

The Freethinker

Volume LXXXV—No. 46

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Sixpence

THE recent visit of Pope Paul to the USA, constitutes undoubtedly an important development in the new papal strategy inaugurated by his predecessor, Pope John. For whilst medieval popes moved freely about Europe, since the counter-reformation, popes have only left Rome under duress—as, for example, when Pope Pius VII was forcibly abdicated and kept under “house arrest” in France by Napoleon until the latter’s downfall in 1814. In particular, since the incorporation of the Papal States into Italy in 1870, the popes have remained obstinately shut up as prisoners of what is now the Vatican City.

By his successive visits to Jerusalem, India, and now the USA, Pope Paul VI has decisively broken with the post-Reformation tradition. Perhaps after all there is something in a name, for was not St. Paul pre-eminently in ecclesiastical tradition, the Apostle to the Gentiles?

India versus Pakistan

This is hardly the place to deal in any detail with the long term aspects of this new papal grand strategy. For here is a veritable counter-reformation inaugurated by the late Pope John; the counter-reformation of the 20th century—against atheism and no longer merely Protestantism. This counter-reformation is being continued by Pope Paul—albeit with a less dynamic personality than his predecessor—and the papal trip to New York was undoubtedly part of it.

However, the actual reason—or excuse—for the Pope’s flying visit to the UN, is also somewhat ironic. Its ostensible purpose was to end the war between India and Pakistan, a war caused ultimately by religion if ever there was one.

Muslim versus Hindu

It is true that the immediately operative *casus belli* between India and Pakistan, was a secular one. But the ambiguity involved in the political question as to whether Kashmir should ultimately accede to India or Pakistan is really a religious one. For, prior to 1947, the native state of Kashmir was ruled (under the suzerainty of the Anglo-Indian Raj) by an Indian maharajah of Hindu antecedents, Sir Hari Singh (who in the early 1920s made a sensational appearance in the London courts) who however, ruled over a predominantly Muslim population. But in any case, the very fact of the creation of Pakistan in 1947 was religious. Had India only possessed a single creed—whether Hindu or Muslim—the war over Kashmir would not have eventuated.

Divide and Rule

For ever since the end of the British Raj, the old Indian Empire has been artificially divided into two rival and bitterly hostile states: India (Bharat) and Pakistan, and the latter name spells the whole programme in itself. For Pakistan means “the land of the pure”; that is, of the (Muslim) True Believers in direct contrast to the Hindu Kaffirs (i.e. infidels) across the Indian border; a Muslim theocracy in which church and state are ultimately united by a sacrosanct legal code dictated by Allah in the Koran

to his holy prophet, Mohammed. Pakistan is historically merely the last of a series of Muslim states established as the result of the jihad (holy war) upon the infidel soil of (Hindu) India, which included the predecessors of England as rulers of the Indian sub-continent, the Moghul Empire of Delhi (c. 1550-1800).

The creation of the exclusively Muslim state of Pakistan—accompanied by appalling religious pogroms, massacres of religious minorities on both sides of the India-Pakistan border—was ultimately due to belief in that time-honoured policy of divide and rule, ultimately upon religious grounds. England, which a generation earlier had divided Ireland between Catholic

and Protestant Ulster, in 1947 divided the Indian sub-continent between predominantly Hindu India and exclusively Muslim Pakistan; a division which would surely have delighted the heart of the original “Old Nick”, Niccolò Machiavelli himself.

And it is worth noting that, whilst the Indian Muslim leader, Jinnah, and his co-religionists in the Muslim League had been agitating for the creation of a Muslim state, they did not actually expect to get it, even in the last days of the British Raj. They were actually prepared to settle for self-government in several Indian provinces with predominantly Muslim populations.

Religion and War

The Indo-Pakistan war itself, represents the culmination of a millenium of Hindu-Muslim holy wars since the days of Mahmud of Ghazni, and of the first Muslim invaders of India. To be sure, whilst the indigenous Indian creeds of Hinduism and Buddhism have usually been tolerant religious cults, Islam, the cult of Mohammed and the Koran, like its Jewish predecessor the belligerent Old Testament cult of Jehovah, has always regarded the jihad (holy war) as a normal institution and even as a religious duty. Most Muslim empires from the Arab successors of Mohammed himself (7th century), to the Turkish sultans in Europe and to the Moghuls in India itself, conquered their vast empires by the sword at the expense of infidel regimes.

But it is really rather ironic that Pope Paul should intervene in what is in effect a holy war between Muslims and Hindus. Historically, and precisely with relation to the holy wars, the Christian Churches and the Church of Rome in particular have proved themselves repeatedly to be the most apt pupils of Islam in this very matter of holy wars! For as the German historian Karl Kautsky pointed out long ago, the Christian crusades originated in direct imitation of the Muslim jihad.

From the days of Charlemagne (800 AD), who converted the German Pagans with fire and sword, down to the wars of religion (which were really crusades) against the Protestant Reformation, which culminated in the Thirty Years War (1618-48) by reducing Germany to cannibalism, the Catholic Church has regularly and ruthlessly waged war against “Turks, heretics and unbelievers”, often including

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

The Pope of Peace and Holy Wars

By F. A. RIDLEY

the very Muslims from whom the Church had (according to Kautsky) borrowed the practice of the jihad. I rather doubt, however, whether Pope Paul even alluded to these chapters in the bloodstained annals of his Church in his recent address to the UN.

"Not Peace but a Sword"

If one examines the evolution of Christianity, one will surely be compelled to agree with the titular founder when he stated (or is reputed to have stated) that he came not to bring peace but a sword. For the genuine Christian

apostles of peace of whom we hear so much today—such men as St. Francis, Tolstoy and Schweitzer—have surely been exceptions rather than the rule. One could perhaps add that if Pope Paul is actually what he claims to be—"The Pope of Peace"—he too, is surely in a papal minority; and what is true of Christianity would also seem to be true of religion in general. For such peaceful creeds as, say, Buddhism and Quakerism are also in a minority. As an old Victorian Freethinker once aptly remarked: "Religion has usually added fresh causes of dissension to the troubled annals of the world".

The Philosophy of Predestination

By RUDOLF WILSON

THE Calvinist doctrine of predestination is derived from certain passages in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, notably Rom. 8, 28-30, and 9, 21-23. These may be summarised as follows. All things work for the good of those who love God and have been chosen by him by his purpose. They have been chosen so as to resemble the Son of God. In this way Jesus became the foremost among a band of brothers. These named individuals have been given righteousness and are destined to glory (presumably in heaven). The action of God is compared to that of a potter making vessels from clay. Some of the vessels are formed to receive honour and others dishonour. These latter will eventually suffer the anger of God and be destroyed. The vessels of wrath, destined to destruction, are made by God so that he may demonstrate his power to the other vessels, the vessels of mercy, and so that they may realise the richness of the glory which he has prepared for them.

This statement by Paul explains why both righteous individuals and sinners are to be found among men. It suggests that there can be no changing over of one sort into the other, for God has determined beforehand the nature and eventual destiny of every person. It also makes quite clear what is in store for the righteous on the one hand and the sinners on the other.

The doctrine of predestination raises some interesting problems, in ethics, in philosophy, in psychology.

Assuming you are a Calvinist, and therefore believe what Paul enunciated, you must accept that no matter what you do, what sort of life you lead, your ultimate fate, in the glory of heaven or in the damnation of hell, has already been determined. Why therefore should you trouble to be righteous rather than unrighteous, particularly if being righteous is going to be dull and oppressive, while being unrighteous means having a good time?

If you are an ordinary member of a Calvinist Church, e.g. the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, righteousness implies a definite type of behaviour. It means keeping the ten commandments as interpreted by the Dutch Reformed Church. But it means also, among other things, going to church every Sunday in a black suit and not working in your garden, playing tennis, swimming or going fishing. It means reading a passage in the Bible every night and saying grace before meals. In fact it involves the type of behaviour which we in South Africa attribute to a good "Dopper" or puritan.

What inducement is there to compel the Dopper to behave as he does? Does his conformity to the rules of his religion convince him that he is one of the "vessels of mercy" and not one of the "vessels of wrath"? In fact it does. But how can he be so sure of this?

There is an interesting section in A. J. Ayer's *The Prob-*

lem of Knowledge (Pelican Books) which deals with the philosophical aspects of this question. Ayer is discussing the theory of causation. Logicians tell us that for every effect there are a number, sometimes a very large number of necessary causes. At sea level, pure water in an open vessel on a burning gas ring will boil at 100 deg. C. At the top of Mont Blanc it will, assuming all other necessary conditions are unaltered, boil at 85 deg. C. The sufficient cause of the water boiling at the lower temperature is of course, the reduced atmospheric pressure. Note that in this example cause and effect are thought of as occurring simultaneously without a time sequence being involved.

On the other hand consider a man in hospital with a broken arm. He broke his arm because he slipped on a banana skin. The banana skin was dropped by a boy, who bought some bananas with money his uncle had given him, because it was his birthday, because he was born on a certain date so many years before, because his mother conceived him nine months prior to that date, etc., etc. In this case we think of cause always preceding effect.

But Ayer asks, "Why cannot cause succeed effect?" If the banana skin is a necessary condition of the broken arm, is not the broken arm a sufficient condition of the banana skin? No banana skin, no broken arm; but, equally well, no broken arm, no banana skin! It would seem that only a professional philosopher would get any entertainment out of considering such an odd question.

However, Ayer goes on to say: "Yet surely no one in his senses would set himself to bring about a past event. The only example I can think of is that of certain Calvinists and even this example may be fanciful. It does however explain behaviour which otherwise would seem irrational. Believing, as they did, in predestination, in the sense that their deity had saved or damned them once for all before they were even born, they were nevertheless, on religious grounds, extremely puritanical. They believed that only salvation mattered, and yet they attached great importance to their conduct, while being convinced that it would make no difference to what lay in store for them.

"But now suppose that they also believed that only those whom the deity had elected were capable of being virtuous. In that case, being one of the elect would be a necessary condition for being virtuous, from which it would follow that being virtuous was a sufficient condition of having been chosen one of the elect. If this was their reasoning, then the goal of their puritanism may have lain not in the future but in the past. We may suppose that they abstained from sin in order to *have been saved*".

A psychologist not overmuch concerned with abstruse problems in philosophy could venture a more obvious
(Concluded on page 364)

Neglected Facts About Albert Schweitzer

By E. C. VANDERLAAN

THE TITLE does not hint at any exposure of secrets. It is all there in Schweitzer's book *Out of My Life*. But for some reason all the emphasis, in the comment one saw, was on his career as a doctor in Lambarene, Africa, supposedly a perfect example of the Christian in action. Yet there is ample material for attacks upon him from the side of orthodox Christianity. If there have been any such attacks upon his heresy, they have not come to public notice. Instead all the world wondered (quite rightly) at this theologian, organist and physician who gave up a promising academic career to minister to the most deprived and retarded of our fellow men.

Schweitzer the theologian? Yes, but what a theologian! In the narrowest sense of the word, a theologian is one who expounds and defends doctrines about God. But in a wider sense, especially on the continent of Europe, a theologian is a scholar who deals in any of the subject matter that clusters about theology proper — church history, Christian ethics, critical studies in the history, development and transmission of the Bible, even linguistic studies in Hebrew and Greek. Schweitzer's own speciality in his early years was the attempt to pierce through the tradition about Christ in order to discover the historical facts about the man Jesus. In the course of this investigation he came to views that pretty well threw liberal Protestantism into a panic. If Schweitzer's interpretation was correct, could a modern man be a follower of Jesus at all? We shall see.

What was this liberal Protestantism? First we had better glance at the sad story of orthodox Christianity. The New Testament contains materials to support several different interpretations of Jesus — that he was a man, the son of a carpenter, who taught love of God and men; that God certified him as His messenger by raising him from the dead; that he was a descendant of King David through his father Joseph; that on the contrary he was not the son of Joseph at all but was born of a virgin; that he was a Divine Being who voluntarily came to earth to atone for men's sins by his death; that he was God's agent in the creation of the world.

Under the obligation to believe everything in the Bible men struggled for several centuries to combine all this into one doctrine. How to picture Christ as both divine and human without giving him a double personality? How to make him a Divine Being without endangering monotheism? Earnest and pious men were exiled from their bishoprics as heretics. Bloody riots occurred in the streets over the question: Has Christ one nature or two?

At last, in the Formula of Chalcedon, 451, the official doctrine was established: Christ is one person having two natures; and under peril of damnation, you must not divide the person nor confuse the natures. All clear? It is doubtful whether anyone has ever succeeded in actually holding this doctrine, except verbally. Many a man who thinks himself orthodox falls into one or another of the ancient heresies — he is unconsciously an Apollinarian, or a Monophysite, or a Nestorian, or a Patripassian. Do these names mean nothing to you? Be glad. In any case, the net effect of all this arguing from a false premise was that the man Jesus was transformed into the god Christ.

Now then, at last, what about German liberal theology, which found echoes in other countries? There have always been escapists who in these labyrinths just loved the

Jesus of the parables and the Sermon on the Mount. Especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries arose the conviction that these incomprehensible complexities must be a *mythology*, that behind and within all these spider-webs must stand a real human figure. With considerable assurance, by the aid of a discriminating separation of the legendary and mythological from the credibly historical, men set about discovering the man Jesus. The new slogans were: "Back from St. Paul to Jesus" and "Not the religion *about* Jesus but the religion *of* Jesus". And how glad they were to discover that the real religion of Jesus turned out to be just what a nineteenth-century theologian was still able to believe, roughly the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man!

At this point, enter Albert Schweitzer, himself a product of this liberal theology. He told how in his room at Strasburg, while resisting the attempts of his landlady to clean up his room, he assembled from the university library, on tables and chairs and floor, all the "Lives" of Jesus of the previous hundred and fifty years. He discovered how each author had selected the elements of the picture to suit his own tastes. As many portrayals of "the real Jesus", as authors. All they had in common was the intent to find a Jesus whom modern men could believe in.

This, Schweitzer became convinced, was a mistake. The real Jesus was not a man of our time but of his own. So, in 1910, resulted his great book (English translation, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*). In constructing their varying pictures of the supposed historical Jesus, the liberal interpreters had laid aside just those parts of the traditions which Schweitzer believed to be most essential. When Jesus said: "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand," he meant just what any Jew of his time would understand, namely that the expected Divine intervention in history was imminent. The "Kingdom of God" was not a gradual social improvement, but God's miraculous ending of the present order, to set up a new order of things. All Jesus's ethical teachings were an "interim-ethic". Forgive your enemies because God will send the expected Messiah, perhaps next month. Lay not up treasures on earth because very soon there will be no earth as we know it.

But of course the cataclysm did not occur. Life on earth continued, with its good and evil. The teachings and the whole career of Jesus were based on a delusion. Some passages in the New Testament indicate that Jesus went to his death in a mood of despair. If all this was true (and Schweitzer argued very persuasively) there was an end, once for all, of any simple "following the teachings of Jesus". Paul Tillich has said that Schweitzer's view has since been corrected, but I may be permitted to doubt this. It sounds pretty reasonable to me.

Was Schweitzer then a Christian? Well, what is a Christian? Out of his picture of this deluded man of long ago, Schweitzer distilled one thing, the principle of love. Is that enough to make a Christian? Perhaps the question is not important. At gatherings of his medical staff, he used to read from Scripture and sing some of the fine, stately old German hymns. There seems to be a nostalgia here. One might say that he was a Christian sentimentally but not intellectually. It is not altogether clear whether, or in what sense, he retained belief in God.

(Concluded on page 364)

This Believing World

WHAT A hullabaloo the Christian advice by the Archbishop of Canterbury of using armed force in Rhodesia, if necessary, has caused, mainly among members of his Anglican flock. Yet, after all, it is thoroughly Christian advice as Dr. Ramsey stoutly and rightly maintains. Most people however, still think Jesus was the Prince of Peace, though in the clearest terms he insisted he was *not*. His exact words are "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace but a sword . . ." (Matt. 10, 34).

★

THE CHRISTIAN religion has always brought "a sword" into a discussion where necessary. History is packed with religious wars, and the Christians continued to hail Jesus as the Prince of Peace, while continuing their slaughter and carnage of opponents. There was, we repeat, nothing un-Christian in Dr. Ramsey's remarks. Whether one agrees with them politically is another matter.

★

NO ONE need be surprised to learn that the Church of England wants to change the present method of appointing bishops (*Daily Express*, 28/10/65). So far, bishops have been appointed by the Prime Minister who may well be—horrors of horrors!—an unbeliever. So one can understand why the Archbishops of Canterbury and York are in favour of dropping the present system and "beginning afresh." It will probably shock both when we say that the result will still be unsatisfactory. Either the bishop will believe implicitly in the Bible, as Dr. Ramsey does, or very little of it like the Bishop of Woolwich.

★

THE LORD Chamberlain has banned a Miracle play which was to be staged at Greenwich next Easter, because Jesus was to be shown wearing jeans. No doubt his usual long hair would pass any censor, but just think what would happen if "our Lord" were portrayed with a Beatle crop instead. Portraying Jesus on the stage at all comes very near blasphemy, but in jeans!

★

CHRISTIANITY is not the only religion that makes money. According to the *Weekend Telegraph* (15/10/65), which has a splendid article on the subject, the trade in all sorts of Voodoo merchandise runs up to £700,000 a year. Not bad when one considers the sales are of portable evil-eyes, religious pictures for magical ceremonies, Dume powder (Death unto my enemy), hexing pins to stick in wax effigies, and such like.

★

OF COURSE, all these things were the stock-in-trade of medieval Christianity, and they can now be bought in dozens of shops, mostly in the Harlem district of New York. In other words, even now, in 1965, the superstition of magic, evil spirits and curses, is still believed in by some (mostly coloured) Christians. But are white Christians much better? Astrology, omens, carrying a rabbit's foot, a nutmeg, or even a potato, to ward off disease or evil spirits, still have their adherents.

★

PAMELA SYKES, of Claverham, Bristol, informed readers of the *New Statesman* (22/10/65) that she was "collecting authentic, first-hand accounts of ghosts, seen, heard or sensed within the last 10 years". Miss Sykes wanted new, unpublished material. She can be sure of getting plenty.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PREDESTINATION

(Concluded from page 362)

explanation of the Dopper mentality. It is easy to believe that you are one of the elect when you have been brought up to behave in the manner of the "in-group" to which you belong. Every member of an "in-group" thinks he is superior to all members of an "out-group", at least in those particular respects which differentiate him from the others. In the case of the Dopper, he knows that he is capable of virtue and does practise it, for example by not playing cricket on Sunday. He sees around him the sinners who seem incapable of virtue and desecrate the Sabbath. These others must clearly be the vessels of wrath indicated by Paul. They are having a good time now, but ah, what of the life to come!

Contemplating the fate clearly in store for the sinners, the Dopper's self-satisfaction in his own virtue is enhanced.

NEGLECTED FACTS ABOUT

ALBERT SCHWEITZER

(Concluded from page 363)

One of his most charming and touching stories told how he came to his great principle, Reverence for Life. He got it, not from the birds and flowers, but from the hippopotamus! Riding up the river to visit a remote village, he found the little steamer surrounded by these ugly beasts, with their eyes and nostrils just emerging from the water; and so it suddenly came to him: "I am life that wants to live, in the midst of other life that wants to live." He was not fanatical about this. He would kill germs to save a human life, but would not needlessly tread on a line of ants. So now if a true believer asks: "What was the hippopotamus made for?" the answer is: "To instruct Albert Schweitzer."

All honour to him. But it is not orthodox Christianity that deserves the credit for his benevolence.

[Reprinted from *Progressive World*, September, 1965]

SECTARIAN BITTERNESS

"Disgraceful scenes marked the end of the Scottish League Cup Final at Hampden yesterday when 107,600 saw Celtic beat Rangers 2-1 . . . Hundreds of fans invaded the field at Hampden Park yesterday as Celtic players paraded with the Scottish League Cup. And the charge almost started off what could have been a blood-bath" (*Sunday Mail*, October 24th). Further trouble broke out on the boat taking supporters of both teams back to Belfast, and it had to return to pick up a detachment of police.

Unfortunate incidents have marred many football games recently but even when the jollity and sportsmanship prevailed elsewhere, the Celtic-Rangers encounter was an annual scandal. Nobody today bothers—or deems it prudent—to say why this event should always have been more acrimonious than similar contests. The answer is simple. Supporters tend to divide on religious, Catholic or Protestant, lines, and sectarian bitterness is the underlying motivation.

Against this deeply rooted feeling all the prior appeals for decency and calm proved in vain. Clearly, if a start is to be made in fostering harmony and goodwill among all sections of the population it must be among our children, before doctrinaire prejudices have been built up. Is such a start being made? Can it be made? Not while the Catholic Church demands its own day schools, brings pressure to bear on Catholic parents to send their children there, and presents most of the bill to the community to pay. Catholic and Protestant children grow up suspecting one another because they seldom if ever meet in a normal friendly way.

Our best insurance against the perpetuation of such "disgraceful scenes" is integration of all our children in community schools. But if special groups insist on antisocial isolation, at least let them pay for it. Let the community not endorse such policies, and squander money badly needed elsewhere, by subsidising them.

DAVID TRIBE,

President, National Secular Society.

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

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 (Platt Fields), Sunday, 3 p.m.: MESSRS. CLARE, MILLS and WOOD. (Car Park, Victoria Street), 8 p.m.: MESSRS. COLLINS, WOODCOCK, and others. 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. Nottingham Branch NSS (Old Market Square), every Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

INDOOR

Birmingham Branch NSS (New Victoria Hotel, Corporation Street), Sunday, November 14th, 6.45 p.m.: GEORGE JONAS, "Some pressing problems of Criminal Reform". Glasgow Secular Society, (Central Hall, 25 Bath Street), Sunday, November 12th, 2.45 p.m.: ALEX STEWART, "Youth Confused". Leicester Secular Society (Secular Hall, 75 Humberstone Gate), Sunday, November 14th, 6.30 p.m.: W. A. GAPE, "Obedience the Original Sin". South East London Technical College, Lewisham Way, London, S.E.3, Wednesday, November 17th, 1 p.m.: Debate, "There is no evidence for the existence of God". Speakers: DAVID TRIBE and a Christian. South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall Humanist Centre, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1.), Sunday, November 14th, 11 a.m.: H. J. BLACKHAM, "Secular Progress". November, 16th, 7.30 p.m.: LEONARD LEWIN, "The Myth and Reality of Freewill".

Notes and News

A REPORT by a committee of 22 Humanist and Christian educationalists calls for more "open" teaching of religion in schools, to encourage children to think for themselves and to undergo moral as well as traditional religious education. While not aiming to abolish RI, the report, *Religious and Moral Education*, questions the relevance of routine religious teaching and attempts at moral instruction, which are sometimes "vitiating by being so closely tied to religious education that at a later stage a rejection of religion may well leave the adolescent without any moral foundation". It makes different suggestions for different age groups. In primary schools, for instance, the emphasis should not be on hypothetical situations, but on the "clear challenge of example", if possible by the children's own master or mistress.

★

A MORE MATURE attitude can be adopted with secondary children under 13, whose questions should be answered honestly, even at the risk of shocking some of the children or their parents. For those between 13 and 16 an integrated course of religious and moral education is advocated, aimed at making the children think for themselves, not handing them a "purely school moral to be thrown off with the school uniform." Sixth formers could be given

an optional weekly period of open religious education as well as a compulsory course in which a wide variety of viewpoints would be examined. Morning prayers have become a pointless ritual, and the report suggests restricting them to two days a week. The committee includes Sir Gilbert Fleming, a former Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Education, H. L. Elvin, Director of the London University Institute of Education, and Professor P. H. Hirst, Professor of Education at King's College, London.

★

WE CAN sympathise with the Archbishop of Canterbury. If he doesn't speak out on important issues like Rhodesia he is failing in his duty: if he does he is meddling in politics. Perhaps it was the unexpectedness of his statement to the British Council of Churches that shocked people more than its content. "If Rhodesia goes over the brink," Dr. Ramsey said, "I think that it is not for us as Christian Churches to give the Government military advice as to what is practicable or possible. That is not our function. But if the British Government thought it practicable to use force for the protection of the rights of the majority of the Rhodesian people, then I think that as Christians we have to say that it will be right to use force to that end." This was sufficient to bring protests from MPs like Quintin Hogg and Gilbert Longden, as well as a telegram from the prospective Conservative candidate, Sir Gerald Nabarro.

★

"AS ANGLICAN churchman," telegraphed Sir Gerald, "I deplore and deeply resent your translation pulpit to party politics and your condoning employment force against Ian Smith and his British patriots, white Rhodesians, who have come to our rescue in two world wars. Recommend you leave party politics to politicians to prevent recurrence your cardinal blunder advocating employment force and shooting down Britons in Rhodesia" (*The Guardian*, 29/10/65). No wonder Dr. Ramsey was "wounded" (*The Sunday Times*, 31/10/65). "I think I must improve my public relations," he said. ITV, who should know something about PR, gave the Archbishop a chance to amplify his remarks. He regretted "misrepresentation" of them, he said, "because I haven't advocated the use of force—good heavens, no." He was thinking purely in the circumstances of the British Government perhaps having to take over the government of Rhodesia and possibly having to use force to defend its legitimate authority. We doubt, however, if this would placate Sir Gerald Nabarro and Mr. Longden. But the Archbishop could "meddle" in politics as much as he liked, so long as he expressed the Tory viewpoint.

★

THE LETTER from David Tribe which we print opposite was also sent to the *Daily Telegraph*, where it received the attention of columnist Peter Simple. The traditional hooliganism at Celtic-Rangers matches in Glasgow does, Mr. Simple agreed (27/10/65), have its roots in religious differences. But he was not so sure about the National Secular Society's suggested remedy of ending separate Catholic day-school which build up "doctrinaire prejudices" in children. "Hooliganism without religion is not unknown at football matches in general," he pointed out. And, "Even if the spectators at Hampden Park became secularists to a man, they might still be unwilling to forgo an enjoyable and all-to-human afternoon of motiveless ritual hate." There is some truth in this, of course, Feelings run high at other local derbies (in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, etc.), but never quite so high as in Glasgow.

A Journal of the London Poor

By ELIZABETH COLLINS

A PARTICULARLY ATTRACTIVE edition in the World's Classics series is published by Oxford University Press (9s. 6d.), containing thirty representative sketches from Henry Mayhew's *London Labour and the London Poor* with an interesting biographical introduction by Professor John L. Bradley, who selected the material from the definitive edition published by Griffin, Bohn & Co., 1861-62. This introduction is worth reading for its own sake, giving as it does details of Mayhew's literary career, his restless curiosity and spirit of enquiry, his insight and humanity in his portrayal of lives of the lower working classes of London. His journalism, although of a casual nature, was activated by a profound concern for the human condition.

Mayhew might almost be described as the "Chaucer" of mid-Victorian England. Born in 1812, one of the seventeen children of a London lawyer, he was educated at Westminster School where, although brilliant, he was a somewhat indolent scholar. Caught studying a Greek grammar instead of his prayer-book during an Abbey service, and due for punishment in consequence, he simply collected his books and left the school for good. Thereafter he tried his hand at many things, the sea, the law, always appearing irresponsible and ill-disciplined, until finally he turned his attention to popular journalism. This, and writing plays for the low dramatic demands of the age, suited him well, and he became a prolific writer. In 1831 Mayhew, together with his friend Gilbert A'Beckett, began to publish the journal *Figaro in London* which ran from 1831-39. The period was one of scurrilous satire, but it was said of Mayhew's editorship that he was the first to prove that "satire in journalism could be conducted without personalities and need not sneer at morality". *Figaro* was unique among the journals of that time in not surrendering to popular tastes.

Mayhew was also one of the originators of *Punch* (1841), and for a short time joint editor of that journal with Mark Lemon. That experience may have inclined him towards philanthropic journalism taking the poor of London as its theme, for *Punch* began as a radical and democratic champion of the poor and oppressed masses of the "Hungry Forties", and although plentifully interspersed with humour, its pages were imbued with social zeal. The most significant event in Mayhew's career was when he prevailed upon the proprietors of the *Morning Chronicle* to publish a series of statistical and anecdotal articles in order to expose the gross inequalities of the social system, and to provide a detailed description of the "moral, intellectual, material, and physical condition of the industrial poor". It was a matured Mayhew who embarked upon this project, and the first of the articles appeared on September 24th, 1849, and ran until October, 1850 — seventy-six articles of some 3,500 words each, dealing with exploitation and poverty. Interrupted by a dispute with the newspaper following his attack upon a West End tailoring establishment employing sweated labour, and believing that his journalistic freedom was being threatened, Mayhew ceased to write for the paper. Instead, he continued the articles as *London Labour*, serialised in weekly and monthly parts until legal action in 1852 again suspended publication.

Subsequently, however, the whole work was completed, and in 1861-62 Messrs. Griffin, Bohn & Co. published in

four volumes Mayhew's extensive studies entitled *London Labour and the London Poor*. The author himself made three important assertions concerning this work: —

- (1) That it was the "first attempt to publish the history of a people from the lips of the people themselves, giving a literal description of their labour, their earnings, their trials and their sufferings, in their own unvarnished language."
- (2) "The first commission of inquiry into the state of the people undertaken by a private individual, and the first 'blue book' ever published in twopenny numbers."
- (3) He visualised his work as "supplying information concerning a large body of persons of whom the public has less knowledge than of the most distant tribes of the earth."

The public took the book quite seriously and it excited comment from all over the kingdom. Provincial newspapers had made a practice of quoting excerpts from Mayhew's articles during their publication in the *Chronicle*, and the response was considerable. So much so that the newspaper had to allocate office room to deal with the donations that poured in for the alleviation of distressed cases. It was this fund that Mayhew was empowered to call upon when the occasion warranted it for those in dire need.

It was evident that Mayhew's book profoundly influenced sociologists and certain novelists of the mid-century, particularly Charles Kingsley in *Alton Locke*, Ewing Ritchie in *Night Side of London* (1857), James Greenwood in *Seven Curses of London* (1869), all covering similar ground. Of the many pamphlets, books, and articles of the time, however, none are recorded with the humanity of Henry Mayhew. His interviewing was unorthodox, and his charm, his kindly understanding manner, instantly established contact between his subject and himself. Added to which was his sympathy, good sense, and compassion for the "human lot" untouched by sentimentality.

These thirty sketches give a moving picture of the London of a century ago, an instructive and appalling account of life as lived by the poor amid the wealth and prosperity of the 1850s onwards. Yet at the same time it is a picture of human courage, independence, and dignity in poverty, with the high spirits of the Londoners continually breaking through depressing surroundings. Of particular interest are descriptions of the street markets, the scavengers, the crossing-sweepers, ham-sandwich men, flower-girls, life in low lodging houses, and the charming sketches of peep-shows, and the "Fanticcini Man" with his marionettes. Mayhew depicts them all, and they come to life in his pages. Throughout his articles he urged a closer relationship between worker and management, and a proper recognition of the former's abilities.

That conditions such as Mayhew described so vividly could persist in a state so ostensibly pious as 19th-century England is indeed a black mark against the Christianity of the Victorians, with their Churchgoing, and a Bench of Bishops in the Lords. Mayhew's sketches were a much needed criticism of such complacency, though only now is the great humanitarian writer being evaluated at his true worth, and belatedly receiving the recognition he deserves. His latter years were marked by a struggle to support himself by casual journalistic work without much

success, and ultimately he withdrew from the literary scene. He died at Charlotte Street, Bloomsbury, in 1887, aged 75 years.

It may well be said of Henry Mayhew by future historians that he was the real architect of the present Welfare State, which though imperfect in some respects is infinitely preferable to the unctuous complacency and patronising attitude of the 19th century. As an invaluable social document, as well as for some of the delightful sketches it contains, this is well worth reading.

Points From New Books

By OSWELL BLAKESTON

THE MYTH-MAKERS have had, and are having, a grand time with Dylan Thomas. Their legends illustrate the ease with which one may write a gospel which is full of inaccuracies. The most salutary lessons are to be learnt by those who do not wish to be bamboozled, for future literary historians will surely take many of these books, when it has become impossible to check the statements, and use them as source material. Myth will have become fact.

Constantine Fitzgibbon, in his *The Life of Dylan Thomas* (Dent, 42s.), has gone to a lot of patient trouble to correct a number of wishful fantasies which are well on the way to becoming "established". He has probably done as much as one man can without devoting a lifetime to one book. Yet there is at least one assumption about a permanent attitude which is misleading, and an occasional second-hand report of an incident is untrue. I dare to say this because Dylan for a time stayed with me in — of all places — Wimbledon; and although Dylan — the "instant Dylan" — would change his tune to suit an audience, I know I can fault at least one blanket assertion about his character. Again, as I was present when certain recorded incidents occurred, I can say, from first-hand knowledge, that second-hand witnesses are often no more reliable than the chroniclers of miracles.

Indeed, Mr. Fitzgibbon is not unaware of the difficulties, although he has not been able to avoid some of the traps; and he quotes an early biographer of Goethe who blandly wrote: "Goethe told Eckermann that of all his mistresses it was Lili whom he had loved the most. Here Goethe was wrong."

Now, since his death, people have tried to prove almost anything about Dylan Thomas and in spite of the poet's own utterances; and there has been a thesis written to show that Dylan Thomas's poetry was essentially "religious." Mr. Fitzgibbon takes a far more balanced view. He remarks that the use of biblical and Christian imagery prove no more the poet's Christianity than his use of astronomical imagery indicates that he was an astrologer or his repeated references to birds confirm him as an ornithologist. "If he was a religious poet, his was a religion that excludes morality, dogma, even sureness of belief. This does not leave much behind . . ." The position could hardly be put more succinctly.

There is a letter in which Dylan wrote: ". . . God is not the lukewarm soup and starch of the chapels, but the red hot grains of love and life distributed equally and impartially among us all, and that in the roots of our being lies not the greed for property and money, but the desire, large as the universe, to express ourselves freely and to the utmost limits of our individual capabilities." One might claim this as a statement made by a free-thinker.

I remember Dylan telling me, in a relaxed moment, that he was compiling a list of words which young poets should not use; and the first word on the list was — God. Then there was Dylan writing to Trevor Hughes saying that Christ was always "the superior, the natty gent in the tramps' ward". Or Dylan specifically telling John Malcolm Brinnin that his last major poems are "poems in praise of God's world by a man who doesn't believe in God". His biographer notes, too, that only once in his adult life the poet entered a church to take part in a religious service; and that when, for some family reason which may never be quite clear to us, he allowed his three children to be baptised.

Mr. Fitzgibbon reminds us that Dylan's father was a sort of God-hater if not a fully fledged atheist. He repeats the delightful story, which one has read elsewhere, of Dylan's father looking out of a window on a rainy day and exclaiming angrily: "It's raining, blast Him!" One thinks of Dylan talking about "the eternal damnation of the Almighty". One recalls that Richard Church refused to publish Dylan's first book of short stories because he feared prosecution for blasphemy.

But *The Life of Dylan Thomas* is certainly a mine of glorious stories about the poet's background and the poet's life. One can see again the gargoyle wink above the dangling cigarette when Dylan says: "It's lovely when you burn your boats — they burn so beautifully." Or Dylan saying that he had not been able to sleep all night because those bloody dwarfs were "crushing up the mice again".

Then Mr. Fitzgibbon is very perceptive about the poems as poems, about words being used as vials for new meaning to be poured into them, and then the progress from "doing magnificent things with words" to doing "magnificent things with poems". Dylan was not always the comic turn that he gave in a pub, but a hard-working craftsman with "an infinite capacity for aching pains". And Mr. Fitzgibbon brings dignity and restraint to his description of the last tragic days when the performer had taken over from the poet.

This book, some four hundred readable pages, is called a definitive biography; but now, I suppose, we will have a spate of books with such titles as *What Constantine Fitzgibbon Left Out*. Someone will surely want to talk about Emily Holmes-Coleman, Max Chapman, Humphrey Searle, and a host of others who are definitely "part of the story" but do not appear in the 400 pages.

Dylan was against people who pop poems "into critical killing bottles", so it is a pleasure to give a simple welcome to a first book by a new young poet, Nicholas Snowden Willey, *The Green Tunnel*. It is published by Signals, the most rewarding of the avant-garde art galleries in London; and it sells at 15s. in hard covers and with a luxurious wealth of white margin and a striking cover illustration by Takis. Here is a poem quoted in full:

I think, therefore I think;
What of the stars that spin?
What does Autumn begin
When it begins to rain?
I am, for there I am.

[Editor's Note: Oswell Blakeston's own new book of poems appears on November 15th with the Trigram Press, *How To Make Your Own Confetti*. It is being published in a paper-back edition at 10s. 6d. and in a hard-cover edition at 18s. The illustrations, called "illusions", are by Max Chapman.]

CORRESPONDENCE

INDICTING THE PAPISTS

Mr. F. H. A. Micklewright's indictment of Papists (22/10/65) is regrettably weakened by the absurd and loathsome chauvinism of his final paragraph. Further, his former Anglicanism (with its ridiculous notion of "my country right or wrong" with which it is permeated) betrays itself. Thus he uses the term "disloyalty" in reference to citizens of another state, Ireland. As "disloyal" one supposes as Cypriots or Adenis. To what? The Crown?

He is led to use licence in describing the country (dear Anglia or Britain?) as "flooded with priests, monks and nuns." In an estimated 1965 population of 53,702,000 for these Isles there are 9,500 priests and monks (*Catholic Directory*, 1965), no figure for nuns but liberally assume 2,500. Twelve thousand priests, monks and nuns in a population of nearly fifty-four million cannot be described as "flooding the country." On this assumption of 2,500 nuns there is only one priest, monk or nun for every 425 nominal Catholics in England, Scotland and Wales. Hence the anxious cries by the heirarchy for "vocations."

Agreed "they claim prerogatives out of all proportion to their real numbers"—and here incidentally Mr. Micklewright refutes his wild assertion induced by Anglomania. But let us get things into rational perspective in presenting indictments. Freethinkers should not be inhibited by pathetic puerile patriotism but should rather be motivated by the clarity of outlook induced by cosmopolitan freethought.

B. J. CLIFTON

THE EPICUREAN

"Hellenist"? OED = Greek Scholar. (I can't find "Womanist" anywhere). Mr. Smith is wrong. I'm not anti-men. I'm anti-anti-feminist, especially those who dare to call themselves "rationalist." There may not have been many women philosophers, but nor, thank goodness, have there been many women theologians. May I suggest that Mr. Smith reads *What Humanism is About* by the non-philosopher, Kit Mouat-ism? (The Rationalist Press has copies.) Commercial over, but thanks for the opportunity.

KIT MOUAT *the Epicurean*

THE MAN JESUS

Mr. E. Markley's letter (22/10/65) on the Myth and Man saga surely takes the cake. He gives us his Mark 6. 3. "Is this not the carpenter Son of Mary," etc., as evidence. Now all we have to deal with is the problem of Mary, sons and all. Further, "the overthrow of the money changers in the temple is too realistic and in keeping with the general character of Jesus" to be a solar myth.

I suggest he tries Mark 14. 21 for a character reference. "Good were it for that man (Judas) if he had never been born." Love thy neighbour indeed! Maybe a little too realistic for Mr. Markley.

As regards the memories of our predecessors being as good as ours (Mr. Markley's words) there must have been an outbreak of amnesia during the "Messiah's" early years. Mark can't even remember where he was born or the Sermon on the Mount, although he seems to be remarkably lucid on his baptism by that other "historical" character John the Baptist, just up from the wilderness in a camel hair coat, munching locusts and wild honey! Strange food? If anyone had any doubt as to the Baptist's identity I suggest he consult a doctor. About all John ever did or still does for that matter, is to pour water from his pitcher. How he lost his head is another tale. Personally, I thought the Rev. Robert Taylor demolished the whole astronomical fabrication a hundred and fifty years ago.

Another typical blunder from Mr. Markley: "One seldom hears arguments about Apollo or Jupiter," he says. Do we have to put up with this in THE FREETHINKER? One seldom hears sermons about them either at least not in their old names. They've been using a new one for the last 1,700 years—Jesus Christ.

F. A. MELVIN

SOURCE WANTED

I received my September 24th, FREETHINKER and read George R. Goodman's splendid article "Their Faith is Vain." I keenly regret that he did not give the reference source of Pope Leo X's statement, "What profit hath not that fable of Christ brought us."

I have for several years sought the original source ever since I read it in Joseph McCabe's book *The Futility of Basic Religious Beliefs*, Chapter 10. McCabe did not give the reference either. If you can refer me to the source or where I can purchase the book in which it appeared, I will have tracts printed with the proper reference to the source and have fun distributing them. McCabe stated that it was at a party at Rome where the Pope Leo remarked

genially to some of his friends on the profit that fable of Jesus Christ had brought them.

B. L. GALLOWAY (Utah)

THE TYRINGHAM TRUST

Recent weeks have seen the emergence of the Tyringham Trust, which is being set up to look into the possibility of establishing the first non-profit making in-patient naturopathic clinic in this country. The first three trustees are Mr. S. Rose-Neil, DO, ND, M.B.N.O.A., F.A.C.A., a business-man and a City chartered accountant. The trustees are working in close collaboration with a committee who include social workers, a psychologist, business people and a journalist.

The clinic under the Directorship of Mr. S. Rose-Neil, will fill a need that already exists in the Naturopathic movement for such a clinic—to offer comprehensive naturopathic treatment to people in all income groups, training facilities for students, the means for scientifically designed experiments, research into the efficacy of naturopathic methods and the compilation of statistical data for the furtherance of knowledge.

The scope of the clinic would be as extensive as possible. Treatments available would include fasting and diet, postural and remedial exercises, psychological treatment, hydrotherapy (including Sauna baths), acupuncture, osteopathic, chiropractic and other manipulative methods, homeopathic and herbal medication, sun and air bathing, and ultra-sonic, faradic and other electrical methods. There would be swimming, tennis, table tennis, gardening and walking together with many other activities for recreation.

The property for the clinic has already been chosen—a beautiful country mansion within easy reach of London and the Midlands, set in acres of woodlands and particularly lovely gardens. It is hoped that with the help of public money and private donations, the property could be purchased by the Trust, converted and equipped, and opened to patients during 1966.

The Secretary would be glad to hear from anyone who can offer help in this exciting project, either financial or otherwise, and those who are interested should contact:

The Secretary, The Tyringham Trust,
2, Harrowby Court, Seymour Place, London, W.1.

THE PENGUIN ENGLISH LIBRARY

First Six Titles

Persuasion Jane Austen, together with A Memoir of the author, by J. E. Austen-Leigh. Ed. D. W. Harding 5s.
Wuthering Heights Emily Brontë, Ed. David Daiches 5s.
The Pilgrim's Progress John Bunyan, Ed. Roger Sharrock 5s.
Great Expectations Charles Dickens, Ed. Angus Calder 6s.
Middlemarch George Eliot. Ed. W. J. Harvey 7s. 6d.

Three Jacobean Tragedies

The Changeling by Middleton
The Revenger's Tragedy by Tourneur
The White Devil by Webster
Ed. Gamini Salgado 5s.

PENGUIN BOXED SETS FOR CHRISTMAS GIFTS

The Penguin Reference Desk Set
The new *Penguin English Dictionary* and the new *Penguin Encyclopedia* in an attractive, durable slip-case. 25s.

The Penguin Parkinson

A three-volume compendium of the wisely-witty, bestselling works of Professor C. Northcote Parkinson. Cover drawings by Osbert Lancaster. 10s. 6d.

A History of the Crusades

Sir Steven Runciman's great contribution to historical literature, now in three Peregrine volumes. Full colour covers and a handsome box. 42s.

The Chronicles of Narnia

All seven of C. S. Lewis's famous children's stories beginning with *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, and ending with *The Last Battle*. Charming box designed by Pauline Baynes. 24s.

The Illustrated English Social History

Over 25,000 boxed sets have already been sold of G. M. Trevelyan's four-volume masterpiece, published by Penguins in 1964. 34s.

Stephen Potter

Containing *Gamesmanship*, *Lifemanship*, *One-Upmanship*, and *Supermanship*. 10s.

Collected Short Stories

W. Somerset Maugham's complete short stories collected in four volumes. Nearly 15,000 boxes have been sold. 18s.6d.

Plus postage 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.