

The Freethinker

Volume LXXXV—No. 48

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Sixpence

TO REMIND ourselves of a few basic notions concerning the relations of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity, we can turn to the Catholic press, the British weeklies. In the advertisement columns you will often see an appeal to the Catholic family. "A priest of your own," it runs. Boys of good character and reasonable intelligence are required for juniorates and seminaries, to be elevated to the dizzy heights of the priesthood in their middle twenties. The parting with their family may be poignant, but the benefits will be definite. When the parents have grown old and sit by the fireside, amidst their grandchildren, they can find comfort in that Dominic, or Benedict, or Aloysius, each morning participates in the universal Church's work of reparation by offering the Sacrifice of the Mass. When their last hour draws near, God will remember they gave a son to the Church, a son who will bless, pray, intercede for them. Such a family will be specially blessed. It is not only for the social kudos this gives in a Catholic community—the mother bends over the cradle and dreams of her offspring clad in chasuble and alb in the years ahead. A mother may even so "sell" the idea of priesthood to a son that he is forced into the wrong mould, and becomes what is known as a "spoiled" priest. But I do not intend to be cynical. The life is arduous and self-sacrificing, and a boy of fine character may be condemned to give of his best in the service of error, in mistaken idealism. As other families wish their boy to be a doctor, an engineer, so a Catholic boy or parent will laud this, the vocation of vocations. There is pride and rejoicing in a good Catholic family when a son goes to be Beda! It is not a matter for anger and dismay.

Priest and Pope.

Now consider further. Basically, we have priesthood in pope, cardinal, archbishop, bishop, Father O'Grady round the corner. Each is a priest. Each has had the holy oil laid upon him, each has prostrated himself to receive the ineradicable marks of the Sacrament of Orders. This is the basic similarity.

The priesthood comes afresh from the laity each generation. Books, for popular consumption, on Pius XII, or John XXIII, start by showing them as little boys in the bosom of their family. The priest may never go further than the next parish, or he may end by concluding concordats or raising his fingers in benediction *urbi et orbi*. But every priest is born a layman and must derive enormously from his family environment.

When the priest crosses from the lay state to the sacerdotal, the Catholic believes that his soul receives a distinctive character. The priest is not just a man with his collar the other way round. If he were stranded naked on a desert island, God would recognise him as different. He can do things his natural born lay brothers cannot do—handle the sacred host, absolve, exorcise: to him are given the keys of the kingdom. This is not just theory, or "seeing things" in the Catholic viewpoint, it is utter-

ly realistic. It is supported by a worked out and highly developed theology. That the results are tangible in their effect on the world even an unbeliever can agree. Through this priesthood, doctrine and dogma are handed down, and the routines that bind the dying, living, marrying, sinning, begetting laity to the Church are dispensed.

Not Above Criticism.

But it does not mean the priesthood is above criticism.

The mother may gaze in wonder at her son's hands for the sacred chrism that has anointed them. The next minute motherhood may assert itself, and chide him for leaving off the black pullover she has newly knitted for him. The office and the man, too,

may be distinguished. Thus a Catholic will argue that there has never been a bad pope (being safeguarded by God), only bad men. A priest may be immoral, but his absolution may save a dying man. Even Graham Greene's "whisky priest" was a priest for ever according to the law of Melchisidech. The sacredness of the priesthood is beyond the frailty of the man, which is *not* to say they are exempt from criticism. That is what outsiders rarely understand, especially since criticism is regarded as a domestic matter. There are family loyalties. Catholics may run Father So-and-So down, but they will be resentful of outside criticism. Like schools, like sports teams, they may hold post-mortems behind closed doors, but there must be no scandal. Let outsiders attempt to join in, and the door is slammed in their faces; the ranks are closed.

Protestant evangelism in Catholic countries has often failed to appreciate this; to realise that the criticism is not in the least to be confused with anti-clericalism. On the contrary, it is the more likely to be active, even rampant, the better the Catholics. Does sluggish Pat Murphy, who has not been near the sacraments these 40 years, soaking gin at the pub, care about the schools question, or Cardinal Heenan's pronouncements on birth control? It is the earnest, the intellectual, the lay people who want to be "at one" with their Church, living with the mind and soul of the Church, that care for these things. Hence the folly of misreading what Catholics themselves would regard only as healthy and reasonable criticism, for signs that the times are ripe to promote a cleavage between laity and hierarchy; this is to misunderstand the whole basic conception of the organic relationship between the two, and probably bears no little connection to the out-moded Protestant conception of the Catholic laity being priest-ridden.

No New Departure.

This may be true of Sicily, or early 19th-century Ireland (where, however, priests sprung from the native soil were not seldom vigorous nationalist leaders), but it is not true of England or Western Europe generally, today. It may be true of peasant and agricultural communities, not of sophisticated and urban ones. That is why people who did not realise this, were surprised when the Church

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

Catholic Clergy and Latin

By GILLIAN HAWTIN

received criticism from its own members in the book *Objections to Roman Catholicism*. They thought it was a new departure; to find otherwise they ought to read the back numbers of the *Tablet*! I remember an eminent Irish Catholic remarking in a lecture in Ireland: "The best Catholic is not always the meek sheep, but he who grabs the pastoral staff and trips him up with its crook." Whatever may be true of Scotland, or France, or Italy, this country (despite a sturdy independence) has not a history of anti-clericalism, even before the Reformation.

Education.

Regard the matter, in particular, in relation to the specific issue of education. We are sometimes fed, even from secularist platforms, the idea that it isn't really the Catholic laity but only the priests who want their own schools. Take it from one who had twenty years' contact with Catholicism (most of that time spent either as a pupil, a student, or a teacher in Catholic places of education and in close contact with parents and nuns and lay teachers) that such an idea is just sheer nonsense. One child of a mixed marriage may be sent to a Protestant school, but

a general rule should not be drawn from a particular instance. The undermanned priesthood hasn't the coercive power, against all the disruptive forces of contemporary England, to force such a policy on an *unwilling* laity. The truth is, the Faith is considered the Pearl of Great Price, essential for salvation, and its transmission from generation to generation is all-important both to the individual and for the leavening of society, for the continued life of the *ecclesia docens*.

Nursery of Faith.

The school is the nursery of faith, it must give the correct theological tone, have a Catholic staff, exclude alien influences. The demand for Catholic schools follows logically from the belief they do not only possess *some* truth, but that Catholicism *is* Truth, and God-derived truth. In this, and in other living problems of today, clergy and laity are tied together as intimately as once they were in the family circle. Obviously, in the case of *Clergy v. Laity*, although as in other civil suits, the *v.* may look like *versus* to the uninitiated, those in the know, the professionals, read and pronounce it as "and"!

The Leopard in a New Suit

(Reply to a Letter from G. M. Paris OP, of Malta)

By PHYLLIS K. GRAHAM

THE Rev. Father Paris OP credits me with "statistics of calumnies against the Pope, including John XXIII and the Church." Calumnies? If he can prove this, on irrefutable evidence, no one will be happier than I. For it is not a happy experience to learn that the Organisation to which one has sacrificed the better part of one's life is guilty of countenancing—and committing—such crimes against humanity. So—would the learned Father care to accept the challenge, perhaps by personal correspondence? If convicted I will do public penance (televised, of course) with sheet and candle.

Now, about these "statistics" . . . I *had* thought my article dealt with facts (or calumnies?), not figures. However, I realise what immense value the Church of Rome puts on "statistics", so I am not too mystified by the good Father's invitation to "note two other statistics." I presume he wishes me to draw a comparison between "the works of the Church for the poor all over the world" and "similar philanthropic good made by Secularists," and to find myself duly appalled by the contrast.

He may be surprised to learn that I am already quite familiar with this mental exercise. Only, being a Secularist, I am definitely less interested in statistics than in humanity and human progress. The obvious fact that Secularists are "in the red" on the balance sheets of Organised Charity does not greatly worry me, though naturally I would prefer it to be otherwise. But I have to remember (and perhaps the good Father might also be reminded?) that whereas the Church, in building up her flourishing business concerns, has merely had to contend with the world, the flesh and devil (or use them as her allies), we poor Secularists have had to contend with the Church as well. This, even a son of St. Dominic must admit, can be a handicap.

However, no tears for that. Secularists have a way of quietly and persistently going about their business (earthworms, perhaps, that without show or glory do the fundamental work which keeps evolution on the move), and, getting down to the comparison on lines of human ecology, we discover they haven't done so badly after all.

Take slavery, to start with. The Founder of Christianity ignored it. Paul (often regarded as the founder) approved and encouraged it. The Church supported it without question, till the Secularist struggle for human freedom and dignity fanned her indifference into ferocious ardour. Her characteristic responses—imprisonment, the rack and the stake, were gradually muffled as her power declined, but her Big-Business instincts went on fighting to the bitter end. Whew! What a tussle. But a big bulge on the credit side for the Secularists, I think.

Other items loom large on the credit column. For instance, the final undoing of the dirty work of Innocent VIII and his *Malleus Maleficarum*: a prolonged fight against the torture and burning of witches. Victory only hove in sight after three centuries of horrid cruelty. Here in England it was not officially won till the Act of Parliament in 1736. Subsequent echoes from that reign of terror have appalled even our enlightened century. Since witch-hunting was essentially a religious rite, based on the text "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," I think we anti-religionists can be congratulated on our victory in the battle for mercy.

Need I point the parallel in the battle for religious toleration? The Reverend Father, spiritual descendant of Father Dominic and of Torquemada, must be well acquainted with the facts (or calumnies?) of Christendom's more gruesome spots of history. He must also be now be aware of the final capitulation to Secularist ideas of brotherly love, announced—if a little late and reluctantly—by a certain recent papal decree. The whole subject may possibly be delicate, if not embarrassing, to a "Hound of the Lord," so I will say no more.

The study and treatment of mental illness and psychopathic disorders has been taken over and revolutionised by "Secularist" psychology. Previously society's misfits, supposedly "possessed by devils," were dealt with by exorcism, ridicule, and the most brutal treatment. "Secular" psychology had to point the way to a Church that knew no psychology. She didn't, you know, and she doesn't possess much now, except what she borrows from

(Concluded on page 380)

Character Deformation

By P. G. ROY

FAR from being conducive to "character formation," religion rather tends to deform it; a healthy child in normal condition brings into this world million of years of genetic experience of social life and is naturally able to develop into a valuable member of the society. Therefore nobody, not even parents, have a right to "mould" young minds with their lop-sided teaching by the inculcation of controversial and intolerant religious dogma, instead of instilling the vehicle of progress and education: the virtue of honest doubt and the urge to accept nothing that has not undergone the test of veracity.

The various vendors of "spiritual values" must be aware that the majority of the inmates of reformatories, penitentiaries and prisons are people amply instructed in the "spiritual values" of religion. Many criminals are even fervent believers, which proves that the Churches are no dam against crime and that the general loss of faith is not the cause of rampant evils in society. Basically, religion is not interested in material betterment and real social welfare (which, if attained, would destroy the roots of transcendental hope).

Social values pass through the crucible of social experience and are determined by their degree of social utility; and it should be clear that morality changes with changes in the history of the community; that a fixed code of morality, set up in, and befitting a long passed stage of society, is utterly unsuitable today. A hundred years ago it was both legal and moral in the USA (as it was for the authors of the scriptures) to own chattel slaves. And at that time, people in this country, with interests in the Lancashire mills, hoped for a victory of the South, for the destruction of slave labour meant a rise in the price of American cotton. The wheel of history turned on, and we no longer subscribe to the ownership of slaves. We do not burn witches alive or have workers chained in the fields. It was through the decrease in religious beliefs, not by observing the letter of Holy Script, that humanity in general has improved on biblical ethics and the gruelling usages of ancient times. Certain moral codes, the mere sugar coating of primitive superstitions in religion, have paved the way for the perpetuation of religious beliefs, and thus led to a widening conflict between religious conservatism and historical adjustments in a world of changing social needs; upholding ritualistic precepts against enlightened adult morality and better judgment. Petrified morality becomes immorality.

The particular needs of the ruling set in any system of society determines in the main the morality of that system and corrupts its standard of ethics. It is not insufficient indoctrination in religion, it is more the surfeit of crime stories and thrillers of violence and glorification of war, in print, sound and cellulose, that has lowered standards.

Not only is healthy morality independent of religion, it is even incompatible with the belief in god.

Time and again it must be stressed that before the appearance of private property and the exploitation of man through man there was no god and hence no religion proper. God therefore represents exploitation and injustice as the imaginary bestower of wealth and insurer of property.

To be decent in order to be rewarded, to abstain from evil merely for fear of punishment does not show moral backbone. On the contrary it may have a demoralising influence, creating the "virtue" of the coward, and vice with a vengeance. Neither temporal nor eternal justice can deflect the born criminal who is ready to take risks

in a society where crime appears to pay. Social laws were discovered by experience before they could be written down in a code and sanctioned by religion.

Religion, that is the perpetuation of social injustice and the existing class society, began with the commandment: Thou shalt not steal—neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet his house, his field, his slave, nor anything that is thy neighbour's. The protection of property, always acquired at the detriment of "neighbours," needed the invention of an omniscient god and religious sanction of social disparity. The Churches extol charity, which is a cheap means of cheating the havenots out of their fair share of the vital necessities of life. Honest means and hard work rarely lead to the accumulation of wealth; the conversion of collective assets to private benefit can only be accomplished through out-smarting others; this includes gambling, the last hope of the members of a moribund society who are after cheap gain.

All religious teaching could be dispensed with; it adds nothing to the character a man brings into this society; rather does it cripple and deform an unspoilt outlook. All ethics boil down to the few words of the "Golden Rule," which—contrary to general belief—is not Christian in origin.

Lord Chesterfield thought that "Do as you would be done by," was the "plain, sure and undisputed rule of morality and justice." Bernard Shaw, however, made the pertinent objection that tastes differ as to what a person likes or dislikes. Therefore the inhibitory formation in which the Chinese, Germans and others put this thumb-rule is preferable: Do not do to others what you do not want done to yourself.

"Take no thought for the morrow," the believer will preach, and "If you deeply trust in the Lord, you can swallow poison and handle snakes with impunity." But will he, if he is sane? The Sermon of the Mount, as Schweitzer remarked, was not meant as a guide to conduct in normal conditions; it was an "interim ethics to be practised in singular circumstances." And those circumstances were the expectation of the imminent coming of the Day of Judgment following the close of temporal history. A life of righteousness and love was urged only in expectation of impending judgment, not as an eternal code.

A code cannot strictly be called "moral" except in so far as the sanction comes from the apprehension of evil social results directly accruing from the conduct the code forbids. Here we have the distinction between the religious idea of "sin" and the moral idea of "wrong." The two ideas are naturally blended or associated in many minds, but we cannot understand the difference between religion and morals unless we distinguish between them . . . Thinkers like Herbert Spencer and Thomas Huxley . . . maintain that a moral code can never become pure and wholly responsive to the needs of a changing society unless it is dissociated from the special sanction of religion . . . Since men, especially in prescientific ages and circles, has conceived supernatural powers according to his fears . . . in ignorance and misinterpretation of the phenomena of nature, his religious codes could scarcely be a true reflection of his social needs. They often perverted social relationships and admitted or inspired conduct detrimental to social interests.

(MacIver & Page: *Sociology*.)

In highly advanced civilisations such as China's the moral principle becomes so dominant that the religious principle proper grows obsolescent; in others, both remain integrated, yet lead to difficult problems of interpretation,

(Concluded on page 380)

This Believing World

THE TRIAL and death of Christ still provide material for books galore, and we note that the London *Evening News* (3/11/65) had a full length review of a book by Guy Schofield, *Why Was He Killed?* Felix Barker, the reviewer, like Mr. Schofield, naturally accepts "irrefutable facts" from the Gospels without producing a scrap of evidence that they are facts. And the trouble with Jesus was that he was "far too liberal for" the Jews. Any evidence? Not a scrap. But it is in "Holy Writ," the Inspired Work of God Himself. What more proof is needed?

★

However, Mr. Schofield does have a fling at anti-Semitism. He recalls that a bishop was burnt for "heresy" in Oxford in 1554 "for his stand against Roman Catholicism." And he admits that "the Jewish people were no more responsible for the death of Jesus than the English people for the death of Hugh Latimer." We cannot imagine the Vatican and its army of cardinals agreeing with that.

★

EVERYBODY OF course knows what Paul is reputed to have written—"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." (1 Cor. 13, 13). Yet, in spite of Paul, we have the vicar of Hadenham, Bucks., the Rev. V. Nickalls, resigning as a trustee of its charities and declaring (*Sunday Express*, 7/11/65), "I have wriggled out of charity work." Paul does not seem as much in favour with Christians as he once was, but for a parson to give up Christian charity must be regarded as a blow at the Christian faith. However, the vicar's absence will, we are glad to say, not stop the charity, which will be handed out as usual.

★

YET ANOTHER world-shattering change suggested. The vicar of Christ Church, Streatham, the Rev. C. T. L. Payne, wants all London cemeteries to "throw out all these tombstones" and turn the graveyards into botanical gardens and parks, with wooden crosses instead of stones (*South London Press*, 5/11/65). Of course, the idea is stoutly opposed by the National Association of Master Monumental Masons—though, with the growth of population, every slice of ground will be needed in the near future.

★

PARSONS NOT only have to contend with poor congregations but with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses and the Mormons doing their best to wheedle good Christians away to the worship of strange gods. Here we have (*South London Press*, 11/11/65) the Rev. G. Heal, of Peckham, objecting to the Mormon's campaign, which is "bizarre and fantastic," and which "perverts the biblical doctrines of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, man, salvation, marriage, and the Second Coming."

★

YET IT is a fact that on all these points the Christian Churches have been at loggerheads at one time or another; and even now they have no meaning for most people. The Mormon explanation is just as silly as that of the Witnesses of Jehovah (who never elucidates for his adorers) and both are as silly as that of true Christianity. And, anyway, there are passages in the Bible which match in stupidity anything in the *Book of Mormon*. In fact, human ingenuity has never been able to beat the Bible in credulity and superstition.

THE LEOPARD IN A NEW SUIT

(Concluded from page 378)

sheer necessity. In spite of her wonderful array of philosophers and theologians. Because she starts from false premises about the nature of man and the universe; and how can psychological truth be based on that?

From this we pass on to the whole vast domain of progress in the sciences, which, while saluting the stupendous achievements of sons of the Church like Galileo or Mendel, we must in sober truth attribute to the courage, intelligence and dogged perseverance of the Secularist tribe. The good Father doubtless deprecates, as we all do, the misuse of knowledge by Big-Business and other vested interests; but he probably runs a car (being a modern friar) and rejoices in the multiple benefits of electricity, radio, etc., and may even on occasions have escaped pain by anaesthesia. He will surely not grudge a few good marks for all this to the Secularist earthworms.

Well, well, it seems to me, even after such a brief survey (alas, space forbids more) that we Secularists have been too much occupied with attacking the ills of humanity at the roots to do much—or as much as the Church—in the way of spraying its surface diseases. Yet the good Father need not be anxious. In the "Secularist" world that will finally emerge from this age of transition, certain items on his list may be needed less, ultimately needed not at all. I refer, of course, to "hospitals, houses for the poor . . . providing food and clothing." It has never been in the interests of Secularism, which does not cringe before the "Will of God," to run poverty, pain and disease as going concerns. Nor have Secularists any use for "missions": their watchword is not conversion but freedom.

The remaining items, "schools" and "universities", can safely be left to the gradual process of infiltration. (I could furnish the Reverend Father with some genuine statistics about our English universities, for instance, which might startle him). It's an arduous fight, we are well aware, against the fabulous wealth and unscrupulous power of a religio-political world-organisation. But Secularists, as we have seen, are stubborn fighters and patient plodders. The obscure earthworm at the base of life holds the final destiny of even popes and princes. That's nature's law.

So—don't worry, dear Rev. Father—the worms will win!

CHARACTER DEFORMATION

(Concluded from page 379)

resulting in the splitting up of religion into sects and groupings until, in the end, even educated people can no longer differentiate between sanity and inculcated beliefs. This becomes particularly apparent when they admit not to taking literally the Adam and Eve story, but maintain that it is a beautiful allegory and highly meritorious. The Lord not allowing man to gain knowledge by eating a certain fruit, the talking snake knowing the background story, and the jealous god then punishing mankind for ever after! Eventually they venture to say that one can remain a good Christian without taking the story literally. Yet without *literal* belief in the Original Sin the whole edifice of Christianity falls to the ground and there is no longer the slightest necessity for the Crucifixion either. So you can't have it both ways. This depraved piece of ritual slaughter is in itself something utterly harmful and has perverted European thinking for centuries; yet few people seem ever to enquire whether it really is commendable and ethical. Human cattle have for two thousand years chewed the cud of gentle Jesus over and over again without ever asking is it true.

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—Marble Arch and North London: (Marble Arch), Sundays, from 4 p.m.: MESSRS. L. EBURY 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 28th, 6.45 p.m.: Miss J. M. LEVI, "The Future of the National Health Service."

Bristol Humanist Group (Kelmescott, 4 Potland Street, Clifton), Sunday, November 28th, 6.30 p.m.: Mrs. FRANCES MACRAE and the Full Life."

Leicester Secular Society (Secular Hall, 75 Humberstone Gate), Sunday, November 28th, 6.30 p.m.: Mrs. FRANCES MACRAE-GIBSON, "Is the Race Problem Insoluble?"

South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall Humanist Centre, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1), Sunday, November 28th, 11 a.m.: Dr. JOHN LEWIS, "Atheists Who Believe in Original Sin." Tuesday, November 30th, 7.30 p.m.: ENID LAKEMAN, "Does Your Vote Count?"

Worthing Humanist Group (Morelands Hotel, The Pier), Sunday, November 28th, 5.30 p.m.: MARGARET MCILROY, "Religion and the Rights of the Child."

Notes and News

How to retain all the benefits of establishment with none of the disadvantages. That—though it may not be expressed so plainly—is the concern of the archbishops' commission set up by the Church Assembly to consider the report of the Crown Appointments Continuation Committee. The Dean of Chester, the Very Rev. G. W. O. Addleshaw, might urge that the commission should examine the function of the royal prerogative and ask whether it was "a great idol holding up the work of the Church," but Mr. W. R. van Straubensee, MP for Oxford, had no doubt that both church and state benefited from some form of establishment. "I beg the Assembly not to sound a call for UDL," he said, "but to have the long-sightedness and statesmanship necessary to get a negotiated settlement of problems" (*The Guardian*, 11/11/65). The visible claim for a divine authority behind all things was the more important, Mr. van Straubensee said, in face of the atheistic attacks of the present day.

★

ANOTHER MP, Mr. M. Alison (York), regarded many of the issues coming before the House of Commons—corporal punishment, abortion, homosexual reform, and Sunday observance—as "in the province of the Christian

Church." And, when Parliament was bewildered by new and alien creeds and philosophies, and members were cajoled from every quarter, many were waiting for a trumpet call from the Church of England, which had a right to an authoritative voice in the forming of new laws. From past experience, we may expect the trumpet to call for a firm defence of the law as it stands. The Archbishop of Canterbury, it is true, spoke for the abolition of capital punishment, but we frankly can't see him arguing for reform of the abortion and homosexual laws. We hope Dr. Ramsey proves us wrong. We hope even more that, whatever he says, neither the Commons nor the Lords will treat it as authoritative.

★

ROMAN CATHOLICS were reminded by the *Observer* (14/11/65) that indulgences still exist. The *Portiuncula* indulgence, for instance, may be gained by visiting St. Francis's chapel at the Basilica of Santa Maria Degli Angeli, in Assisi, on August 2nd. From time to time—as the *Observer* said—the Church "brings indulgences up to date." In 1898 all 1,000-year indulgences were cancelled, and as recently as 1942 "a sliding scale was introduced whereby cardinals were limited to granting up to 200 days, archbishops 100 days, and bishops 50 days." But what, the paper asked, "is the meaning of days or years in Purgatory? Totting up indulgences looks rather like filling in books of green trading stamps." And "an enlightened Jesuit" was quoted as saying: "It is a thing that, frankly, I find very embarrassing."

★

"I WAS shocked when I heard it. It is a word that is used periodically and I have used it myself, but certainly never in the presence of a lady" (*Daily Telegraph*, 15/11/65). Thus Brig. Terence Clarke, Conservative MP for Portsmouth, who decided to table a question to the Postmaster-General after Kenneth Tynan, Literary Manager of the National Theatre, had used one of those notorious but unutterable four-letter words in the TV programme *BBC 3*. Mr. Tynan, who appeared with the American writer Mary McCarthy in a discussion on censorship, was asked by compere Robert Robinson if he would go so far as to allow a play to be performed in which sexual intercourse took place on the stage. Mr. Tynan said he would, and added: "I doubt if there are any rational people to whom the word ——— would be particularly diabolically or totally forbidden." And obviously it isn't *totally* forbidden as far as Brig. Clarke is concerned.

★

Mr. ROBINSON said afterwards that he was surprised when it happened. The discussion was spontaneous and there had been no run through, but he thought Mr. Tynan was "up the pole to use that word." Hugh Wheldon, Controller of Programmes, was also surprised but not appalled. It was, he said rightly, "quite germane to the discussion that was taking place." And, he added, "I thought it was a responsible discussion and a reasonable one," a view with which we concur. Someone, of course, had to ask Mrs. Mary Whitehouse what she thought of it. But it is perhaps indicative of the general indifference towards her absurd Clean-Up TV Campaign, that she is now driven to writing to the Queen in protest.

★

IT WOULD be a pity, however, if the hubbub over a word were allowed to drown some other important remarks by Mr. Tynan. Sex, he pointed out, was by no means the only subject of censorship by the Lord Chamberlain. Political and religious free speech suffer more from his depredations.

Sungods and Messiahs

By GEORGE R. GOODMAN

(Concluded from page 375)

WHEREAS the word *Christoes* is Greek, the word *Messiah* is Egypto-Hebraic; both mean "anointed." The Egyptian *mes* or *mas* means to give birth to, to be born; and it also means: — to steep and to anoint. The suffix —"iah" or —"jah" is Hebrew and occurs in many names, such as Elijah, Halleluiah, Messiah, Zachariah, Abijah, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Hezekiah and many more. It can even be used as a prefix, as in the word Jahweh. Therefore, *Messiah* means: — the born (or reborn) deity or the anointed deity —or god.

Anointing with oil was throughout ancient days a ritualistic performance, signifying a baptism of man's physical (or animal) body with a substance that could be set on fire! A baptism with water is of a lower order, whereas the baptism with oil is of a more exalted order (as at the coronation of a king or queen. Oil is obviously of a higher order, because it rises to the top of water and also gives a bright, shining appearance, and thus becomes the oil of gladness".

Through the "anointing" aspect of the term *Messiah*, we come to the allied Greek name of *Christos* (Greek *Chrisein*, to anoint) and appearing also in our words *Chrism* (oil, unction) and *Chrisom* (a white cloth laid on a newly baptised child). Even the French word *Chresme* with, later on, the "s" dropped and becoming *Crème* (cream) is related to *chrism*, because it is rubbed in!

Christos is derived from the Egyptian KaRaST (Karest, Kerast), the name of the mummy prepared for burial, when it was anointed with oil. Both *Osiris* and *Horus* were called the *Karast-mummy*, which was symbolic of the incarnation of deity into its coffin-like case (or mummy-like crust) of the physical body—similar to a *chrysalis*. The comparison and similarity with a *chrysalis* is, in fact, striking, because the pupa of a butterfly looks exactly like a mummy and when it opens, a new life-cycle begins on a different wavelength.

The *Karast-mummy* was the prototype of the Church's *Corpus Christi*. In fact, the whole paraphernalia of the Church has been copied from the Egyptian solar-myths, continued by the Gnostics and then "christianised" by Rome! The Egyptian *Karast* or *Krist* is related to the Sanskrit *Kri* (to pour, rub over, anoint) and appears in the Indian name *Krishna*, indicating that he, too, was an anointed messiah.

No need to point out specially that the above *Karist* (the vowelings does not matter) appears again in *Eucharist*, and even in our simple words *crust* and *cross* (*crux*); the *Christ-principle* was alleged to have taken incarnation on the "cross of matter", because the human body, with outstretched arms, is in the shape of a cross. It was then encrusted with flesh and became a creature (from the Greek *Kreas*, flesh), in other words, it was "fleshed". Even the above mentioned *Chrysalis* of a butterfly contains the root *Kris* of the *Karast* (mummy) and appears again in *crystal*—a solidification of matter around a nucleus of force (from the Sun).

It remains now for the name *Iusa* to be explained. The root "*Iu*" is even mentioned on pages 22 and 40 in that excellent pamphlet of the Pioneer Press entitled *The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ*, by Gerald Massey, explaining what Christianity owes to ancient Egypt.

It is one of the best pamphlets concerning the christian origins, but is somewhat too condensed. When placed

into the hands of people who have not studied Egyptian mythology or are not very familiar with Greek, Latin and Hebrew expressions, it makes very heavy reading and is apt to baffle them, because the explanations in plainer language have been left out.

But to come back to *Iusa* itself. It is merely an earlier name for *Horus*, who was the "ever-coming-one", the prototype of *all* coming "saviours", dating back many thousands of years BC. *Iu* is the verb "to come"; that is its root, but sometimes it is *la*, *le*, *lo*, and often *Ja*, *Je*, *Jo* and *Ju*. This root is then combined with the Egyptian suffix *Sa* (sometimes *Se*, *Si*, *Su* and quite often with the Egyptian masculine "f", like *Saf*, *Sef*, *Sif*, *Suf*, meaning son, successor, male heir or prince.

Therefore *Iusa* means "son of the divine father *Iu*"; appearing again in the words *Ju-Ptah*, i.e. Prince *Iusa*, eldest son of *Ptah*, in Latin *Ju-piter*, in Aryan *Dy-aus Pitar* (*Deus Pitar*), in Greek *Thios* or *Zeus*; all gods of all ancient nations were "related" to each other and, likewise, there was and is a "correspondence" between all religions! *Ptah*, *Piter*, appears again as *Peter*; the next step was *Pater* the father; then our *Papa*; and lastly, the *papa* of all *papas*, the *Pope*.

The Hebrews turned the Egyptian *Iusa* into the well-known *Joshua* (*Josua* or *Jeshua*) and the Greeks into *Iesus*. The Romans made *Jesus* out of *Iesus* and *this* form was retained by the Church, because there were already hundreds of *Joshuas* and their common name was not "holy" enough. So we were saddled with a *Jesus*!

Yet, like a will-o'-the-wisp, the names of *Iusa*, *Horus*, *Jesus*, *Joshua*, appear again in a slightly veiled form in about three hundred different names, both in and outside the Old Testament. The best example is *Ju-sef* which is pure Egyptian; the Hebrews called him *Jo-seph*, but the Muslims still call him *Jussef*. *Josephus*, *José*, *Josephine*. *Joe*, *Joey* are other well-known forms, all names starting with *Ja*, *Je*, *Jo*, *Ju* belong into this category, as a dictionary of biblical names will indicate.

A very typical example is the Egyptian *Io-Aan*. The Babylonians turned him into *Io-annes*, the Hebrews into *Jochanan*, the English into *John*, the Gaels into *Ian* and the French into *Jean* (not omitting the Scots *Jock*); the Italians say *Giovanni*, the Spaniards *Juan*, the Portuguese *Joao*, the Germans and Scandanavians *Johann* and *Hans*, and the Russians *Ivan*.

When in the 3rd and 4th centuries the New Testament was concocted, the papal falsifiers turned good allegory, appertaining to the seasonal "dying" of the sungod, into impossible history and landed themselves into a heap of trouble. Never for a moment did they imagine that, thanks to the Rosetta Stone, we who are living 1700 years later on would be able to brand their fabled accounts as impudent forgeries!

Had they known, they would have erased the "two thieves" (who, more than any other item, gave the game away) from their farcical sob-stuff story of a "crucifixion" that never happened! Through its inaccuracies, the whole account is really laughable. It reads more like a scene from Gilbert's comic opera *The Mikado*, with its Lord High Executioner.

At *Dendera* (the ancient *Tentyra*, a village of Upper Egypt, 28 miles north of *Thebes*, there is a temple of

Hathor in almost perfect preservation. On the ceiling of a portico was found a Zodiac now in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris. It dates from the period of Cleopatra.

In that Zodiac can be seen Horus—who is Iusa (Jesus)—on the “cross” or at the crossing of the vernal equinox, pictured with the “two thieves” Anup and Aan on either side of the Sungod. Here is authentic proof of the pre-Christian prototype of the Gospel “crucifixion” between two thieves!

Anup (who was in Greek mythology Hermes) was an Egyptian deity whose office was to guide the souls in the underworld. He can be seen in numerous bas-relief representations as a man with the head of a jackal “weighing the souls” on a pair of scales, while Osiris watches the operation.

Aan (or Taht-Aan) was the dog-headed deity, often represented as a dog-headed ape. He is generally pictured together with Anup. (See Dr. Kuhn's *The Lost Light* p. 528).

Anup and Aan were called “the two thieves of the Light”, because they were said to have stolen the “bright light of the sun”—or during an earlier cult—the Moon. On the other hand, the 12 solar characters previously mentioned were pictured as seated in the barque of Osiris. They were called the “guardians of the treasure of light”.

Gerald Massey enumerates 180 items of similarity between the Gospel Christ and his Egyptian precursor. Egypt's “Christ” was not a living person. It would have been equally fatal to Christianity if he had been. But, the fact of his non-historicity rises now out of the past—which the Bible fabricators (really copyists of earlier religions) had thought they had sealed in oblivion for ever—to strike the death-knell of the false and spurious religion called Christianity. Thus, the Gospel's “life” of Jesus turns out to be nothing but a garbled and fragmentary copy of an Egyptian prototype who had *never lived*, but was a purely dramatic type-figure of the Sungod.

The Church's deception of presenting as historical facts Gospels which now stand revealed as forgeries, must be reckoned as one of the greatest crimes in the annals of humanity, for it has retarded man's finer development by nigh on eighteen centuries. Many of the “Christianised” nations still display an inhumanity and brutality in their bellicose adventures that is uncommonly like that of the most depraved savages of 3,000 years ago—or perhaps worse. Far from being *good* influence for speeding cultural advance, orthodoxy still acts like a drag-chain on anything that savours of progress, enlightenment, harmony or brotherhood. Only through constant and insidious propaganda by means of press, radio and TV and by encouraging superstition and ritualism, can the orthodox Churches retain their hold on the untutored masses.

Anything that would dispel the ecclesiastical fog of mystification and distortion is vigorously suppressed. Light and truth are the arch-enemies of all religious denominations. The gruesome and repulsive “passion” fiction of a crucified saviour, is not only a travesty of truth, but also a nauseating mockery of grief, calculated to throw the Church's gullible devotees into paroxysms of dolorous dejection and holy pity. By hypnotising their adherents with the empty promise of a vicarious atonement and instilling a “sin-complex” (i.e. conceived in sin and constantly sinning), the Churches have turned them into dupes. Instead of encouraging nobility in their followers, they have reduced them to grovelling beggars and miserable wretches, forever pleading for mercy, in order to be “saved” by a fictitious “redeemer.” This is, perhaps, the most lamentable aspect of crazed religionism in the 20th century.

The World Union of Freethinkers

By C. BRADLAUGH BONNER

The Executive of the World Union of Freethinkers, at a meeting held at Strasbourg on July 24-25th, revised the regulations in accordance with the amendments proposed, and agreed the request of the British National Secular Society to fix the date of the next international congress as September 2nd-5th, 1966 in London; in conjunction with the celebration of the Centenary of the NSS. The two principal questions to be considered by the congress will be the historical development of Freethought on the one hand, and its future possibilities and tasks.

The National Congress of the French Freethought Federation was held at Grenoble from August 12-15th, and was preceded by a public meeting when the President of the National Federation and Vice-President of the World Union spoke on “Religion and Freethought Confronted by Present Day Problems.”

At the opening of the Congress the General Secretary R. Labrègère welcomed not only the delegates of France, but also representatives of Freethought from Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Switzerland and also from the Spanish Resistance. Greetings from the World Union were expressed by Hubert Freistühler, the Information Secretary, who emphasised the need for close international co-operation. Letters from many parts of the world, including one from the President, C. Bradlaugh Bonner, bore witness to the community of aims with the French Federation.

Having dealt with administrative questions, the Congress considered press action, propaganda, the Home for Aged Freethinkers and finally the main subject, that of Youth and Freethought.

The Federation considered that the seeming liberal changes in recent Vatican policy were in no way altering its fundamental policy of universal supremacy, and noted moreover that the Vatican, now one of the great financial powers of the world, had recently blackmailed the Italian State into giving it preferential treatment in State institutions. It also observed in France the Church intrigues to split labour and youth organisations, and with respect to the schools its rejection of any invitation to bring about a reasonable solution for national education. The Federation judges the present Government of its country to be opposed to all its own ideals, and views with great misgiving the abundant facilities offered to the Churches, especially the Roman Church, in sharp contrast with the exiguous times allotted to rationalist broadcasting, despite the considerable proportion of rationalist listeners. The aim of the Federation is to secularise all State institutions, and, on the eve of the general election the result of which may strongly influence the future for many years, it calls on all who sympathise with that aim to forget their quarrels and unite in an attempt to establish a genuine democratic and secular State in France.

In the international field the Federation considered that the belligerent policy of the United States, was inspired, not merely by hostility to a political ideology, but also to a materialist philosophy; and the Pentagon, by its interference in different parts of the globe, particularly in Vietnam, had become a danger to world peace. Religions, limited by their doctrines and institutions, were incapable of solving with justice and humanity the urgent problems of today; the Federation therefore appealed to all like-minded persons to co-operate with it in an effort to advance good and humane measures which aim at world-wide

peace, freedom of thought and one happy co-existence of peoples.

The foreign congressists and those French who were particularly interested held several discussions as to the best ways of collaborating, and hailed the establishment of an information service with warm approval. President Jean Cotereau re-elected, stressed in his closing address the great need for close co-operation, and reminded his hearers of the International Congress to be held in London early next September.

The Annual Conference of Progressive Esperantists (SAT) took place at Karlsruhe, Haus der Gewerkschaften, and included a veritable international Freethought gathering as 35 members of the Freethought section were present. Though from seven different countries they discussed their problems in a single language; exchanging information as to the Freethought situation in the several lands, e.g. church taxation, formalities required to leave a church, cremation and burial, including the recent American "refrigeration" of the dead. On account of another meeting Germany was not strongly represented, though there was present Josef Burger of Essen, well known as a poet and ever cheerful.

"CRUEL MORALIST"

MRS. DAPHNE MCCARTHY, wife of the founder of the Moral Law Defence Association, Dillon McCarthy, has been granted a decree on grounds of cruelty. Mr. McCarthy, whose Association is strongly opposed to divorce, was described by the judge as an unusual type of man; virtually all his life was spent within a room, sleeping by day and staying awake at night (*South London Press*, 2/11/65). In the eyes of the law he was a cruel man, said the judge. The case had been listed as Mr. McCarthy's petition for restitution of conjugal rights, but he did not attend court. He did, however, submit a 60-page sworn statement. In 1961, the Moral Law Association organised a group of "vigilantes" to clean up bookshops.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTMAS

A reader asks for suggestions for an appropriate non-Christian Christmas greeting. What about "Merry Solstice Celebrations"?
OTTO WOLFGANG

Reading through the list of names of those who write so regularly and so well for *Freethought* and *Humanist* publications. Breasting through the literary efforts of the trained minds, who are such a wealth of information on historical fact and who write as only those can who train for the task, I wonder, where do I, a poor and by comparison a semi-literate bus conductor come in?

What active part can I take in the Humanist movement, if literary qualifications and affluence must be the standard? It has been said that Humanism must come from the top, downwards, from the intellectuals down to the base semi-literates. Am I then to be debarred from playing my part in a movement which I have searched for over many years? Debarred until the intellectuals have had their fill?

I am an atheist because religion is a lie and because the basis of religions is the debasement of man and is the doctrine of fear. I want to see this fear removed from all men, that they may lead a full and happy life. I want desperately to do something concrete to stop such things as the proposed take-over bid for the Church of England by the Roman Catholics, and with it, of course, the "establishment." Terror and fear and torment lie in the wake of this cunning move.

I don't want to write about sex. It is important, but is not top priority for an active atheist. I don't want to write about homosexuality; his problem can be resolved later. I don't want to denigrate parsons and bishops nor to mock and scoff at what

others believe. I want to see a code of conduct preached by atheists which is not the doctrine of fear but is the dignity of man.

I believe that the process of the evolution of man is still going on; the most important thing today to assist that process, is to abandon the debasing effects of religion. Evolution will be stifled, whilst fear and mysticism and God-worship last. We shall never prove our claims, or attain our aims until we stop "muck-slinging" and put forward a concrete code of conduct and the basis of a new morality, which we can offer and prove to be more satisfying and more effective than any religion.

We are the pioneers of a new era in social life and social reform. Let us put forward a new morality, founded on rationalism and secularism. This way lies dignity and the deletion of fear. Surely, somewhere, someone will lead us.

KENNETH J. EAD

OBITUARY

Fred Pain, who died in London on October 27th, was a member of the National Secular Society and a FREETHINKER reader for many years. He was a quiet and unassuming man who held his views with deep conviction; and despite poor health he frequently attended meetings and other functions. He also enjoyed music and was a keen theatregoer.

The funeral took place at Mortlake Crematorium on November 2nd, and was attended by the following NSS members: Messrs. H. Cleaver, F. A. Ridley, W. McIlroy, R. Sproule and Mrs. E. Wynants. The late Mr. Pain was a widower and is survived by his two sons (now living in Australia) and a daughter, to whom our sympathy is extended.

THE ENGLISH SUNDAY

Distraught on a fat Sunday
the she-rat runs abroad
where enemies may shoulder-gun for ducks
talk about religion and
more buttons in the bank).
And then she's glad to see again her man
back of the sunset.

OSWELL BLAKESTON

RELIGION AND ETHICS IN SCHOOLS

The Case for Secular Education
by DAVID TRIBE

with a foreword by LIONEL ELVIN

Price 1/6d. plus 6d. postage

Special rates for quantities:

3 copies 3/5d., 6 copies 6/7d.

12 copies 13/-, 18 copies 19/8d.

24 copies 26/2d. (including postage).

National Secular Society

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

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.