively subordinate to the State. As I have elsewhere remarked "the Church of England has never known whether it is Catholic or Protestant, but it has always known that it is English". In Scandinavian lands the Lutheran Church seems also to have been effectively subordinated to the State. Down to quite recent times in Sweden, one had to get police permission to change one's religion; contrarily, in Scotland, as well as in some of the early Puritan colonies in what are now the United States, the Calvinist Church effectively dominated the State.

The Kirk

It is, in fact, open to doubt if *any* Church anywhere, has ever dominated its contemporary society more completely than did the totalitarian "Democratic Theocracy" of the Scottish Kirk during, in particular, the 16th and the 17th centuries. Meanwhile, the post-Reformation Roman Catholic Church has also made certain changes in its attitude towards the secular state. Under the influence of the Jesuits and in particular of Cardinal Bellarmine, the Roman Catholic Church nowadays, only claims an "indirect power" over secular society, whilst the State is now recognised as also an institution of divine

— VIEWS and OPINIONS — Church — State Relationships

By F. A. RIDLEY

authority, ordained by God to preside in the secular sphere. However, the recent (1953) Concordat between the late Pope Pius XII and the Spanish Dictator General Franco, which has current legal status in Spain, makes it clear that the Vatican still practises religious intolerance, since this Concordat brands direct anti-Catholic (including presumably all freethinking) propaganda as illegal, whilst even religious minorities such as Protestants, Jews and Muslims can only practise their respective religions under severely restricted conditions, and only then in places specially assigned to them for religious worship.

Secularism and the Modern World

The above however, appears to constitute an exception in the modern world, where the Secularist principle of the complete separation of Church and State gains increasing acceptance. Both the dominant Powers in the present day world, the USA and the USSR accept and practise the complete separation between Church and State. The USA, indeed, was the first modern State to have done so, right at its inception at the American Revolution. In recent years, and despite much religious pressure, the American Supreme Court has been successfully invoked in defence of this fundamental secular constitution. In a number of Asiatic lands such as India (still in popular belief probably the most religious country in the world) and Communist China, the separation of Church and State is complete. In the Socialist Peoples' Democracies this is only partially so. When I was in the German Democratic Republic in 1957, I was informed that the Churches still receive subsidies from the State, and this appears to be currently the case even in Hungary, despite the openly anti-Communist role played by Cardinal Mindszenty and the Hungarian Catholic Church in the Hungarian revolt in 1956.

Church and Commonwealth

In 1962 in the modern world, the states that accept either in part or totality, the secular principle, are nowadays probably in the majority. The chief exceptions are presently to be found in the Muslim lands (Pakistan, Persia, Afghanistan, etc.), where there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as either a secular state or a civil law (since all Muslim jurisprudence is based on the divinely inspired precepts of the Koran, God's Holy and Infallible Word) and in a few still surviving Catholic states such as Spain, Portugal, Austria, etc. Apart from these the most conspicuous examples of the survival of the State-controlled Church, with a special position still recognised by current law are England and Scotland, where State Churches still enjoy a legally privileged position. It may be added that the present position is anomalous and illogical to the last degree. For whilst there may have been some sense in a State Church in the days of Queen Elizabeth I, or even of Queen Victoria (when England was still the predominantly Christian metropolitan centre of an undemocratic Empire governed almost exclusively by Christians) in this period of Elizabeth II, the titular head of a multi-racial, multi-religious, democratic Commonwealth in which Christians are in a minority, and the Anglican (and Scottish) Church a minority even amongst the Christians themselves, the very idea of an Established Church appears as a demonstrably absurd anachronism. Since Her Majesty cannot very well embrace simultaneously all the religions in the Commonwealth, there seems to be an overwhelmingly logical case for the speedy adoption, here as elsewhere, of the secular principle of the absolute separation of Church and State and of the complete equality of both religious and of anti-religious propaganda before

the law. This transformation would incidentally deprive the Churches of their present near-monopoly on the air, no doubt to the advantage of all, including themselves, for they would perforce have to refrain from such obviously absurd statements as, say, "The resurrection of Jesus is the best authenticated fact in human history", despite the surely obvious fact that 80% of humanity still reject it, including the Jews themselves, amongst whom this "best authenticated fact" allegedly eventuated.

The National Secular Society will at any rate continue to work in the future as in the past, for the speedy triumph of the Secular principle in relation to both Church and State in England, as more generally throughout the civilised world.

[The above article is the substance of a lecture under the same title given by Mr. Ridley to the (Jewish) Combined Overseas Rehabilitation and Refugee Appeal (CORRA) at 5 Abbey Court, St. John's Wood, London, on April 29th, 1962.]

The Priest on the Bus

By OSWELL BLAKESTON

[A great deal of interest is shown by readers in certain short stories which are published in a London paper with the query: Did This Really Happen? But we won't leave our readers in suspense. The following little anecdote is based on a true incident which was related to me by Rosalinde Fuller, who was one of the passengers on the ill-fated bus.]

It had been very kind of old Martha to give him a rice pudding, but it was also very awkward. The young priest held the pudding basin in a napkin on his lap; and then the bus swerved, and the basin slipped from his hands and fell on the floor.

"Oh dear," he said to everybody, "I'm so sorry!"

Privately, he thought that it could have been much worse. How awful if the pudding had splashed on to a lady's dress!

The conductress stopped the bus.

"All off," she shouted, "all get off the bus please."

A fat woman protested, "Why?"

"A priest," the conductress answered coldly, "has dropped a pudding."

"Most unfortunate," the fat woman sniffed, "but . . ."

"It'll have to be cleaned up," the conductress snapped. "Now hurry along, please. I expect there'll be another bus in half an hour or so."

One of the passengers had come down from the top to see what was the matter below. "Look here," he said, "this doesn't affect us upstairs. Why should we get off?"

The conductress ignored him.

"Oh dear," said the priest again, "couldn't I borrow somebody's newspaper and wipe it up myself?"

"It'll have to be done properly," the conductress declared haughtily, "or else we'll have people complaining."

"We are complaining," the fat woman put in gently. "We don't want to waste half an hour. Surely you could ask him to get off, love, and carry on with the rest of us?"

"It's regulations," retorted the conductress. "Everyone off the bus, please."

The priest said, "Good God! do you mean there's actually something in the regulations about priests dropping rice puddings on buses? What sort of people do they think we are?"

But now the driver had joined the conductress, and he added his bellows to hers. "Hurry along, please, all off the bus," they both shouted, over and over again. "Can't you see that the priest has dropped a rice pudding?"

The Portuguese Angle on Angola

By COLIN McCALL

LAST YEAR'S CONFERENCE of the National Secular Society deplored the attitude of the Portuguese Government towards the people of Angola, and condemned the then recent massacre. A copy of the resolution was sent to the Portuguese Ambassador in London. In January this year, the Executive Committee of the Society supported and approved a motion by the Marble Arch Branch calling on the Portuguese Government "to implement the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in its overseas territories, and to take steps to prepare its colonial peoples for ultimate self-determination". Again a copy of the resolution was sent to the Portuguese Ambassador.

I recently received a lengthy official reply from the Ambassador (presumably to the first resolution) dated March 7th, 1962, but not posted until late in April. "From the terms of the letter", said the Ambassador, "I infer that, regrettably, you may have been unable to secure accurate information on the events to which it refers. Nevertheless, I did not fail to transmit to my Government a copy of your letter". "It is necessary to stress, I think", he went on, "that in the first fortnight after the 15th March last [1961], some 1,900 black, white, and mixed Portuguese inhabitants of Angola were, without provocation, massacred with the utmost savagery in Northern Angola in a wave of terrorism and barbarism launched from across the border. Some of the white victims were from continental Portugal, many were Angola born. The leader of the terrorists, Holden Roberto, whose communist links are well known, stated in an interview published by the French newspaper *La Monde* on July 5th and 6th, 1961, that *torture had been used and would continue to be used, and that dozens of people had been sawn alive*" (italics underlined in letter).

Accompanying the letter were various printed publications and duplicated sheets of which it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the value, but which I feel it my duty, as Secretary of the NSS, to report. One, entitled, *On the Morning of March 15th*, is published by the Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs of Boston, Massachusetts, and contains hideous photographs of corpses, with descriptions of atrocities committed during the massacre referred to by the Ambassador (not to be confused with massacre condemned in the NSS resolution). "The following stories and pictures speak for themselves", the pamphlet begins. But that won't quite do. In a sense, of course, they do: they are evidence of atrocities. But by whom, why, and on what scale? (Some of the photographs are obviously duplications from a different angle.) "These few extracts, taken from official sources, tell only a part of the whole ghastly story," we read. But what are "official sources", and how reliable are they? To ask these questions is in no way an attempt to justify the atrocities, but it is a recognition that the Portuguese Government, which is presumably the "official" source, is an interested party. And the concluding words of the pamphlet have a distinctly colonialist ring: "Are those who inspired and ordered these acts fit to govern? Are they fit to merit the support of the United Nations, or any Christian, civilised society? . . ."

There can only be one answer to the first question: no. That is, if the acts were "inspired" and "ordered". There are allegations in accompanying literature of com-

munist "inspiration". "The only doubt, as British and other research groups put it", wrote Dr. Max Yergan (*The Reader's Digest*, November, 1961), "is whether the leaders are themselves communists or merely accept communist help". According to Dr. Yergan, Roberto Holden or Holden Roberto (said to be the head of the "terrorist" organisation, Uniao das Populacoes d'Angola—UPA) is "generally regarded as pro-communist and does not bother to deny charges of communism", and in a "Strictly Secret" circular addressed to "Dear Compatriots of Angola", allegedly by UPA, and calling for support for Patrice Lumumba, Holden declares: "One cannot deny this: communism is not a bad thing. On our visit to Moscow, we saw many magnificent things which the West will never have". And he ends the circular (of which there is a photostat copy, the date illegible, but obviously written before the death of Lumumba): "Long live Communism: Down with Egocentric Tribalism".

Yet, two articles in *The Reader's Digest* (of which Dr. Yergan's is one) refer to the rebellion as a "mixture of tribalism and fetishism, stirred by the communists and Africans from other countries". The tribalism hardly seems to fit in with Holden's circular.

I don't think it can be denied that there are movements outside Angola that are planning the country's independence as part of a gigantic plan for the Africanisation of Africa, and it would be surprising if there were no Communists in them. But I should doubt if the Communists were preponderant. There is a notable lack of discrimination among the conservative-minded between communist, socialist, progressive (in any sense) and indeed anyone opposed to the status quo. African freedom movements are, in fact, likely to be principally concerned with just one thing—African freedom.

What role such movements played in the terrible events of March 15th, 1961, is hard to say. That there were atrocities seems clear, and they must not be underrated. But it is nothing like so clear that they were expressly planned. They were confined to Northern Angola where, as Brig.-Gen. Frank L. Howley (the other *Reader's Digest* writer, and a firm supporter of Portugal) admits: "The strong civilising impulses throbbing through Angola [*sic*] are feeblest, or entirely absent . . . For reasons of history and geography the tribes there are the most backward and have been most hostile to modern influences". The north is, in other words, still a savage country despite close on five centuries of Portuguese occupation.

The British Consul-General at Luanda, visited the region in July 1961, and reported "one major difficulty": "The members of the party received a good deal of information", said the Rt. Hon. Edward Heath, MP, Lord Privy Seal (in the House of Commons, July 31st, 1961), "but much of it was second hand and hearsay, and they formed the best judgment that they could". Mr. Heath considered that there were, at the outset, attacks on Africans and European settlers which were "savage in the extreme"; that, as a result of this "intense provocation", there were then "acts of lawless and indiscriminate reprisal by armed Portuguese civilians against Africans, and in many cases these Africans had not been connected with the rebellion in any way"; and that the Portuguese authorities were "prevented from taking effective action by the small number of security forces in Angola at the time".

(Continued on next page)

This Believing World

Nothing adds more to the gaiety of nations than the stout-hearted defence against Evolution so often put up by Fundamentalist Christians. In one of their journals, *The Plain Truth* for May, there is a terrific attack on "Natural Selection", and to drive the point home, we are told that Darwin in 1863 wrote to Jeremy Bentham: "When we descend to details, we can prove that no species has changed, nor can we prove the supposed changes are beneficial, which is the groundwork of the theory". Whether Darwin wrote this or not is impossible to check for, of course, we are given no authority; but the delicious bit about writing to Bentham *can be checked*, for he died in 1832!

★

However, we are given famous names of "believers in various forms of Evolution"—Plato, Thales, Anaximander, Empedocles, and Aristotle among them. And to make sure that Rome comes into the picture, we are told that "Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, both theologians of the Catholic Church, were *theistic evolutionists*". No one was ever more bitterly attacked than Darwin by the Churches, for they knew that from a scientific standpoint, Evolution meant the death of Christianity. And now it seems that *true* Evolution, that is, the "theistic" brand, was first put on the map by all-believing Christians!

★

Now that Mr. Godfrey Winn has proved himself such an indomitable defender of Christianity in the *Daily Express*, we note, certainly with amusement, that he objects to the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead attacking "faith-healing". Mr. Weatherhead once wrote a big book on "healing", and there is no doubt that he then believed in "faith-healing" in some form or other. In fact, Mr. Winn proves this is the case—so he cannot understand why the reverend gentleman should now say, "I believe in faith, but we do not live in the first century when faith was a projection from credulity". Mr. Winn countered this by saying, "All faith in all centuries stems from credulity"!

★

Of course it does. And then Mr. Winn gives cases of the utter failure of doctors to cure a lady whose face was covered with sores, and who was eventually cured by a "man of God", a case which could be duplicated in magazines dedicated to Spiritualism, a thousand times. There indeed was the "hand" of God or of "spirits" who cured where mere doctors—those without Mr. Winn's faith—miserably failed. But, and the point is never or very rarely raised, why is it that doctors cure a hundred people where faith healers either completely fail or manage to get only one cure?

★

While we cannot of course blame Christianity for the attack, it is interesting at least to find that even a "theological" student can sock the warden of his college on the jaw and break it. The *Daily Mail* (May 11th) gives us a picture of the gallant Christian gentleman who later apologised and in court was bound over. But the puzzle is—how can anybody, once having accepted Christ as his Saviour and realising that henceforth he would live *in* Christ, sock anybody on the jaw? Shouldn't he have turned the other cheek?

★

The Liberal Education Association has come out—rather belatedly, we think—against our schools' religious teaching. They found it "sloppy and sentimental and in most cases lamentably out of date", according to the *Kentish*

Mercury; and they also found that the teachings do "more harm than good". They even agreed that some of the "Jesus stories" were "sloppy and sentimental". We particularly love the word "sloppy" in connection with "our Lord".

★

Moreover, it appears that parents are often asked such questions as, "What does God sit on in the sky?" or "Who was God's daddy?" most embarrassing for good Christians who don't know the answers. And what about hymns? It was found out that children sang them with fervour, but not because they were *religious* but because they were school songs. The children were quite oblivious to their "religious meaning". But will the Liberals discuss these things if they ever become the Government? Not on your life!

THE PORTUGUESE ANGLE ON ANGOLA

(Concluded from page 163)

But—and this has particular bearing on the National Secular Society's second resolution to the Portuguese Ambassador—Mr. Heath added: "All this is not to say that there was no basis of grievance behind the revolt. As I told the House in the last debate". And he ended with the hope that the Portuguese would amplify the statement made by Dr. Salazar to the Assembly on June 30th, "in which he mentioned far-reaching administrative reforms and changes in the status of the Africans. We believe that this could make a profound difference to the course of events in Angola".

The National Secular Society resolution, let me repeat, called on the Portuguese Government "to implement the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in its overseas territories, and to take immediate steps to prepare its colonial peoples for ultimate self-determination". Which seems to go to the root of what is no doubt a tangled problem.

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16TH, 1962. Present: Mr. F. A. Ridley (President) in the Chair, Mrs. Ebury, Mrs. Venton, Messrs. Barker, Borsman, Cleaver, Corstorphine, Ebury, Hornibrook, McIlroy, Mills, the Treasurer (Mr. Griffiths) and the Secretary. Apologies from Mr. Shannon. The Chairman welcomed Mr. Borsman, who was attending his first meeting as representative for Scotland. New members were admitted to Manchester, North London and Nottingham Branches which, with Individual members made 9 in all. Humanist Council and National Council for Civil Liberties reports were before the meeting. It was agreed to purchase extra copies of the NCCL analysis of the Radcliffe Committee report. Request from Glasgow Secular Society for speakers was approved. Conference matters were discussed, the Financial Report was passed for printing, and the Annual Report was approved with slight amendment. Handbills for distribution, "For all Angry Young Men (and Women)" were available for branches. The next meeting was fixed for Wednesday, June 20th, 1962.

PAPERBACKS

- A Dictionary of Psychology (Penguin Reference Book), 4s.
 - A Woman Doctor Looks at Love and Life by Dr. Marion Hilliard, 2s. 6d.
 - The Human Body by Cyril Bibby and Ian T. Morison. (Puffin Book). Ideal for young people. 2s. 6d.
 - One Woman's Fight by Vashti McCollum. Revised Edition, with a Postlude by Paul Blanshard, a Preface by George Axtelle and the complete text of the Supreme Court Decision on religious instruction in US public schools (the "McCollum Case") 13s. 6d.
 - Man and His Gods by Professor Homer W. Smith (500 pages). 12s.
 - The Theory of Evolution by John Maynard Smith, 7s. 6d.
 - Chemistry by Kenneth Hutton, 5s.
 - The Lost World of the Kalahari by Laurens van der Post, 3s. 6d.
- And a large selection of other paperbacks.
Available from the PIONEER PRESS, plus postage

THE FREETHINKER

103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, S.E.1
TELEPHONE: HOP 2717

THE FREETHINKER can be obtained through any newsagent or will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates: One year, £1 17s. 6d.; half-year, 19s.; three months, 9s. 6d. In U.S.A. and Canada: One year, \$5.00; half-year, \$2.50; three months, \$1.25.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1. Details of membership of the National Secular Society may be obtained from the General Secretary, 103 Borough High Street, S.E.1. Inquiries regarding Bequests and Secular Funeral Services should also be made to the General Secretary, N.S.S.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Branch N.S.S. (The Mound).—Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN, McRAE and MURRAY.
London Branches—Kingston, Marble Arch, North London: (Marble Arch), Sundays, from 4 p.m. MESSRS. L. EBURY, J. W. BARKER, C. E. WOOD, D. H. TRIBE, J. P. MURACCIOLE. (Tower Hill). Every Thursday, 12—2 p.m.: Messrs. J. W. BARKER and L. EBURY.
Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Platt Fields), Sunday afternoons. (Car Park, Victoria Street), Sunday evenings.
Merseyside Branch N.S.S. (Pierhead).—Meetings: Wednesdays, 1 p.m.: Sundays, 7.30 p.m.
North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead).—Every Sunday, noon: L. EBURY.
Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Old Market Square, Nottingham).—Every Friday, 1 p.m., Every Sunday, 6.30 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY

INDOOR

North Staffordshire Humanist Group (The Guildhall, High Street, Newcastle-under-Lyme), Friday, May 25th, 7.15 p.m.: A MEETING.
Southend Humanist Group (Leigh Community Centre, Elm Street), Saturday, May 26th, 7.30 p.m.: COLIN MCCALL, "Is There a Place for Militancy?"
South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1), Sunday, May 27th, 11 a.m.: F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT, M.A., "Past Laws and Future Reforms".
Tyneside Humanist Society (100 Pilgrim Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1), Wednesday, May 30th, 7.30 p.m.: DR. NEIL JENKINS, "The Place of Conservation".

Notes and News

"IT IS A frighteningly short step", wrote *The Guardian's* Parliamentary Correspondent, Norman Shrapnel, "such is the relativity of politics, from a situation in which it is wrong to do a thing to a situation in which it is wrong not to do it" (9/5/62). Mr. Shrapnel was referring, of course, to the Prime Minister's contradictory attitudes to the Russian and the American nuclear tests respectively. It would be "not only wrong but futile", Mr. Macmillan had told the House of Commons, for Britain to try to persuade the United States to abandon her tests. "They were of the greatest importance from the point of view of defence".

IN HIS MAIN statement to the House, Mr. Macmillan hesitated to express an opinion on the effects on the Van Allen Radiation Belt of the proposed high altitude tests, because "scientific views differed". In replying to a question from Mr. Tom Driberg, however, the Prime Minister did essay such an opinion. With a curious logic he argued: "Only a very short time ago, nobody knew the Van Allen Radiation Belt existed, and if it should be now temporarily disturbed I don't think great harm will come to the world". "One or two members shuddered at this piece of unflappability", Mr. Shrapnel reported, "possibly reflecting that a child who finds a bomb buried in the garden is scarcely the safer for not knowing that bombs exist . . .".

IN THE House of Commons on May 14th, Mr. Kenneth Robinson, MP (Labour, St. Pancras) asked the Minister of Health if he would urge local health authorities to tell mothers, through health visitors and by any other means, of the availability of family planning services. "No sir", replied Mr. Enoch Powell. "Is it not a ridiculous position", said Mr. Robinson, "that even where family planning clinics are held in local authority premises, it is forbidden to advertise or publicise them in any way? Is it not time that the Minister ceased to be intimidated by a religious minority from adopting a rational policy towards what is a most valuable and necessary health service?" There were Conservative cheers when Mr. Powell said that he was not intimidated by anybody. But intimidated or no, he must be grossly misinformed to say: "I do not accept that the existence of these facilities and their availability is not well known . . .". Or does he know but still refuse to accept?

★

WRITING IN the May issue of the American magazine, *Church and State*, Paul Blanshard exposed a new "trick of phrase" being used by the Jesuits in their campaign for Federal aid to Roman Catholic schools. Father Virgil Blum, a prolific writer on the subject, attacked the Kennedy Administration because it demands "that the parents of the nation's 7,000,000 independent school children surrender their constitutional right to send their children to independent schools as a condition for sharing in a massive Federal aid-to-education programme" (*New York Times*, 8/11/61). Father Blum and his allies, said Mr. Blanshard, "are trying to fix the label 'independent' on all Catholic schools in much the same way as French Catholics have fastened the word 'free' on French Catholic schools in their successful drive for public funds in France". And, if they get it accepted into popular usage it will, as Mr. Blanshard remarked, "be worth more to them than a whole library of legal arguments".

★

A "SMALL BUT vociferous minority is able to impose its will on the essentially religious people", complained Msgr. Hubert A. Maino (*Detroit News*, 28/1/62), when Director R. Sargent Shriver announced that the Kennedy "Peace Corps" would not sign contracts with Church groups. He called it a "sudden about-face . . . intended to appease certain extremist groups that are self-appointed guardians of an exaggerated and undemocratic version of the separation [of Church and State] doctrine", and saw it as another step towards "setting up secularism as the established religion" of the USA. "This is a real violation of the First Amendment", Msgr. Maino declared.

★

THE APRIL ISSUE of *Progressive World*, organ of the United Secularists of America, contains an article on "The Catholic School System as the Power Box of the Hierarchy", by "Thomas Monahan", the pseudonym of an ex-Roman Catholic priest. Hugh Robert Orr, editor of the magazine, tells how Mr. Monahan called at the office and said: "I have been reading your magazine in the public library for the past year and it has changed my life". The following day Mr. Monahan telephoned and said: "I've had it out with my bishop, and it's all over. I am a free man".

★

ON MAY 10TH, the *Daily Mirror* printed a photograph of three Irish girls in white wedding gowns kneeling at an altar rail. They were "Brides of Christ".

More Light on Jesus?

By H. CUTNER

(Concluded from page 156)

APART FROM THE "evidence" of the Gospels, there is no contemporary proof that there was somebody called Jesus Christ at the commencement of our era. And we can well understand the frantic search for proof that Jesus was an historical character when first criticisms of the Gospel story gradually began to be printed. The one historian almost contemporary with "our Lord" was Josephus, who gave a detailed account of Palestine but who, alas, only mentions Jesus twice and says nothing at all of his "ministry". We can understand the anger which besets the average Christian when asked for proof of the existence of the Messiah (Christ and Messiah are synonymous) but it is very difficult to understand why some Humanists and Rationalists should be such stout defenders of Josephus.

They very reluctantly admit that at least one of the passages in Josephus is a forgery or, if not altogether a forgery, it replaces some other passage—though there is not a scrap of proof that this is the case; but they almost to a man stoutly defend the second passage. It is quite impossible to imagine Christians forging two passages—one perhaps, but never, never two. And so we can understand when the "Slavonic" Josephus was first discovered, the paean of joy which burst from all believers in Jesus, from all those who believe that at last Josephus can be called upon as a "witness" if not to the Son of God Almighty, at least to a Man Jesus, or even to a mere man Jesus.

Mr. Furneaux gives a full account of this Slavonic Josephus derived mostly from Eisler; but he makes dozens of statements for which, as far as I read him, he gives no authority whatever. It appears that there was (1) the original Aramaic text written by Josephus in a short version; (2) A longer and fuller text written later in Aramaic; (3) A translation into Greek of both texts; and the English translation which we have from the fuller Greek text. The disputed passages about Jesus are in our translation.

The Slavonic translation, so different from the current Greek texts, was known as far back as 1866, and was made, or is supposed to have been made, about 1000 years ago. But the text used by the Russian translator is certainly unknown; and Eisler in particular embarked on a series of "speculations", dutifully swallowed by Mr. Furneaux, and no doubt by all who want to make Josephus a "witness" for Christ. (The title of Eisler's work is *The Messiah Jesus*—that is, *The Christ Jesus*.)

When Mr. Furneaux tells us that "critical examination of the Slavonic MSS" shows that "they are derived" from this or that Greek text, he reminds me of the investigators (unknown) who claim that the Spiritualistic phenomena they investigate were always under the strictest critical control. The real truth is that a translation into the Slavonic tongue was certainly made because we have it—but nobody really knows who made the translation, when or where. We are told it was "prepared for a heretical sect" in Russia in the thirteenth century, and used "in the denial of the divinity of Jesus". The "heretical" sect wanted to show that Jesus was not divine, and these passages were undoubtedly in the "original" text of Josephus. So that the Slavonic Josephus is after all the great "witness" for Jesus, and the Mythicists are at last defeated.

Unfortunately, Mr. Furneaux appears to have relied too much on Eisler. In actual fact, whatever Greek text was used by the translator into Russian, there is not a scrap of evidence of any kind that the passages describing Jesus are genuine—that is, that they were in the original Aramaic; for as far as I have been able to find out there are no Aramaic copies of the "original" Josephus in existence. Mr. Furneaux gives a number of reproductions of various Hebrew texts altered by Christian sects or censors, but not one of any Aramaic manuscript. So if the Greek texts we have are not an exact translation, we do not know what is.

In the Slavonic translation there are eight passages on the Christian story, the longest being on the life of Jesus. It reads to me as a fraud from beginning to end—or it may even be a "parody" on the Gospels. That anyone should take it seriously shows how far credulity can go.

In any case, early "authorities" appear—according to Dr. Dunkerley's *Beyond the Gospels*—to have considered that these passages "were late Christian interpolations containing no primitive material". This was the view of Prof. S. Zettlin, as J. M. Robertson notes in his *Courses of Study*. They were "late Christian fabrications". As for Eisler's big book, *The Messiah Jesus*, and its championship of these "fabrications", Dr. Dunkerley declares:

Many critical views of Eisler's work appeared. His use of the documents in question was generally felt to be so arbitrary and uncritical that his theory based upon them was utterly discredited. One writer spoke of it as "a cascade of imaginary hypotheses . . ." There are other fully Christian passages in the Slavonic manuscripts (which are obvious interpolations); why then are these of such an unconvincing and ineffective character?

Two contemptuous rejections can be found—one by Professor J. M. Creed in the *Harvard Theological Review* (1932), and the other in Dr. J. W. Jack's *The Historic Christ* (1933), both of which pulverise Eisler. Both writers, says Dr. Dunkerley, examined the Slavonic Josephus and Eisler's theory, and it was "felt by most scholars" that they had "finally disposed of this strange chapter of New Testament study".

Mr. Furneaux, as I have already noted, in spite of the Slavonic Josephus, sadly admits that "no exact date for the Crucifixion can be stated with any certainty"; but he comes to the conclusion that it *must* be 21 AD because that is the date given by Eisler. Perhaps one reason why Dr. Eisler was so completely rejected by many Christian scholars is that 21 AD is an impossible date if the Gospels are accepted; and they no doubt felt that it is better to hold on to them. Mr. Furneaux gives us a "Chronological Table" as an Appendix, based on Eisler of course. It is just as useless as *The Messiah Jesus*. He tells us that in 29 AD, there was an "eclipse of the sun". So what? Does he mean that this was the famous eclipse at the Crucifixion of Jesus related in the Gospels? Even if Eisler is right and the Crucifixion took place in 21 AD, what has an eclipse in 29 AD to do with it?

But the real point in all this interminable, and for some readers no doubt boring discussion, is that the defenders of the Slavonic Josephus, knowing full well that there was no contemporary reference to Jesus, moved heaven and earth to save the Jewish historian at all cost. And I have shown that even Christians writers ridicule this "evidence".

One point has always interested me. Why did Josephus translate his Aramaic into Greek? After all, he was trying to impress his Roman friends about the greatness of the Jewish race—so why did he not write in Latin? A Latin text, we are told, was made by Egisippus in 370 AD, but I find no authority for this given. In any case, we are not told if any manuscript of it exists, and if so, what it says about Jesus, if anything.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Furneaux is that "the other side of the story" which was "once censored, long suppressed, now reconstructed" is that of "a picture of many hands of an unknown man". And to prove that this *unknown* man veritably existed, he has written a book of over 200 pages! So unknown is the man, however, that it really presents the "discovery or the rediscovery of an authentic picture of a *real* man".

And where do the Gospels and Acts come into the picture? They do not, says Mr. Furneaux, "record the beliefs of the original disciples of Jesus"; they "represent the views of the men who supplanted them". In fact, "they demonstrate a doctrine of the existence of which there is not the slightest hint at the time of the death of Jesus"—and so on. I consider these views delightful.

Whatever Mr. Furneaux thinks of Jesus, like so many unorthodox believers, he will never give up his belief in Judas. The "betrayal" is "the dark spot in the picture". Was there a betrayal? Of course. So long as the history of Jesus lasts, the Crucifixion will last, and so will the betrayal by Judas. Yet both are unequivocally myths.

Still, books like *The Other Side of the Story* will always find readers. Anything which can prove there really was a Jesus, known or unknown, God, Man or Myth, will find its enthusiastic readers. For of course he really did live, and he really is our Saviour.

C. P. SNOW AND F. R. LEAVIS

It was good to see that you had devoted some space on May 11th to the Leavis-Snow controversy, and I began reading in the hope that here at last we were to be given an intelligent examination of Leavis's Richmond Lecture. Perhaps you will allow me to set out, briefly, and in a constructive spirit, why I was disappointed by Mr. McCall's performance.

You will agree, no doubt, that whenever we contribute to a public discussion, we must try to exclude from our contribution everything that would expose us to the accusation of not being disinterested; if we are privileged to write under such a title as THE FREETHINKER, we shall be, or shall be expected to be, especially aware of the need for a scrupulous handling of evidence and a vigilant self-discipline in respect of any *parti pris* in our thinking about the given subject. Now I do not know whether Mr. McCall knows Sir Charles Snow personally; for all I know there may be no closer connection between THE FREETHINKER and C. P. Snow than between THE FREETHINKER and F. R. Leavis. But if I had to judge from this one issue of your paper, I should be forced to say that there probably was such a connection with Snow. Mr. McCall's credit with your readers is undermined by the appearance he gives of being personally committed to take Snow's side. The article begins with an eulogy of Sir Charles's *character*—and at once the reader feels that Mr. McCall has forfeited his right to be regarded, for the purposes of this article, as a *bona fide* adjudicator. However, what I had chiefly in mind in talking about the need for disinterestedness and for scrupulousness in the handling of evidence, was the variety of ways in which Mr. McCall misrepresents the Richmond Lecture. As this is a serious charge, I hope you will give me a little more space in which to substantiate it.

One kind of misrepresentation is misquotation. Mr. McCall twice omits the word "intelligent" from a sentence he twice quotes on page 146 (so that we have not to do with a *printer's* error). A less excusable type of omission, is to alter the meaning of a paragraph by leaving out a sentence that may not suit your

purpose; this Mr. McCall also does—in the long quotation on page 146. Less excusable still, is to snip sentences, or phrases, out of their context and comment on them as if the context could make no difference; this he does throughout the article. Whatever they may think of the Richmond Lecture, some of your readers will know that it is very rash to assume that a sentence by a Leavis will not have intimate connections with adjacent sentences. Another kind of misrepresentation is exemplified when Mr. McCall says that, by "literature", "Dr. Leavis means Joseph Conrad, D. H. Lawrence and just a very few others". This is very bad because it is grossly untrue and is also the sort of untruth that plays up to prejudice.

There are of course kinds of misrepresentation of which it is difficult to say whether they were deliberate or whether the writer simply hadn't understood what he read. It is difficult in this case. But even if our powers of comprehension are as limited as Mr. McCall's seem to have been at the time of writing his article, we can approach our subject in a creative and impersonal way. If he really wanted us to see for ourselves that Leavis's lecture was, in a bad sense, personal, he could perhaps have made a start by himself exhibiting, in his own intellectual conduct, a truly impersonal concern for the problems of civilisation raised by Snow's Rede Lecture. But he merely behaves in the way he alleges—without any careful examination—Leavis behaves.

J. C. F. LITTLEWOOD.

MR. MCCALL'S REPLY

It is one of the fallacies of criticism today that one should be, or should try to be, disinterested. Had I been disinterested, I should not have written about C. P. Snow and F. R. Leavis. For the record, I have never met Sir Charles Snow, and there is no connection between him and THE FREETHINKER—except, perhaps, a similarity in general outlook. But Mr. Littlewood asks the impossible when he expects me (or anyone else) to approach such a subject in an impersonal way; to exhibit "a truly impersonal concern for the problems of civilisation raised by Snow's Rede Lecture". I wonder if he realises what he is saying? I cannot exhibit an impersonal concern for any problems of civilisation. I am personally involved in them and therefore personally committed to take an attitude towards them. I find nothing to apologise for in that. As for my "eulogy"; not only was it courteous in the light of Sir Charles's operation; it was relevant in the light of Dr. Leavis's abuse.

Mr. Littlewood says that I misrepresent Dr. Leavis's Richmond Lecture. But he doesn't deal with any of my criticisms: he concentrates on my quotations. Now it is obvious that there is a limit to the amount of quotation possible in an article the length of mine. I had to be selective, but I tried to be fair. I did accidentally omit the word "intelligent" from the long quotation on page 146, and consequently from the immediate citation from it. Mankind—this should have read—"will need to be in full *intelligent* possession of its full humanity". I am sorry for that, but I can't see that it affects my argument that the whole passage is far from explicit.

As for the sentence omitted; it reads: "I haven't chosen to say that mankind will need all its traditional wisdom; that might suggest a kind of conservatism that, so far as I am concerned, is the enemy." Granted space limitation, I consider it permissible to leave out of Dr. Leavis's "explicit positive note" what he hadn't chosen to say and put in what he had. Again the sentence in no way affects my argument. I ask Mr. Littlewood to answer a plain question. Is Dr. Leavis's "explicit positive note" explicit? I say it isn't. I ask Mr. Littlewood to explain, "something with the livingness of deepest vital instinct . . ."

I did my best to find the crucial points in a lecture that was—as I said—something of a circumlocution, long sections of which seemed pointless. The two major matters, as I saw them, were the supreme importance of literature and the fear of "mass culture". If I misrepresented Dr. Leavis here, Mr. Littlewood should represent him. If I didn't, Mr. Littlewood should answer my criticism.

To be a Freethinker is not to have no opinions. Anyone who thinks about things is bound to have opinions on them and, if he feels strongly enough, to express those opinions. It is precisely because I have strong opinions and commitments broadly similar to those of Russell, Snow and Wells, that I wrote my article.

COLIN MCCALL

ABORTION LAW REFORM ASSOCIATION aims at saving women and children from injury, disease and often death through the unprofessional operation. Local branches need your help and money in struggle for new legislation. Please apply for membership to Chairman, Col. J. Campbell, 17 Meadway, N.W.11.

CORRESPONDENCE

ORWELL IN SPAIN

F. A. Ridley's references to George Orwell as a Volunteer in the POUM militia, in which incidentally I was a *cabo* (corporal), makes interesting reading. There are many incidents I could relate during the time I was there—January to June 1937. I feel, however, that no good purpose would now be served by raking over the embers of a political fire that burst into flame in the Republican ranks particularly in Catalonia. It is odd and somewhat ironical to look back and remember—in the light of Orwell's later reputation in the Bourgeois-Capitalist world as an intellectual lash on the backs of the Communists—that, whereas I then was an ardent POUM-ist, Orwell favoured the Stalin line on Spain! Looking back I wouldn't argue now, as I often did then, against his then Stalin line which he later deserted during the "May-uprising" in Barcelona. When that unhappy affair was over he and I discussed the matter and Orwell said: "Doran, I never thought I would ever witness the terrible experience of seeing the communists firing upon the workers!" This had a shattering effect upon him and being at bottom a Bourgeois intellectual who had thrown himself so nobly and self-sacrificingly into the great struggle towards socialism, he was quickly disillusioned. His very honesty was his undoing as a political theorist, as in my own case from the opposite angle.

Stalin's line failed as we know, but we also know now that the Spanish Republic was doomed anyway, since Britain had then no intention of interfering with the onward march to the ultimate conquest of Communist Russia! So Chamberlain and all the reactionary forces in what is now known as the "Free World" thought. So much for History!

Reverting to Orwell. Three Spanish comrades and myself carried him from the front line when he was wounded. Shortly after my return home his then wife, Aileen, sent *Homage to Catalonia* to me with a request from Orwell to give my opinion on it. I tried to get it into libraries here and wrote a short review of it myself.

I ceased to admire Orwell when I heard of *Animal Farm*, and later 1984. I felt that I couldn't—given his skill, of course—have been guilty of throwing such a great hostage to the wolves of Reaction! George Orwell died as he lived—an *old Etonian*!

CHARLES DORAN.

SNOW AND LEAVIS

Colin McCall's exposition of the Snow-Leavis affair is balanced and, within its space limits, comprehensive; but I must regret his implied denigration of D. H. Lawrence, who was one of the great creative writers and prophets of the era; many of whose ideas concerning the horrible mechanisation of humanity and human nature have so swiftly been endowed by events.

One can agree with Mr. McCall's approval of Sir Charles Snow's lecture on "Magnanimity"; yet perhaps be permitted to consider Dr. Leavis's plain dealing refreshingly unlike the smoothly sinister euphemism which so often passes for critical appreciation, and which can present back-scratching in a magnanimous façade.

A. E. CARPENTER.

"JESUS"

According to Gerald Massey (in a pamphlet published by yourselves), the name Jesus Christ derives from the Aten sun god (the coming one) *iusu*, the Egyptian equivalent of which name is *karast* the words being used together, when, after

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY
ANNUAL CONFERENCE

to be held in the Secular Hall,
75 Humberstone Gate, Leicester,
(by kind permission of Leicester Secular Society)
The N.S.S. Executive Committee invites delegates
and friends to

RECEPTION AND SOCIAL
in the Secular Hall on Saturday,
June 9th, at 7 p.m.
(for Members only)

THE CONFERENCE
will be held in the
Secular Hall on Sunday, June 10th
at 10 a.m. — 12.30 p.m. and 2 p.m. — 4.30 p.m.
and will be followed by an

OPEN AIR MEETING
in the Market Place, Leicester at 6.15 p.m.
Will all those requiring hotel accommodation please
immediately inform the General Secretary, N.S.S.
103 Borough High Street, London, S.W.1

the fall of Egypt and its god, Osiris, many Egyptians deserted him and joined the Christians. Joshua (the French form is *Josue*) jesse, josia, and jeshua, are all forms of *iusu*. It should be noted that there was no letter "j" in the Latin alphabet until the time of Marcus Aurelius. Cicero used to put a "tail" to the letter "i" when he used it initially, and this was later adopted as an additional letter. I suggest that the letters INRI, seen beneath the crucifix stand for *iesu nazarii rex iudi*, Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews.

H. D. JONES.

SOCIAL ETHICS

Mr. F. A. Ridley said (27/4/62) that social ethics commenced with man's primitive communities. General zoology and anthropology reveal that man, his ape ancestors, and most forms of life lived in societies, some going back hundreds of millions of years. Some non-simian forms of life developed social ethics much superior to man's. Man has mainly been a disgraced group and inter-group creature ever dreaming of eternal torture or oblivion for his fellows and extinction for animals, while arranging everlasting bliss for himself. There is no concrete ground for believing that he will radically change. Unless he is exterminated by nature or himself, he may live for millions of years upon the earth, even expand among the stellar galaxies. Evolution most likely means expanding evil. C. R. DAVIES.

[Mr. Ridley writes: "A distinction must be made between the largely (in some cases wholly) instinctive behaviour of animals, and the consciously ethical behaviour of human beings."—ED.]

OTHER NEW PAPERBACKS

- The Face of the Earth by G. H. Dury, 6s. plus 6d. postage.
Freud and the Post-Freudians by J. A. C. Brown, 4s. plus 6d. postage.
The Flame Trees of Thika by Elspeth Huxley, 5s. plus 6d. postage.
Childhood and Adolescence, by J. A. Hadfield, 5s. plus 6d. postage.
The Normal Child by C. W. Valentine, 4s. plus 5d. postage.
The Affluent Society by J. K. Galbraith, 5s. plus 6d. postage.
The Uses of Literacy by Richard Hoggart, 5s. plus 6d. postage.
Education for Tomorrow by John Vaizey, 2s. 6d. plus 4d. postage.
Communications by Raymond Williams, 3s. 6d. plus 4d. postage.
The Economic History of World Population by Carlo Cipolla, 3s. 6d. plus 4d. postage.

FREEDOM'S FOE: THE VATICAN. By Adrian Pigott. Illustrated. Price 3/-; postage 6d.

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

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK (11th Edition). By G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball. Price 5/-; postage 8d.

AGE OF REASON. Thomas Paine's masterpiece with 40-pages introduction by Chapman Cohen. Cloth 5/-; postage 7d.

THE THINKER'S HANDBOOK By Hector Hawton. Price 5/-; 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

CATHOLIC ACTION. By Adrian Pigott. Price 6d; postage 3d.

FAMILY PROBLEMS AND THE LAW.

By Robert S. W. Pollard. Price 2/6; postage 6d.

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

MEN WITHOUT GODS. By Hector Hawton. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD. By Grant Allen. Price 3/6; postage 8d.

THE CULTURE OF THE ABDOMEN. By F. A. Hornibrook. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Ernest Renan. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

THE ORIGINS OF RELIGION. By Lord Raglan. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

JESUS, MYTH OR HISTORY? By Archibald Robertson. Price 2/6; postage 5d.

A LETTER TO ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS. By Emmett McLoughlin. 2/6 per doz. (incl. postage).

POPE JOHN AND THE COLD WAR. By F. A. Ridley. Price 5/-; postage 4d.