

The Freethinker

Volume LXXXV—No. 30

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Sixpence

SOME TIME ago, the BBC presented on television, a spectacular and impressive feature on the Battle of Culloden—May 16th, 1746—that put an end to the Jacobite movement in Great Britain. A subsequent article of mine inspired by this outstanding production, elicited some critical letters, naturally from chiefly Scottish sources. Partly in order to deal with some points at issue, I subjoin a more general article upon the Jacobite movement, including the '45.

The Jacobite rising of 1745-61 marked the end of a century-long political struggle between the medieval regime of the absolutist and Roman Catholic Stuarts on the one hand, and the Protestant bourgeoisie upon the other. A long and bitter struggle marked by dramatic vicissitudes and by alternate revolutions, restorations and counter-revolutions, it began and ended in Scotland. It began with the armed rising of the Scottish Calvinists in 1640 against the attempt of Charles I, to force episcopacy and a High Church ritual upon the Presbyterian (Calvinist) Church of Scotland, and it ended—as was recently brilliantly depicted in the BBC documentary—upon Culloden Moor in 1746, when the last despairing charge of the Jacobite Highland clans broke before the sustained fire of the Hanoverian redcoats.

The Auld Alliance

The Stuarts (connected by marriage with Robert Bruce, Scotland's liberator at Bannockburn in 1314) had reigned over Scotland since the 14th century, prior to the accession of James VI of Scotland as James I of England in 1603. That Scotland, despite repeated invasions by its far more powerful southern neighbour, had succeeded in maintaining its independence for over three centuries (since Edward I—1272-1307—first attempted to found an English Empire in Great Britain by the conquest of Scotland) was solely due to Scotland's Auld Alliance with France, which had been initiated by Sir William Wallace about 1300 and continued down to Culloden, where French troops fought in the Jacobite army. A glance at the respective economic resources of England and Scotland at this time, makes it evident that without the continuous French aid Scotland could not possibly have resisted for long. For example, an Italian (Venetian) despatch early in the 16th century, tells us that the respective revenues of Henry VIII of England and of James IV of Scotland, were 1,309,000 gold ducats and 90,000 gold ducats: that is, England was about fourteen times as rich as Scotland. One might just as well imagine, say, the modern Swiss Republic waging war successfully against France or Germany. As it was, we learn from the same Italian source that there was not a nobleman or noble woman in Scotland who was not in the pay of the most Christian King (of France); also that the French government kept a permanent Army of Scotland, an expeditionary force that could reach any part of Scotland within two days. Put briefly, the Stuarts reigned over Scotland as French Royalists or Gauleiters. A contemporary English proverb (cited

by Shakespeare in Henry V) concisely sums up the military situation: "He who would France win, must with Scotland first begin", The Auld Alliance in a nutshell!

The Stuarts and the Counter-Reformation

From 1603 to 1688, the Stuarts were also the titular kings of England, though Scotland remained a separate kingdom. And this stormy era bisected by the English Civil War and the subsequent Restoration of the Stuarts

in 1660, was marked by a series of violent struggles between the absolute monarchy of the half-French and crypto-Catholic Stuarts and the English Protestant bourgeoisie. The final overthrow of the Stuarts by the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688-9, was ultimately due

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

The Jacobite Movement

By F. A. RIDLEY

to their attempt to extend the Auld Alliance to England, to rule like Louis XIV, champion of the Jesuit-led Counter-Reformation. Charles II had been received on his deathbed into the Roman Catholic Church by a Jesuit, and James II was a fanatical tool of the Jesuits who tried to overawe Protestant London with a Catholic Irish army. The "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 expelled the Stuarts and finally established the Protestant succession.

The Stuarts did not fall without another Civil War, chiefly fought in Ireland and Scotland. But they were eventually forced to retire to France, where they set up a government-in-exile under French protection. It would appear that had James's son (of the same name, dubbed by the Hanoverians as the "Old Pretender") been willing to join the Church of England, he might have been recalled to the English throne upon the death of his half-sister, Queen Anne (Stuart) in 1714. But since he remained faithful to Rome, "George in pudding time came o'er" (as the contemporary *Vicay of Bray* expressed it) and founded the present Hanoverian dynasty. Again the Stuarts took up arms in Scotland, and James himself came over. But the '45 fizzled out, whilst the Act of Union (1707) between England and Scotland, officially ended Scotland as a separate kingdom.

The '45

The Stuarts however, had one final card to play. For, after 1715 the Hanoverian general, Marshal Wade, dug roads through the hitherto inaccessible Scottish Highlands and began to undermine the patriarchal clan-system. This induced a number of the clans to rally to the cause of the Stuarts, paradoxically more in defence of their traditional primitive communism than of absolute monarchy.

Accordingly, when in the Summer of 1745, Charles Stuart, the "Young Pretender", made a daring raid into Scotland he was soon able to raise a Highland army, at the head of which he occupied Edinburgh, beat the English regulars twice—at Prestonpans and at Falkirk—and actually invaded England. He got as far as Derby before he made his controversial decision to retreat, the wisdom of which, and his alternative chance of success had he continued his advance on London, have been hotly disputed by subsequent historians.

The spectacular episode of the '45 finally ended in

disaster at Culloden, to be followed by savage repression under "Butcher" Cumberland. The personal rôle played in the '45 by the Stuart Pretender, has been the subject of much controversy, and the real military brain seems to have been Lord George Murray rather than its titular chief. But the last of the Stuarts certainly demonstrated courage and charm, useful qualities in the leader of what was by then a forlorn hope. Incidentally, the last Stuart demonstration occurred in 1760 when, during a miners' strike at Elswick, the strikers proclaimed James Stuart, king. Thereafter, Stuart romanticism melted into the smoke of the dawning Industrial Revolution.

The Jacobite Epitaph

A 17th century Scottish Republican, a bitter enemy of the Stuarts—Fletcher of Saltoun—once went on record with the historic remark that a nation's songs are more important ultimately than are its laws. And today the Jacobite movement is kept alive not by its medieval politics, but by its superb songs. We do not envy anyone who can remain unmoved by the haunting *Loch Lomond* or *The Skye Boat Song*. It seems fair comment that the Jacobite movement will still be remembered in and by its songs long after the thunder of the English guns has died away upon Culloden Moor.

Why Not Secularism?

By H. CUTNER

ONE of the characteristics of Freethinkers is their apparent inability to agree what they shall call themselves. What they have always wanted was a sort of all-inclusive nomenclature which everybody would understand, and which would offend nobody. Should they be called Deists or Atheists, Secularists or Agnostics, Humanists or Ethicists—or what?

Thomas Paine insisted that he was a Deist, for example, but very few Christians would agree he was one. He was for them an Atheist. Yet his description of God as the Creator of "Nature", was not very different from that of Christians today. But Paine did not believe in the God of the Bible, and so he was an Atheist for all who did.

George Jacob Holyoake was an Atheist, but he did not like the word. So he invented "secularism"—a word which appears to me an excellent one for describing an unbelieving Freethinker. Here are two definitions: The principles of the Secularists, which are founded on an exclusive regard to the interests of this life (Nuttall). The belief that politics, morals, education, etc., should be independent of religion (Chambers).

Both definitions could be upheld by Secularists these days, for they clearly mean that we can leave religion completely out of all our affairs. That was all I think Holyoake meant when he coined the word. It was readily adopted by most, if not all, Freethinkers as a splendid word defining their position; and when a hundred years ago Charles Bradlaugh decided to join the scattered Free-thought societies into one body, he called it the National Secular Society.

Bradlaugh readily adopted the term secularism, but his interpretation of it differed radically from that of Holyoake; and this difference of opinion eventually led to a debate between the two leaders in 1870 when Bradlaugh was only 37 years old. A report of the debate was published, and must have had a great success, for it has become exceedingly scarce. When I was collecting as many of Bradlaugh's debates as I could find, I was utterly unable to come across a copy, though eventually one was given to me by a friend.

In her biography of her father, Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner pointed out that the debate represented "different schools of Free-thought and was for many years copiously quoted, especially by persons opposed to every view of Free-thought, who would confound representatives of one school by quoting opinions taken from the other". Roughly, Holyoake maintained that "the principles of Secularism do not include atheism", and, "secular criticism does not involve scepticism".

Though the word Atheist, as perhaps now, was often a term of opprobrium, Bradlaugh deliberately used it.

For him it was a clear statement of his opinion on "God". It is not therefore surprising that he maintained that secularism, rightly understood, must inevitably result in atheism and, in the debate, he put this with his usual powerful eloquence. Holyoake declared that the "imputation that secularism involved atheism "was the greatest impediment in the way of national secular education". Secularism was, he said, "a new form of freethought", independent of atheism or theism. But was it so in fact? Was not secularism, even as defined by Holyoake, devoid of all contact with religion! Interests in "secular" activities only, with no religious faith or belief was really atheism—it was being "without God".

Holyoake put his case, as he thought, very convincingly; but in the ultimate, it was Bradlaugh's arguments which prevailed. And though he had invented the term, Holyoake eventually gave up calling himself a Secularist and preferred to be known as an Agnostic. Both disputants had, whether they wanted to do so or not, to discuss the Bible and Christianity, and it is as well to see how Holyoake felt about them and secularism. He said:

Secularism is not an argument against Christianity it is one independent of it. It does not question the pretensions of Christianity, it advances others. Secularism does not say there is no light or guidance elsewhere, but maintains that there is light and guidance in secular truth . . .

If I remember aright, Holyoake's one-time opponent, the Rev. Brewin Grant—their two debates on Christianity and secularism can still be read with great profit—would have liked to call himself a Christian Secularist; so that we can see that he at least did not really object to the term as defined by Holyoake. But the majority of Secularists sided with Bradlaugh. Secularism must inevitably lead to Atheism, however one might deny it. A Secularist was an Atheist willy-nilly.

But words change in meaning in the course of time, and no doubt the present generation of Freethinkers, the descendants of Secularists, would prefer the word "humanism" as better representing their beliefs. Of course they have every right to prefer it. But I have never exactly found out why they do so.

"Humanism" is an old word. No doubt it can be argued that it has the same meaning as Holyoake's secularism, but it can be used to define Christianity as well. For after all, the teachings of Jesus mostly refer to the way one must live in this world. And Erasmus has been aptly called a Humanist. But what exactly is wrong with "secularism?" Does it conjure up the "artisans", the "mechanics", the "working men", who called themselves Secularists, and formed, perhaps, the largest part of the
(Concluded on page 236)

The Last Post

By GEORGE S. GOODMAN

(Continued from page 226)

TO RECAPITULATE and clarify: the New Testament falsifiers altered all the writings or "letters" of Paul, so that they should contain plenty of words, phrases and sentences confirming doctrines which were only concocted three to five centuries *after* Paul's death!

In the light of this, all references to a "redeemer" or a "gospel of Christ", and phrases like "God's Son Jesus Christ our Lord", "Christ died for us", or "through Jesus Christ our Lord" or "in Christ Jesus", "body and blood of the Lord", and so on, are nothing but the drivel Catholicism intended for devotees, in order to produce mass-hysteria; to bludgeon them into docile submission and to stifle all and every doubt or criticism under threat of excommunication!

At no time did Paul preach the sophistries and absurdities of orthodox Christianity, for Paul himself says that he was indebted to the Greeks for their wisdom; and what he expounds in that 15th Chapter to the Corinthians entirely coincides with ideas expressed in Plato's *Timaeus*.

The "brethren" to whom he was writing were *not* Christians, but Hellenic Jews and proselytes who would be quite able to understand his reference to the prevailing Jewish custom of blowing the ritualistic ram's horn at the passing of a co-religionist at his deathbed.

What Paul wanted to make clear was that, according to ideas *prevalent at the time* in which he was living, a man was credited with changing from a mortal to an "immortal being" within a second of his death.

That is the underlying reason why, first, the Roman Catholic Church (and then all other denominations following the Catholic lead) selected the 15th Chapter of First Corinthians as being most suitable for the funeral service.

However, it *had* to be altered, in order to imply a *future* "resurrection day" with an archangel (Gabriel) blowing a trumpet and, after that, his opening, by remote control, all the graves of "believers" — but leaving the skeletons of wicked unbelievers in their dark graves to further rot away, without the solace of meeting their "saviour and redeemer" and, perhaps, receiving an MBE (Most Believing Elders) and being allowed to sit on the right side of him, together with the goats.

It is, perhaps, not universally known that not only Roman Catholics, but also Anglicans and students of other denominations, are obliged to buy only those dictionaries and reference books that are "approved" by their authorities. In other words, it is made most difficult for them to find out the unlimited misleading statements of their superiors.

Thus, if the Hebrew word "Sho'far" was, ages ago, translated as "trump" and not as "ram's horn", the student would be prevented from stumbling to the true and rational explanation and would, for the rest of his life, still harbour the old indoctrinated orthodox falsehoods.

In the days of Paul, the secrets of the highly cultured Gnostics (the word means "knowers") were only imparted to privileged groups. What gave the impetus to the spread of Christianity in the 3rd and 4th century? In the main, it was the popular resentment and hostility of the uneducated masses against the "exclusiveness" of those groups of cultured Gnostics.

As a matter of expediency and in order to gain

adherents, the early Church fathers gradually corrupted the profound philosophies of the Greeks and reduced the sublime teachings of those giants of intellect to the vulgar level of the adherents of the, then, newly manufactured creed. The latter's main attraction was the inclusion of an "instant-saviour" as a means of escape from the plebs' lowly economic lot and also, because the masses wanted a political liberator who, together with a religious message, would give them a utopian regime in world affairs.

In order to come back to the funeral service with its blowing of a ram's horn, we have to skip over a great number of centuries and see what happened to the Jews in Byzantium, Greece, Macedonia and other districts when Christian intolerance drove them out.

When Christian intolerance drove the Jews out of the Holy Roman Empire, the Moors in Hispania offered them refuge and freedom from religious persecution. This was an astute move for, in complete collaboration with the artistic Moors, the highly cultured refugees from Greece and the Balkans, turned the Spanish peninsula into one of the most advanced countries in Europe. The arts, sciences and industry flourished there as nowhere else and, even today, the remains of Moorish architecture are still a delight to tourists visiting Spain.

Those Jewish refugees from Greece, the Balkans and Asia Minor were the descendants of the "brethren" to whom Paul wrote his letters and, quite naturally, they retained the same burial customs as their ancestors in the above countries.

Alas, though, the wheel of fate turned once more; Spain and Portugal were gradually conquered by Christian emperors, and ecclesiastical overbearance degenerated into terrorism of the worst kind. Religious mania instituted the Inquisition, and people were tortured into confessions of "crimes" which they had never committed. Non-Catholics were forced to be baptised or to leave the country.

Many Jews fled to Holland and England, where they founded separate communities which differed greatly from the Ashkenasis or "Westerners", the German, Polish and Russian Jews. The Spanish-Portuguese Jews are called Sephardim ("sephar" means book); in other words they were the "book-people" or studious men, and there is no doubt that they are highly cultured and still retain a certain grandeur and refinement, reminiscent of an illustrious past.

In the days of Paul, the ram's horn was blown when a man died, as a kind of farewell. Nowadays, this honour is reserved for the funeral of a rabbi of the Spanish-Portuguese congregation, and the short fanfare is blown at the graveside and not in the death-chamber, as in Paul's day.

It will now be clear that the Christian Church turned this simple ceremony into one of the most senseless dogmas in her rather formidable catalogue of pious deceptions.

The uneducated masses who had no access to books and, in any case, could not read or write, were told that there would be a corporeal "resurrection-day" in a dim and distant future when a mystical Christ and Saviour would judge them.

It is truly amazing what constant propaganda and brain-washing can do, for even in our very much more enlightened days, millions of church-people accept such a puerile doctrine which, if it had been recounted in *Gulliver's*

(Concluded on page 236)

This Believing World

A SPECIAL stamp has been designed to mark the centenary of the founding of the Salvation Army, and it will soon let the world know how highly honoured is its religion of "Blood and Fire" in England. Or perhaps, it is not its childish view of Christianity (which has generally been derided by the Establishment) but its "social services", and its capacity for money-making on sound business lines. We can however give it some credit for dealing with poverty and misery where most other organisations have failed.

★

ALL THE same, the picture drawn for us of the Salvation Army at work with the down-and-outs by the late George Orwell in his *Down and Out in Paris and London*, is not one which it would like to perpetuate, or one which TV and radio would care to dramatise. Orwell claimed that Salvation Army shelters, though clean, were far drearier than the worst of the common lodging houses, which were themselves pretty awful. Orwell's *1984* was given world-wide publicity but not many people know that he wrote about the "Army". It would never do to publicise his terrible picture of religion and social service mixing in the name of "our blessed Lord".

★

NOT ALL faith or spirit healing comes from Spiritualists. For example, the *People* (4/7/65) gives us particulars of the case of a Mrs. Pike who was blind, and had to walk with a stick. Hospitals could not help her; her case was "hopeless"; so eventually she went to a service held by the Divine Religious Healers, and "knelt before a faith-healing minister and prayed". On opening her eyes, "she could see". The Rev. A. Tee of the Elim Church remembered her case well. One of his ministers simply put his hands on Mrs. Pike, and prayed with her, and (Mr. Tee added), "we were privileged to witness one of God's miracles". What a pity it is that God has not cured more of the many millions of other blind people in the world.

★

SO, AFTER all, Professor Fred Hoyle who as an astronomer and physicist, made mincemeat of the Bible's account of Creation, and who threatened to leave England if he was not given a special institute for his work, has got what he wanted! From it, he will be able to continue his work in demolishing religion and advancing Freethought—though he may not call it that. His "steady state" theory of "continuous creation" has no need at all for God. Yet our bishops and priests cling to the primitive idea, and our Members of Parliament argue that children should—for their own good—be taught the dear old faith of their fathers.

★

AFTER all the ballyhoo about not blaming the modern Jews as it always did the ancient Jews, for the crucifixion of Jesus, the Vatican has "shelved" the "not guilty" verdict altogether (*The Observer*, 20/6/65). After all every Christian in history really believed Jews, ancient and modern, are guilty, and such belief simply cannot be shelved. After Bishop Carli of Segni, affirmed "the collective responsibility of the Jewish people, past and present, for the Crucifixion of Christ", what else could the Vatican do? And so long as people stick to the New Testament story, so long will Jews be blamed for the crucifixion.

SPECIAL OFFER to readers of this paper. The Autobiography of Major Christopher Draper, DSC., entitled *The Mad Major*. First published in 1962 at 25/-. A limited number offered at 10/- post paid. 230 pages fully illustrated and autographed from C. Draper, 2 Conway Street, London, W.1.

WHY NOT SECULARISM?

(Concluded from page 234)

members of the National Secular Society? Does secularism conjure up a quite out-of-date attack on the Bible and Christianity?

If anybody imagines that Bradlaugh and Holyoake as well as many of their followers were unable to attack "Holy Writ" except by ignorant abuse, he should read what they said, and how they debated. Bradlaugh must have spent many years in compiling his *Genesis* which, it may surprise those who know him by name only, and have never read him, is a work of genuine scholarship and painstaking research. They should read the two debates Holyoake had with Brewin Grant, and if they are philosophically minded, read the debates Bradlaugh held with the Rev. W. M. Westerby—regarded as his best by J. M. Robertson—and with W. R. Browne, MA on "Miracles". And here is the opinion of Professor Flint in his book *Anti-Theistic Theories*;

There is an impression in some quarters that Atheism is advocated in a weak or unskilful manner by the chiefs of Secularism. It is an impression which I do not share. Most of the writers who are striving to diffuse Atheism in literary circles are not to be compared in intellectual strength with either Mr. Holyoake or Mr. Bradlaugh.

Why, I repeat should we change the word "secularism"? Next year is the National Secular Society's centenary, and we want to show how solidly behind the word we still are. As a veteran of the movement, I not only see no necessity for any change, but am proud still to be an active Secularist.

THE LAST POST

(Concluded from page 235)

Travels, would have been dismissed with a smile.

But, because it is chanted by a long-faced cleric, sporting a outsize cross dangling from an immense chain, it is uncritically accepted, such acceptance being mainly determined by mental laziness and crass ignorance.

For, if people would only use their brains for a few minutes, they would immediately realise how much such an unnatural act would be in direct opposition to physical laws.

We know now that the deliberately mistranslated "last trump" was a weekly, historical occurrence in Paul's days, quite on a par to our "Last Post" at military funerals. And in the Church's game of dogmatical trickery, it has turned out to be not a "trump", but a card-sharper's fake.

NOW IN PAPERBACK

ALL THINGS NEW

DR. ANNE BIEZANEK

The controversial book by the young woman Roman Catholic doctor—mother of seven children—who here explains why she defied the Church she loves in order to practise and teach scientific birth control.

Available from THE FREETHINKER Bookshop, price 3s. 6d. plus postage.

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

and the

THOMAS PAINE SOCIETY

AN OUTING

to Lewes, Sussex, on Sunday, July 25th, 1965

including a visit to Paine's house.

Coach leaves central London at 9.30 a.m.

Return fare and Lunch £1.

Apply: National Secular Society, 103 Borough Street, London, S.E.1. Telephone: HOP 2717.

THE FREETHINKER

103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, S.E.1

Telephone: HOP 0029

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 USA and Canada: One year, \$5.25; half-year, \$2.75; three months, \$1.40.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

Items for insertion in this column must reach THE FREETHINKER office at least ten days before the date of publication.

OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Branch NSS (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. J. W. BARKER, L. EBURY, J. A. MILLAR and C. E. WOOD.

(Tower Hill). Every Thursday, 12-2 p.m.: L. EBURY.

Manchester Branch NSS (Car Park, Victoria Street), Sunday Evenings.

Merseyside Branch NSS (Pierhead)—Meetings: Wednesdays, 1 p.m.: Sundays, 3 p.m. and 7.30 p.m.

North London Branch NSS (White Stone Pond, Hampstead)—Every Sunday, noon: L. EBURY. Every Friday, 8 p.m.: L. EBURY and J. A. MILLAR.

Nottingham Branch NSS (Old Market Square), every Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

INDOOR

Birmingham Branch NSS (Midland Institute, Paradise Street), Sunday, July 25th, 6.45 p.m.: T. DAWES SMITH, "The World's Greatest Deception".

Notes and News

A SAD letter from John Shephard, founder of the Sunday Freedom League, informs us that he must temporarily suspend his anti-LDOS activities, because of a serious accident to his son and helper, David, needing a delicate operation to the brain. When Mr. Shephard wrote (on July 11th), David had been unconscious for a week and was still gravely ill, but there had been a slight improvement in his condition. And Mr. Shephard records "how wonderful people have been to my wife and me . . . giving us courage to face this ordeal, proving what humanism can do in times of trial and crisis, and illustrating that mankind is, at rock bottom, good and kind". Mr. Shephard also says lightheartedly that he can hear the cheers from some of our readers that they may not hear from him for a while. We know that we speak for all our readers in expressing our sympathy to Mr. Shephard and our hopes for his son's recovery. We look forward to their return to our pages.

★
"IF IT were not for what they discover about the Christian faith in our schools, most growing boys would know precious little about it", wrote the Rev. John Chicken, Vicar of St. Paul's, Whitley Bay, in the *Newcastle Evening Chronicle* (14/6/65). And there were, he went on, "strong vocal groups" who wanted to see a completely "secular pattern of education" in this country; they wanted to do away with morning prayers and to see the teaching of the Christian "truths" removed from school timetables. This obviously presented an awful prospect for a conscientious clergyman like Mr. Chicken: what hope would there be

for his religion if it were missing from school as well as home? Fortunately, a suitable report is to hand—that of the National Society, a body established 154 years ago in the Church of England for the promotion of religious education. It finds there is little public demand for a change.

★

TO GIVE him his due, Mr. Chicken tried to be fair. The lack of public demand may, he admitted, be no more than "an expression of a generally held apathy about religion". We agree with him—and the report—that it is more probable that the majority of parents want their children to be brought up in "an atmosphere where Christianity is presented as a way of life". The false identification of Christianity and morality is, as we all know, extremely hard to eradicate. It is also hard for a Christian vicar to be fair on the subject of R.I. Children should be free to accept or reject Christianity, "later on", said Mr. Chicken, "but in their formative years at school they should be so educated that they have a proper basis on which to make their own decisions". And, he added, we should see that they continue "to enjoy their right to learn about the truths of the Christian religion". By indoctrination in their "formative years!"

★

TWO interesting snippets caught our eye in the first episode of Arthur M. Schlesinger's memoirs of President Kennedy in the *Sunday Times* (11/7/65). Before the presidential election, someone phoned on behalf of a Knights of Columbus bowling team. Kennedy, who didn't answer the phone, whispered, "Tell them I've gone out. If I don't have their votes, I might as well give up". On another occasion, he spoke at Cardinal Spellman's Al Smith dinner. The audience had been strongly pro-Nixon, and Kennedy was ironically entertained, we are told, by "the fact that the wealthy Catholics obviously preferred a conservative Quaker to a liberal of their own faith". It all goes to show, the future President commented, "that when the chips are down money counts more than religion".

★

THE growth of the German Humanist Union—under the direction of Gerhard Szczesny, author of *The Future of Unbelief*—has Christian leaders worried, the *Catholic Herald* reported (9/7/65). The Union, "an organisation of intellectual atheists", is "growing day by day", and it is finding most of its followers among "students, artists and professors". It was concentrating on intellectuals, said a Franciscan priest, Father Tupec, so that "eventually it would be able to spread its influence among all citizens". The Union has strongly opposed a concordat on education drawn up this year between the Holy See and the German state of Lower Saxony. While most Germans are Catholic or Protestant in name, a lot of them have left the churches. Isn't it unfair, Szczesny asks, that Christian Churches have influence and prestige far beyond their due? "They receive tax exemptions. They are supported by the government. Their officials sit on nearly all government censorship boards. In the world they command great power, but inside they are weak, shorn of members".

★

THE JULY anniversary story in the *Bolton Evening News* on July 3rd, was the Tennessee "Monkey Trial", which took place on July 10th, 1925. "The great trial began—science v. the Bible", the paper headlined. "Would progress win?" it asked. Today, 40 years after the trial, Tennessee still has not repealed its notorious anti-evolution law, a classic example, as the *Evening News* remarked, of "the curtain of dogma being drawn across the window of science".

Souls in Conflict

A SHORT STORY

By P. BULLOUGH

"HE WHO would find his soul must first of all lose it", said the Gnome with the long white beard.

"Surely this is some kind of game, is it not?" asked the Brown Cow, flicking away the flies with her tail. "Why should he want to lose it in the first place merely in order to perhaps experience the pleasure of finding it again. Come to think of it, he wouldn't experience any pleasure at all if he knew that it wasn't really lost in the first place".

"A perfectly logical consideration too, if I may say so", said the Owl. "There is the essence of simplicity in your observation my friend: providing of course that one considers one's soul in the light of one's bowler hat or artificial dentures".

"That is all very well", said the Mechanical Hare, running around in circles and flapping his ears in exasperation. "How is it possible to lose something that no-one can define in the first place? What is a soul in the light of modern scientific thought, this is what I would like to know?"

"That is a question that is easily answered", barked the Walrus, majestically. "One has merely to study the teachings of Christian faith in order to see clearly that the soul of man is the form of man in his 'after-life', and in order to find perfection of the soul in the 'after-life', he must of necessity spend the whole of his earthly existence in preparing for the advent of perfection by denying all claim to earthly material things".

"Balderdash!, Fiddlesticks and poppycock", shouted the Mechanical Hare; sniffing furiously. "Nothing but unqualified mystical humbug, and self-hypnotic escapism from the complications of reality. Anybody with any imagination and scientific knowledge at all must know that there cannot possibly be an 'after-life!' any such possible existence has been discredited by the invention and use of the revolutionary electronic soul-detecting machine. Perhaps one or other of you have heard tell of it?"

"Come to think of it, I do remember reading something concerned with the workings of such a machine as this in the *TT Times*", said the Brown Cow, rubbing her hide against the side of a tree. "Wasn't the machine being used by the Psychic Research investigators in their work on the detection of the soul at the moment of the death of the human body?"

"Yes, that's right! The results of the investigation prove beyond any shadow of doubt that there is no evacuation of any description from a body at the time of death. This goes to prove my theory that belief in the existence of an 'after-life' is merely superstition, and the outcome of ignorance", replied the Mechanical Hare jubilantly.

"Sacrilege!", bellowed the Walrus, drawing himself to his full height of seven feet, six and a half inches; his moustache bristling with indignation. "A fig for your scientific methods and investigations! How *dare* you suggest that this infernal contraption is the be-all and end-all of soul detection. These tests you speak of prove nothing outside of the ignorance of the people who undertake the investigations". Muttering to himself angrily the Walrus sat down on a large stone and looked at the Gnome for approval.

It is, however, the Owl who breaks the short embarrassing silence that follows the emotional outburst of the

Walrus. "Come! Come! my friends; let us not lose ourselves in the wilderness of emotional egotism in the search for the truth concerning our souls. The wilderness of ego is a barren place compared to the garden of humility in the search for truth: therefore let us seek in the place more likely to provide the seeds of truth".

"Doubtless you mean well even though you do speak in riddles, dear Owl", said the Brown Cow. "The seeds of truth as I see them aren't found in a wilderness either, but I often find them on the trees in the farmer's garden when he is out of the way. There's nothing like a juicy apple to buck you up when you're feeling a bit under the weather and that's the truth as I see it: but please don't tell the farmer about me will you!"

"Capital! Capital! There is indeed the essence of simplicity in your philosophy, my uncomplicated friend", said the Gnome with the long white beard, giving a deep chuckle. "Even though it was not my intention to create such a controversy among you when I was merely reflecting upon the subject of 'souls' at the start of these proceedings, I think you will all agree that we have all learned a little something about science and humanism in the process".

"I for one cannot agree to having learned anything", snorted the Walrus. "I certainly don't follow your association of science and humanism. To my mind there is no connection at all between the two: the gulf is as wide as chalk and cheese".

"Corn and peas!" said the Brown Cow, dreamily licking the bark of a fallen log. "I love peas: especially the farmer's. I remember the last time I was in the garden among the vegetables when the farmer was away at market. I . . ." "Shut up and go back to sleep", broke in the Mechanical Hare irritably. "This is a very serious discussion and we haven't got time to waste on inane chatter".

"There is a great deal of truth in what you say, dear Walrus. There is indeed a gulf between the phenomena of science and humanism", said the Owl, chewing away at a piece of straw. "The gulf that separates the two would appear to exist only in the minds of men. We see in the mass of mankind an ignorance of either one or other of the two subjects. We have on the one hand, invariably; a scientist who knows next to nothing of humanism; and on the other a humanist who knows next to nothing of science. This is of course, not forgetting the majority of people who know nothing of either one or the other" . . . "I put it to you my friends: where is the man qualified in both the understanding of science and humanism? Any one man with such knowledge does not belong among mortals and can be found nowhere in a universe within the bounds of mankind".

"I don't agree. One such man was born on this earth nearly two thousand years ago; born the son of God and the keeper of souls", reverently replied the Walrus. "This man knew all things and laid down a code of living for all humanity to follow in order that each man may save his soul in the life hereafter".

"Nonsense", said the Mechanical Hare. "This son of God, whom you so emotionally describe, with a true knowledge of all things in the universe in all its inestimable complexity; was none other than an outstanding intellectual with a vision far removed from the normal and a

desire for the idealistic understanding of the human being by the human being. His theories were far removed from actual realism in his own generation, or any other generation for that matter. In fact, they were rationally impossible in any perceivable sphere of time".

"True! True!" said the Gnome quietly. "Where a theorist such as yourself is merely dealing with science and technology the time-lag between theory and practical reality is comparatively negligible when measured against the time-lag that is envisaged in the changes in the mass of humanity from the jungle state of ethics to the utopian state of 'universal brotherhood of man!' So far as human understanding is concerned, the Siamese twins among humanity are really the only two persons with anything in common with regard to mutual understanding, and until the whole of humanity become as one with the Siamese twins there can be no humanitarian utopia. This is, of course, a measure for all conceivable time as our friend the Hare so rightly points out" . . . "A double yolked egg is a much more intimate fruit than two single yolked ones, but I cannot imagine any hen laying all her yolks in the same shell".

"A very good analogy too, if I may say so", said the Owl. "It is easy to see that the measure of advancement in any particular field is proportional to the understanding of the advance by the mass".

"Aren't we wandering away from the original point in question? If my memory serves me correctly that point concerned the 'soul of man'", mumbled the Brown Cow, reaching up to pull down an acorn.

"Ah yes! Of course! A most appropriate observation too", said the Owl, hooting his approval. "We appear to have started well along the highway of 'souls' and lost our way at the cross-roads of philosophy and mass psychology".

"I'm not surprised!" growled the Mechanical Hare, his nose twitching with anger and his eyes changing colour like traffic lights. "No wonder we've lost the point in question. What else can we expect when our moronic friend the Brown Cow is chasing around the farmer's orchard filling her stomach all the time, and our pseudo-humanitarian comrade with the moustache is trying to lead us up the garden path alongside his own hypnotised mind. It's enough to cause a Hare to turn over in his time-cycles and destroy his computer".

"How dare you Sir! I . . .", the Walrus splutters, sneezes, changes three shades of purple and sits down with a bump beside the Brown Cow. "I . . . words fail me . . . Damn your impertinence Sir!"

"Now! Now! Now! take it easy! Steady now! watch your blood pressure", said the Brown Cow, turning around and rubbing her nose gently over the head of the Walrus. "I'm sure the Hare didn't really mean to upset you like this. What he says doesn't mean a thing to me, I'm far too ignorant to know anything about souls anyway. Ah! that reminds me . . . I wonder what my friend Daisy did with those pieces of fish she found in the barn last night? I hope she hasn't eaten them all: I must go and find out". So saying, the Brown Cow wanders away vaguely in the direction of the barn-yard.

"Well! Well! Dear me! We have indeed learned quite a lot about science and humanism since we started out in search for souls", said the Owl.

"Yes! We do at least come to the conclusion that the emotions and reasoning qualities of our sanctimonious friend the Walrus are of different value from those of our mechanical friend the Hare: neither lending themselves to a co-ordinated effort in the search for the truth about souls. The sanctimonious cog doesn't fit into the mechani-

cal wheel, so to speak. And yet! Come to think of it; each is an essential cog in the wheel of time", replied the Gnome.

"That's it! The wheel of time!" screeched the Owl, jumping up and down and flapping his wings with excitement. "The wheel of time is the reference point in the study of both science and humanism. Science cannot be studied separately without at the same time studying humanism if we are to get a clear picture of the two; and our knowledge of both is proportional to the natural speed of revolution of the wheel of time. The inability to realise this prime factor is the root of our trouble".

"Perhaps we have also discovered the true definition of 'soul' into the bargain", replied the Gnome, thoughtfully stroking his whiskers. "Could it possibly be that 'self' and 'soul' are one and the same thing; and in order to find our souls in this context we must first of all look for their rightful place in the scheme of *all* things that are knowable to mankind? In this way we *lose* our souls in the first place, and then find them again in their *true* perspective as a very small and unimportant part of the transcending scheme of things as a whole". Turns to the Owl. "The whole theory being 'relative to time' of course, my very dear friend".

And peace and quite reigned once again around the old oak tree at the far end of the orchard.

POAU APPEALS FOR SUPPORT

IN a letter dated June 1st, appealing for support, POAU (Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State) reminds us that:

"Catholics are taking advantage of the war on poverty to bolster meagre administrative staffs at their schools". That's what the Evansville, Indiana *Press* said March 10th, and that's about right. The Kansas City *Star*, March 9th, announced that daily vacation schools would be run in Guadalupe, Annunciation-St. Vincent and St. Aloysius parishes July 5th at the expense of the Federal Government. These missions of the Church will be supported by taxpayers. This is the aid-to-parish programme now contemplated in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Philadelphia, New Haven and El Paso, as well as Kansas City and Evansville.

Here is a new threat to church-state separation. Obviously, we must challenge the constitutionality of such expenditures. Our lawyers are studying three situations.

The struggle continues on other fronts. We have gone to trial in Mercer County, Ohio. We have lost the first round in *Horace Mann v. Tawes*. (We are substantial supporters of this Maryland case which is marked for the US Supreme Court). We are ready to file in Colorado.

In seven states we have been in the press, on TV and radio, in public and church meetings, seeking to counter clerical pressures for public funds. Critical states have been Ohio, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Minnesota and counties of Maryland.

The letter is signed by Glenn L. Archer, the Executive Director of POAU.

CORRESPONDENCE

JOSEPHUS AND JESUS

I do wish Mr. Goodman would not present opinions as mine which are not. He writes (THE FREETHINKER, June 18th): "I should like to point out that no scholar of any standing has ever doubted that the passage in Josephus is an interpolation . . .". Will Mr. Goodman kindly show me at what point in my letter published May 28th, I state that the passage is not an interpolation? If he refers back he will find that I was drawing attention to a point made by another writer in the same issue of THE FREETHINKER that contained his article. The writer in question, F. A. Ridley, conceded that Josephus did refer to Jesus.

The important point about Josephus is not whether the passage is an interpolation but that one appears—in fact there are two passages the second not being disputed by historians "of any standing". Georges Ory in his pamphlet *An Analysis of Christian Origins* states that "both these [references] are interpolations". He does not give any documentation for the statement, perhaps this suggests a degree of uncertainty in particular with the second passage. Herbert Cutner in his book *Jesus—God, Man or Myth?* rejects both passages (pp.103-106), but his reasons for doing so

lack conviction in that he states it is an interpolation in both cases (without much if any documentation) and thus indirectly presents it as evidence for the historicity rather than against. Indeed the same author on page 3 of the work referred to all but admits that behind the Gospels there is an historic figure. Joseph McCabe, another leading Secularist historian, makes no bones in his little work *Did Jesus Ever Exist?* as to the historicity of Jesus. McCabe referring to the disputed passage in Josephus, writes (p.36): "It seems to me not unlikely that he [the author of the passage as it now stands] found there a reference to Jesus . . .". Another Rationalist, the late Archibald Robertson, in his book *The Origins of Christianity*, is also an out and out historicist in that he argues in favour of a passage in Josephus and in relation to the second passage states that it "may be genuine". Genuine be it noted as it stands.

I have extended the above point to impress on Mr. Goodman that I do not dispute that the main passage in Josephus is an interpolation; what I do assert is that *there was a passage* and that the second passage must also be considered, and that there are not textual grounds for rejecting it. I look forward to Mr. Goodman's article on Josephus, though I suspect I know his points in advance. In conclusion I would like to draw his attention to two other writers, both Secularists. Dr. M. A. Larson in his massive recent work *The Religion of the Occident*, London, 1960, bluntly states on page 306 that the passage in Josephus on James and Jesus is genuine, while F. H. Amphlett Micklewright in the concluding passage of his most interesting book *Catholicism and the Need for Revolution*, refers to ". . . the central fact of world history", as being "the Word became flesh".

(Rev.) C. STROTHER, FAES,
Secretary, The Saint Osmund Society.

NEW MORALITY OR NONE AT ALL

I am grateful to Mrs. Ebury for her compliments, but I do not know what she is complaining about. We seem to be in complete agreement on all points! In fact if Mrs. Ebury does me the favour of rereading my article, she will see that my arguments can be boiled down to three main propositions:—

1. Unwanted babies—real live ones that bawl and leak, as well as metaphorical ones—are a tragedy. This is so both for their own sakes and for the lives of student parents who have yet to make their way.

2. Some students in our universities are having unwanted babies, and reactionary Christians are trying to impress the idea on an important Commission that this is because the students have rejected "Christian" morality.

3. *Not* having unwanted babies is merely common sense (*pace* Lord Chorley) and what the Christian Churches have called *their* morality is nothing else than everybody's—yours and mine, Gillian Hawtin's and Mrs. Ebury's—common sense. Morality is common sense, I want morality taken away from the Churches and given back to the people, shorn of dogmatism.

Don't call me a Reverent Humanist, Mrs. Ebury. I claim to be humane, but am utterly irreverent. What I said was that clean, simple, decent living is completely possible without any form of Christian morality.

I happen to like babies—in families and born of stable marital relationships. What concerns me, and it should be concerning all Freethinkers, is that students in Oxford and elsewhere, don't know enough about birth-control methods and are begetting children before they can form such stable marital unions. I was merely concerned that the only "evidence" on the matter should come from the other side, and amounts to a cock and bull story that "loose" behaviour is to be equated with rejection of supernatural religion.

My article was written to rebut this, and to try to prove the opposite. Perhaps it would have done more good if I had written to the Frank's Commission direct. I am certain it would do good if Atheists, instead of attacking each other, were to complain to the commission along these lines, and to do a bit of counter-propaganda among the students.

GILLIAN HAWTIN

Just Issued

FREETHOUGHT AND HUMANISM IN SHAKESPEARE

By DAVID TRIBE

"A most perceptive, acute and entirely valid analysis of Shakespeare as a humanist"—HAROLD PINTER

Price 2s. 6d. plus postage 4d.

from THE FREETHINKER BOOKSHOP
103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1.

NCCL

Your correspondent, W. R. Nicholson (2/7/65) objects to the NCCL and CND getting any publicity in THE FREETHINKER. The first is primarily concerned with injustices affecting individuals—even atheists! The second is concerned to alert public opinion against the possession and threat of nuclear weapons. Surely everyone, with the possible exception of "God-fearing Atheists" and "priestly-minded libertarians", would support this object. I would ask Mr. Nicholson to remove the fetters from his "libertarian" mind which seems to be constricted within a very narrow circle of freedom of thought which he mistakes for atheism, and begin—he should have done it long ago—to inform himself of what is involved in being a Freethinker, secularist and atheist.

As intellectual exercises they have their limitations and confusions unless anchored to the positive ideas of *social* struggle to higher levels of civilised living—for all! In other words, politics! People like Mr. Nicholson, be they ever so iconoclastic and libertarian are more a menace to enlightenment than the religious people they so roundly condemn. I would ask him to consider that very few people think of God in the sky or anywhere else. It's a myth and as such carries little weight in reality. But the iconoclastic base on which it rests is something which, because it is reality, dominates individuals and society. It is rather ironical to witness the spectacle of many clergymen being more advanced in thought—on God and divinity—than your "atheistic" scribe who adds slander to his illiteracy by stating at the end of his silly effusion: "Which are as valueless as a trade unionist's signature".

Perhaps, Mr. Nicholson didn't need to work for his living, therefore, didn't need to be a trade unionist.

CHARLES DORAN.

NEW PAPERBACKS

SCIENCE FICTION

Fifth Planet: *Fred and Geoffrey Hoyle* 3s. 6d.
The Space Merchants: *Frederick Pohl and C. M. Kornbluth* 3s. 6d.

More Than Human: *Theodore Sturgeon* 3s. 6d.
Journey to the Centre of the Earth: *Jules Verne,*
Trans. Robert Baldick 3s. 6d.

Cat's Cradle: *Kurt Vonnegut* 3s. 6d.

NON-FICTION

London Nobody Knows: *Geoffrey S. Fletcher* 6s.

Sir Walter Raleigh: *Norman Lloyd Williams* 5s.

CRIME

The China Governess: *Margery Allingham* 4s.

Give the Boys a Great Big Hand: *Ed McBain* 3s. 6d.

PELICANS

The City: *Paul Ferris* (Re-issue) 4s. 6d.

Death and Life of Great American Cities, The Failure of

Town Planning: *Jane Jacobs* 8s. 6d.

Exploration in Management: *Wilfred Brown* 6s.

Garibaldi and the Thousand: *G. M. Trevelyan* 8s. 6d.

Government of Education: *W. O. Lester Smith* 3s. 6d.

Historical Interpretation: *J. J. Bagley* 6s.

The Queen's Government: *Sir Ivor Jennings* (Re-issue) 3s. 6d.

Short History of the World: *H. G. Wells* (Re-issue) 5s.

Tradition and Dream: *Walter Allen* 6s.

Witchcraft: *Pennethorne Hughes* 5s.

CLASSICS

Plutarch: Makers of Rome: *Trans. Ian Scott-Kilvert* 7s. 6d.

Poems of the late T'Ang: *Trans. Dr. A. Graham* 4s.

WEST AFRICAN SERIES

Life of Azikiwe: *K. A. B. Jones-Quartey* 5s

AFRICAN LIBRARY

South Africa's Hostages: *Jack Halpern* 8s. 6d.

PLAYS

Two Plays: Lucifer and the Lord, and The Respectable Prostitute:
Jean-Paul Sartre. Trans. Kitty Black 3s. 6d.

POETRY

Penguin Book of Elizabethan Verse: *Ed. Edward Lucie-Smith* 5s.

Plus postage from THE FREETHINKER BOOKSHOP
103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1.

Frauds, Forgeries and Relics by G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler.
(An excerpt from *Crimes of Christianity*) Price 1s. plus postage 4d.

from THE FREETHINKER Bookshop

103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1.

Details of membership of the National Secular Society and inquiries regarding bequests and secular funeral services may be obtained from the General Secretary, 103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1. Telephone: HOP 2717.