

FREETHINKER

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

FOUNDED 1881 by G. W. FOOTE

Friday, September 1, 1967

THE LITTLE MAN

"THE Autostrada del Sole, Europe's most spectacular motorway, runs 469 miles from Milan to Naples and south, past almost enchanted countryside. One of the outstanding enterprises of post-war Italy, a stretch of it was blessed by the Pope."

Thus opened an article in the *Observer* Colour Supplement (20 August). As I read this I thought to myself: Big deal. So the little man has blessed a stretch of the Autostrada. I wonder what the thinking behind that was. Are we supposed to have fewer accidents on that particular stretch than on any other? Are we indeed supposed to have no accidents at all along this stretch now that the little man has blessed it?

I then turned to a recent number of the *Catholic Herald*. August 4th to be precise, and I read that the little man had just returned from a strenuous two-day visit to Turkey and was now, that is already four weeks ago, resting at Castel Gandolfo, his summer residence in the hills just outside Rome. And I read further that the little man would be resting there until the middle of this month, a paltry period of six weeks. And I looked again at the headlines in the *Catholic Herald*. And I read 'POPE VERY FATIGUED BY TURKISH VISIT'. And I felt very sorry for the poor little man who had had such a strenuous two-day trip that he needed to rest for six weeks at the Castel Gandolfo in the hills just outside Rome. And then I thought of some of the women living in Rome itself, of the women living along the Autostrada del Sole, both the blessed and the unblessed parts, all the way from Milan to Naples, of the women living, not in the Castel Gandolfo, but in the shacks and the hovels, the slums and the rat-holes. I thought of the women who, like the little man, were also fatigued. Fatigued, not by a two-day trip to Turkey but by bearing so many children, bearing them in pain and

rearing them in sorrow. I thought of these fatigued child-bearing, child-rearing women who bore so much because the little man said they should, who endured so much because the little man said they should endure, who suffered so much because the little man said it is the will of God. And the little man knows so much about the will of God. And I thought what a pity that the little man does not invite these fatigued women to join him for six weeks' rest at the Castel Gandolfo. They would surely enjoy it as much as he does.

And then I read that the little man was going to reform the Curia. He was going to reform the man-made, man-managed, man-mad Curia, the Cabinet of the Cadaverous Church. And there it was in the paper I was reading. And I looked in another paper and there the little man's move was reported too. And in another, and in another. And then I thought again of the little man's trip to India, and of the little man's trip to Fatima, and of the little man's trip to the UN in New York, and again I thought of the fatiguing little man's trip to Turkey. And then it was that I understood why the little man had blessed a stretch of the Autostrada del Sole. I was no longer confused for I could now understand what it was all about.

The little man is indeed little because he is not simply the supposed controller but the definite victim of a mechanism which he did not create, which is larger and greater and far more powerful than he himself is. He sees the mechanism, which he feels bound to protect, threatened by a rationalism and a humanitarianism which he can neither fully appreciate nor fully control. He sees the mechanism no longer inspiring awe and fear and admiration to an extent it once did but evoking mockery and indifference on the outside and, on the inside, a confused combination of apathy and rebellion. And so the little man has taken a crash course in Public Relations and Advertising. And the little man will go on making a little trip here, a little trip there, a little trip somewhere else, and getting so tired that he must have a long rest at Castel Gandolfo or some other palatial residence. He'll go on hitting the headlines with a blessing of this and a pronouncement on that. Until the gimmicks are no longer gimmicks because they are no longer new and the newspaper readers and the radio listeners and the television watchers are no longer impressed by the little man's demonstrations at Fatima or his blessings of Autostradas or his fatiguing visits to the Turks or even to the Hottentots. And then they will simply think, if they think at all, of the women in the shacks and the

INSIDE

- THE NEW MORALITY *Harry Lamont* Speaking Personally
- FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH I: The Origin of Religion *A. C. Thompson*
- THE ANATOMY OF THE SOUL *S. Levin*
- SCIENCE FOR MAN, NOT MAN FOR SCIENCE *David Tribe*
- ANNOUNCEMENTS : LETTERS

(Continued on page 280)

Harry Lamont

Speaking Personally

ONCE upon a time a girl who fornicated before marriage was regarded as damaged goods. If she married a man who thought her a virgin, he felt aggrieved to discover his error, even if he had been with numerous women. Such was male arrogance and conceit.

But things are changing. Nowadays pre-marital chastity is the exception rather than the rule. Occasionally Professors and others get into hot water for declaring they see no harm in an engaged couple sleeping together if they are truly in love.

Whether we like it or not, the decay of religion plus the accessibility of cheap and reasonably reliable contraceptives have resulted in an increase of unmarried sexual intercourse, particularly among young people.

Sixty years ago—as I recall—a terrible stigma was attached to bastardy. If a respectable girl got pregnant she was often driven from home. The disgrace was more than her parents could stand. Heedless of Christ's injunction about the woman taken in adultery, the pious stoned her with ferocity.

But nowadays the stigma has practically disappeared. Single girls go to special centres with great aplomb. The Matron of such a place told me she wanted particulars of a putative father, to make him pay a contribution towards the expenses, but the girl knew neither his name nor address. So the Matron asked for a description. What was the colour of his hair?—"I never saw him with his hat off" cried the lass.

I do not attach much importance to reports like the Kinsey compilation, because it is enormously difficult to find out the truth about people's sexual activities. Some exaggerate to impress and others pretend to be virtuous when they are quite promiscuous. But it seems reasonable to assume that there is far more sexual laxity than say half a century ago.

The professional prostitute complains of unfair competition from the typist, shop assistant and *au pair* girl, many of whom will allow a man to take them to bed in exchange for a dinner, theatre show, silk stockings and a box of chocolates.

Moralists deplore promiscuity and cite the example of ancient civilisations that were wiped out for widespread immorality, but love continues to laugh at locksmiths and a lusty male tends to forget his conscience.

A famous French psychiatrist wrote *la libido mène le monde*, ie, "the sexual urge drives the world", and everywhere, at all times, strong healthy people will tend to seek intimacy, despite marital obligations and the censure of society.

A woman tied to a man who dislikes sexual intercourse and consents to it with extreme reluctance and shows no pleasure in the act, will naturally seek elsewhere what she doesn't find at home. Conversely many jaded frigid wives wonder why their partners are unfaithful when the said women are so dutiful, self-sacrificing and virtuous. All they lack is sex appeal and passion.

Throughout the ages great importance was attached to female chastity, because a husband naturally didn't want a bastard to inherit his property. Before departing for the Crusades, knights used to fix on their wives a chastity belt to ensure fidelity during the husband's absence.

THE NEW MORALITY

There has been much discussion about sex instruction in schools. Some parents think such tuition puts ideas into children's heads. The fact remains that for a good many years from the age of puberty the sex urge is very strong, and it would seem better to receive sensible instruction in the subject than to glean one's information from bawdy yarns and lavatory walls. But it is amazing how scared of sex some parents are. The dirty secret must not be mentioned.

Country children have one great advantage; they see animals mating and regard the act as normal. But to the town child sex remains the filthy mystery, and if he sees a dog and a bitch coupled, he howls with obscene laughter.

On balance I prefer the new morality to the old. Today—taking them by and large—young people are more honest and frank in their attitude to sex. I used to stress to my pupils that the great crime was to bring an unwanted child into the world, and if a youth really cares for a girl he will wait until they are married before sleeping together.

Of course what is called heavy petting is a serious problem. The man kisses and cuddles, then wants to go the whole hog. The girl must restrain him, gently but firmly.

Male chastity is made difficult by pictures of pin-up girls in scanty attire and provocative postures.

It has always seemed amusing to me when a parson fulminates against the lusts of the flesh, then marries a seductive pleasure beast, a real *femme fatale*, whose one purpose in life is to stimulate male desire.

There is still a strange reluctance to discuss social problems in England. A few years ago, in a south coast hotel. I noticed in a newspaper that a prostitute placed her four children in a crèche while she plied her trade. I read the item aloud, but the five widows in the room ignored me when I asked them what they thought about it. I then addressed my question to Mrs X, whom I knew quite well. Looking embarrassed she replied: "I do not wish to discuss such an unpleasant topic"—"And you think your attitude a proper one", I scoffed. "While VD is rotting the vitals of the nation we refuse to discuss a social evil. No wonder foreigners regard us as the world's champion hypocrites".

In *Jonathan Wilde* Henry Fielding describes how a man would have ravished a woman in a few minutes if she had not, by a timely compliance, prevented him. Many females are expert at leading men up the garden path. Such sirens pretend to be coy, while doing all they can to excite the male.

The female body was designed to perpetuate the species. Art emphasises nature. I recall how embarrassed I felt a few years ago on entering a London store to be confronted by a gorgeous *houri* in ornate brassière, glamour pants, silk stockings, high-heeled shoes and nothing else.

In Africa I lived among native women who were nude save for a small square of beads amidships. I did not consider them as provocative as the enchantress who wiggles her crupper and upper structure in a London street. Women's legs provoke the male and therefore mini skirts endanger chastity. One can even buy *falsies* which are inflated with a cycle pump. But I have no time for the seductive damsel who dresses provocatively and then complains to a cop if a sex-starved bloke makes a pass at her.

FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH: I

A. C. Thompson

The Origin of Religion

TODAY, more and more people are coming to believe that religion is simply foolish superstition. It may be superstition, but it surely is not foolish—rather, candid study of religion shows it to be a most practical and ingenious invention of the human mind. Religion has been hitherto, and still is today, an extremely useful expedient for the preservation of society, and it is for this reason that so many people cling to it.

Early man gained a fragmentary knowledge of the world by exceedingly slow steps, and anything that was not perfectly obvious he almost invariably explained the wrong way. Although mankind has always been more or less curious about things, early man could not have seen in nature the order and regularity which men of the present generation find in it. The orderliness of nature has been appreciated only since the time of the ancient Greeks. Rather than regularity, savage man found uncertainty and confusion. Rain and fair weather, health and sickness, safety and jeopardy, abundance and famine, good luck and bad luck, all came with no apparent plan. On no day could he tell what to expect on the morrow, and he realised his own inability to influence the course of events by anything else than supplication of the unseen spirit. It was doubtless this apparent irregularity of natural events that led early man to fabricate a multitude of unseen beings whose capricious wills dominated happenings beyond his control, and who were to be influenced by ritual and sacrifice. Thus arose primitive religion—man, mystified by the work of the seemingly inanimate forces of nature, gratified by their occasional friendliness and alarmed by their hostility, and realising his own impotence to alter the forces of the elements or the lot destined him by fate, ascribed to almighty and invisible beings a power over all nature similar to that which he himself exercised over the sticks and stones around him.

Early man saw other men hurt or killed, by animals, by falls, by lightning, crushed by falling trees, murdered by other men. Here, they could see the cause of death: animals, lightning, trees, enemies, can make a man die. But they saw other men—strong, healthy men—get sick, lie down and die when nothing had hurt them. What made this? If there was a cause, it could not be seen. It was something like a bad animal, or an evil man, that worked without being seen. It was a "spirit". After men learned the culture of the soil, the barbarian farmer knew that there were years when he worked diligently, ploughing his field, watering it, uprooting weeds, killing insects, guarding against molestation; but floods or drought came, weeds thrived, insects devoured half his crops, thieves carried off the other half, and he was left with a bare subsistence. In another year, warm sunlight alternated with gentle rain, there were few insects or weeds, and he reaped an abundant harvest. He realised that, not only in farming, but in all affairs of life, he could work for a desired result, but his fate was still not entirely of his own making. It was for the beneficence of factors over which he had no control that he besought the gods and feared them.

In the Bible, the Prophet Isaiah gives us a vivid picture of the origin of religion. He portrays a man who uses some wood to kindle a fire which warms him and cooks his food; then, feeling satisfied and warm, the man takes some of the wood which remains, fashions an image, falls down before

it and worships it, saying, "Deliver me, for thou art my god" (Isaiah xlv, 14-17). In this same chapter (xlv, 6, ff), is presented the first clear declaration of monotheism in all of Scripture. Belief in the intervention of spiritual beings endowed with physical and mental powers similar to, but more efficacious than, those of human beings, furnished an easy and satisfying explanation when no other was available, and to the savage and the barbarian this conception seemed wholly logical, even when extended to control over the free acts of men.

As far as is known, earliest religion was concerned with worship only, not with morality. It was an effort to secure self-preservation by begging or otherwise winning the favour of the unseen gods. Religion, even to the Christianity of modern times, has ever been more concerned with the relation of man to his god than to his fellow-man. But morality must be as old as mankind. The first human beings who were ever begotten by their simian parents, or who were ever created in Eden, whichever theory you favour, must have confronted the necessity of preserving their society and of making judgments about what was good, or better, or bad, or worse. Each of those original ancestors of humanity must have had at least a right to eat and to live, and the duty of letting his fellow creatures do the same. It was declared by the English moralist Thomas Hobbes that men at this time were constantly fighting one another, but the French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau held to the contrary that the earliest men lived together in peace, harmony and happiness, precisely because they were free of the artificial restraints imposed by government, church, law and ethical rule. Researches in human palaeontology have not yet yielded conclusive evidence that the first men were any more hostile or friendly to one another than are the members of any known species of gregarious mammals. Although evidences of ancient murder are found, such as those discovered at Dragon-Bone Hill in China where the remains of Peking Man were unearthed, still it is reasonable to believe that murder, which is not observed among the higher apes, was likewise not practiced by earliest ape-men, but must have developed as men progressed. Palaeontological evidence of moral beliefs and practices of the earliest men are of course scanty, and attempts to fill this lack of observations of present-day savages make an assumption, perhaps questionable, that the way of life of the most primitive present or recent savages has come down to them with little change from prehistory.

The most primitive group of human beings who can display social and moral conduct towards one another, both naturally and historically, is the family. One may well ask why the members of the first human families required a morality to guide or rule their behaviour towards one another more than did the apes or any other species of gregarious animals? The reply must be, because man can do more. Human beings, as they developed from the apes, became fully plantigrade, maintaining themselves erect on their heels as well as their toes, thus freeing the forelimbs for other activity than locomotion. As the human body progressed, man's muscular control over his hands became such as to enable him to execute the most varied, refined and delicate of movements, and man became a tool-making animal. Also, the human throat and larynx achieved that ability to produce the variety of vocal sounds which permits speech. When a man steals, he uses his

hands; when he murders, he usually first gains an advantage by equipping himself with a weapon; when he lies, he uses his voice. These are actions which are difficult to other animals not physically adapted to perform them. Man's superior abilities can be directed towards either good or evil; the same propensities which led the human race eventually to dominate the earth also make a person capable of crime.

As descendants increase in number, the family becomes a clan, and marriage to wives from other families tends to unite clans into tribes. In primitive societies, the individual is identified with his family, clan, or tribe, which are also held responsible for what he does along with him, and which take his part to avenge any wrong done to him. Earliest enforcement of morality depended upon vengeance. If one felt himself wronged by another, he complained about it to his kinsmen, who aided him in securing the seven-fold revenge sufficient to satisfy him. If a man were murdered, it would be his kinsmen, and not a government, that would avenge his death. Since the man to be punished is a member of some family, clan and tribe, and since punishment is to be inflicted not only upon the malefactor but also upon his kinsmen, this enforcement of morality tends to result in bloody and protracted feuds. Although there exist divergent theories of the origin of government, it must be evident that government serves, partly at least, to establish order out of this otherwise chaos by enacting and enforcing general rules—laws—and by punishing those guilty of violating them with equitable rather than excessive punishments. Instead of allowing one offended to exact revenge of a life for the loss of a tooth, law restricts the penalty to "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth".

It was only later in human progress that morality became part of religion, and only after the advent of government could it become part of law. The ancient Hebrew religion, as shown in the Bible, was preoccupied with ritual, and gave scant attention to morals. Only a tiny portion of the Mosaic law (Exodus xx-xxiv) is concerned with human relationships, and present evidence indicates that this was a later insertion into a work which was composed late in the history of the Jews. They thought their tribal god, Yhwh, demanded from them propitiation with correct ritual, even more than a good life. Only the later prophets exhort the people to turn their religion from ceremonial to morality. Micah, for example (vi, 6-8), proposes that instead of offering the Lord sacrifices, even of one's own first-born, giving "the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul", one should rather "do justly and love mercy". To the present day, the religious view of morality has looked on an immoral act, let us say stealing, as an offence against a Great Spirit rather than against another man; this Spirit controls morality and avenges what humans avenge. Here is the immense practical value of religion: it became a tool for enforcement of morality.

Monotheism first appeared in history as a theory in-

vented by the Egyptian Pharaoh, Amenhotep IV, who declared that there exists one god, Aton, and who changed his name to Akhn-aton. He believed he could force the Egyptians to accept his new religion. But to those people, monotheism was as immoral as polytheism is to religious people today; they resisted, and after he died broken-hearted and almost alone, later pharaohs restored the old religion. One of these, Tut-ankh-amen, died young but was given a most lavish burial by the priests who were re-establishing themselves. His tomb near Thebes was discovered almost intact in 1922. Another, Rameses II, finished the great Temple of Amen at Karnak. Which was the pharaoh of the exodus is uncertain, for he is nowhere named in the Bible, nor is a captivity of the Jews recorded in Egyptian history; chronologically the pharaoh of Moses' dealings would have been some successor of Akhnaton. Hence, many have suggested that the Hebrews learned their monotheism during their Egyptian slavery. But this suggestion must be rejected. Before Isaiah, the religion of the Hebrews was not a real monotheism as was that of Akhnaton, who declared that the sun-god, Aton, ruled over all men everywhere; true, they had one god, Yhwh, but he was simply their tribal god, and they did acknowledge the existence of other tribal gods of other tribes. Whenever the Hebrews advanced to new lands, the Bible portrays them as tending to worship the local gods of the territory in order to win their favour; they need to be constantly restrained to worship their own god, Yhwh. The Egyptian religion, further, was based on a future life in which one's earthly acts would be judged. The importance attached to life after death inspired embalming arts and mummification as well as monumental pyramids and tombs which have ever since been a wonder of the world and attest that in ancient Egypt one was more important dead than alive. On the other hand, the Hebrews never had a conception of life or anything else beyond the grave (sheol). After 400 years of slavery, surely the Hebrews would have come away speaking Egyptian, writing, if they had learned to write at all, in hieroglyphics, and practising either a true monotheism, or a true polytheism with many national gods, based in either case on life after death. The only reasonable conclusion is that the whole story of the Exodus is sheer fable—it never happened. The Hebrew religion, with its many bloody sacrifices, more resembled those of Mesopotamia—of Sumeria and Assyria—than that of Egypt.

The moral teachings of Jesus Christ were few. To find them, one looks through the Gospels picking up a phrase or a sentence here and there. Jesus never attained a complete and coherent system of ethical thought; rather, his moral teachings are fragmentary, and his sayings have been found, throughout history, to be capable of various interpretations to suit individual wishes and needs. Departure from the "infallible" interpretation has given rise to numerous sects. Much of what he said, such as the sermon on the mount (or plain, Luke vi, 17) is impractical. Those today who speak of "our Christian morality" refer to very little that is not in every other religion and ethical system of the world; in many respects, some other religions such as Buddhism may uphold higher moral standards. But it is really a sad loss to the world that he was executed so unjustly so early in life, for if he had lived on, his interest in ethics and human relationships might eventually have led him to make some really sound and worthwhile contribution to human thought. Jesus held, if anything, two distinct and somewhat inconsistent moral philosophies, one supernatural, based on love of God, the other natural, based on

Challenge '67

The FREETHINKER requires a full-time editor. Lively, responsible, interesting post. Salary and expenses by negotiation. Letters of application should be addressed to

W. GRIFFITHS, Esq., *Chairman*,
G. W. Foote & Co. Ltd.,
103 Borough High Street, London, SE1

(Continued on page 279)

THE ANATOMY OF THE SOUL

S. Levin M.B. (Rand), M.R.C.P. (Edin.), D.C.H. Johannesburg

I AM privileged to present this summary of a clinical theology meeting on *The Anatomy Of The Soul: Dilemmas And Difficulties In The Soular System*. Under this bold title a number of provocative papers were delivered during the first plenary session of the Inter-Angelic Conference on Soulology, held at Araboth, Moderator Gabriel presiding.

Opening the congress, the Moderator deplored the widespread lack of interest in soular research and knowledge. He remarked on the fact that, among the 12,000-odd items listed in the Index of *Gray's Anatomy*, there was not to be found one single reference to the soul. He pointed out that the location of the soul had very much interested physicians of former ages. Herophilus of Alexandria (3rd century BC) had considered that the soul resided in the ventricular cavities, but Galen (2nd century) denied this on the basis that penetrating injuries of the ventricles were not instantaneously fatal. In the mid-17th century Nicholas Stensen maintained that the brain was the principal organ of the soul. The 17th century philosopher Descartes accepted the Platonic system that the soul could be divorced from the body. Cartesian philosophy included the suggestion that the soul resided in the pineal gland.

Some investigators had observed that the body became lighter at death and had drawn the inference that the soul had escaped. In the mid-18th century an Italian priest, Francesco Emanuel Cangiamila, had published his *Embryologia Sacra*, a best seller dealing especially with the time of entry of the soul into the embryo. In the late 18th century Emanuel Swedenborg had sought to locate the soul on the basis of his anatomical studies, and at the same time Samuel Thomas von Soemering, who numbered the cranial nerves (his system is the one still in use today) sought to establish the importance of the ventricular cavities as the organ of the soul.^{1,2}

Since then little has been heard of the soul, though occasional writers like Raimer Smith,³ American pathologist and Sunday School teacher, and P. G. Fothergill,⁴ currently Catholic Senior Lecturer in Botany at the University of Newcastle, have suggested that the soul only entered into Man at a time when Man was the mental, emotional and moral equal of Adam, i.e. when he had developed sufficiently far on the evolutionary scale. At an earlier stage of biological evolution Homo had but an essence of soul or perhaps none at all.

Soular entry

Following on the introductory remarks by the Moderator, Bulvan⁵ claimed that Genesis 3:7 supplied the answer to the problem of soular entry:

... and the eyes of them both were opened ...'

Clearly, when Homo became sapient, the soul entered within him. This might have been some 40,000-50,000 years ago.

Glomp⁶ extended Bulvan's concept in an intriguing hypothesis (his subsequent report in the *Journal of Celestial Geography* bears close scrutiny). He stated that all living creatures are paired with souls which remain in heaven and that only in sapient Man does synthesis take place for varying periods. He quotes Shlemuzzel,⁷ who feels that a spark of soul has always enveloped evolving Man (free-floating soul, as it were) and that when Man was sufficiently developed to receive it, it entered into him.

Of course, this is merely a gloss on the well-known theory of Tipes⁸ that the soul evolves *pari passu* with Man—separate development, in fact.

The location of the soul

Laymener Golem⁹ restated the case for the brain as the organ of the soul (see the full account in *Theomythology Weekly*).

He dealt at some length with the difficulties attendant to placing a portion or an essence of soul within the trunk or limbs, bringing up the well-known problems of soular fate in tissue losses and gains, paying particular attention to accessions such as blood transfusions, skin, bone and kidney transplants, and donations from animal and inert origin. He also dealt with the loss of tissues such as saliva, semen, teeth, hair and in amputations.

He concluded that the soul animated the organ of consciousness alone.

Bogomol¹⁰ raised two objections to this limitation:

1. If the soul animates the brain alone, one may urge the contrary view: the brain generates the soul; it conceives of a soul and creates this soul, and when the brain dies, the soul perishes with it.

2. In two situations among human material there is no brain:

(a) In the zygote and early embryo.

(b) In anencephaly and hydranencephaly.

In (b) a virtually brainless infant can live weeks and even months. If the soul be paired with consciousness, such infants (with soul in the thalamus?) can have no soul.

The problem of soular location was left unresolved.

Soular symbiosis

Not only pregnancy and multiple pregnancy need to be considered but also phenomena such as mosaicism and chimeras, dermoids and lithopaedon.

These problems proved a sore trial. Sturebareban¹¹ pressed the view that the soul entered the embryo at the moment of fertilisation and that for fully nine months thereafter there was a soular symbiosis between mother and baby. He felt strongly that the foetal soul animated the brain alone because there were too many difficulties attendant on the status of organs such as placenta, membranes and cord. Non-souled foetal blood also escaped to the mother's circulation.

A special problem is associated with multiple pregnancy, in particular identical twins. This phenomenon is perforce delayed until the fertilised ovum has begun a successful mitosis to result in two fertilised cells, each of which will become a separate individual. If the soul enters with the fertilising sperm, then presumably the soul also divides with mitosis. Khamor¹² sees no difficulty in this hypothesis, for the soul, being like an electrical charge, is not diminished by division. The similarity of identical twins bears testimony to the similarity of the souls in such instances.

According to Meshugener,¹³ who adopts a fundamentalist approach, the occurrence of multiple pregnancy is foreseen by the All-Soul, God, so that the correct number of souls is allocated to the initial fertilised ovum, or else the placing is withheld until more definite differentiation occurs with

regard to the number of individuals to be grown from the original zygote.

Gluses¹⁴ dealt with the problem of chromosomal mosaicism and chimeras, pointing out that up to 50 per cent of a person's blood may be derived from that of a twin. Such composite characters, he feels, should not be considered as possessing composite souls, for the soul, he also maintains, is limited to the brain. Gluses also dealt briefly with the soular problems associated with derooid and lithopaedon formation.

Soular teratology

Theologians have little contact with neonatal pathology and teratology and these pose staggering problems for the philosophers of the soul.

An aborted monstrous embryo has been recorded containing 69 chromosomes per cell. Possibly a 23-chromosomed sperm fertilised an ovum which had failed in meiosis and still presented 46 chromosomes. What was the status of its soul? Shmendrik,¹⁵ who feels certain enough of the soular status of 46- (nee 48-) chromosomed individuals, is in some doubt about the souls of such malformations. He notes that the Talmud does not accord equality to all souls, regarding them as superior, inferior, good and vicious, and believes that the current active soular research will shortly supply an answer to this dilemma. Present evidence seems to indicate that souls also undergo concomitant chromosomal aberrations and development.

As an extension of this view Behema¹⁶ argues that defective souls do exist and animate monstrosities, idiots, the hideously deformed, the anencephalic and hydranencephalic. He denies the medieval view that these are animated by the devil.

What of fertilised human ova growing some weeks in tissue culture? Laimpatz¹⁷ feels that these are a horror and denies them a soul. Only pregnancies within the female (though not necessarily within the womb) are endowed with a soul.

Conjoined monsters were considered at some length by Shlepaya Pundreh¹⁸ who frankly acknowledged that this was an especially difficult matter for soular apologetics. How is the soul divided in thoracopagus or abdominopagus twins, joined at chest or abdomen but having two heads? Shlepaya Pundreh believes it short-sighted to assert that they have two distinct souls because of their distinct brains: this opens the possibility of maintaining that the souls are merely expressions of the brain. Bodily extensions of the souls also exist and intermingle though retaining their individual integrity by means not yet clarified. Surgical division of conjoined twins results in withdrawal of the respective souls to their individual bodies. Research in soular symbiosis, he pointed out, is still young.

Craniopagus monsters, with one brain and two bodies or parts thereof, have only one soul, and it is tempting to classify these as deformed or abnormal souls, or if that is an anthropocentric label, then as noble, heroic or self-sacrificing souls, or perhaps foolish and unpopular souls.¹⁹

At any rate Averbotel¹⁹ contends that research in this field is urgently necessary and that funds should be made available for this worthy endeavour. He quotes the classical, if somewhat materialistic overstatement of Shlemiel:²⁰

'All the secrets of the universe are to be found in any local branch of Barclay's Bank.'

The congress concluded on a jarring note. Tam²¹ questioned the very existence of the soul. He brought up two points:

1. It introduces a new factor to heaven and earth, making the universe into a multiverse. He quoted Huxley:²²

'The knowledge explosion of the past hundred years has given us a new vision of human destiny—of the world, of man, and of man's place and role in the world. It is evolutionary and monistic, showing us all reality as a self-transforming, continuous process, with no dualistic cleavage between soul and body, matter and mind, life and non-life, natural and supernatural. All phenomena, from worms to woman, from radiation to religion, are natural.'

2. The soul was centred in Man at a time when the earth was centred in the universe, when the sun revolved about it and even stood still for Joshua.

But Galileo deposed Man, who is now seen as a speck on a crumb of earth orbiting about a puny young star hurtling along an obscure side street in a galactical metropolis, itself no more than an atom in the galaxies of space; and possibly Man may not even be alone in space.

Should Man be eternal? At such cosmic conceit the stars disintegrate with laughter.

Tam ended by stating that medical and biological considerations place insuperable obstacles in the way of regarding the soul as anything other than a faintly ludicrous idea.

The Moderator was plainly displeased at this turn of events and urged the steering committee to explore fresh ground for fruitful debate on Clinical Soulology next year.

REFERENCES

1. Clarke, E. (1962): *Transac. Colleg. Phys. Phila.*, **30**, 85.
2. Gibson, W. C. (1962): *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.*, **180**, 944.
3. Smith, C. R. (1950): *The Physician Examines The Bible*. New York: Philosophical Library.
4. Fothergill, P. G. (1961): *Evolution and Christians*. London: Longmans & Co. Ltd.
5. Bulvan, A. Z. A. (1964): *Heavenly Works*. Chelm Univ. Press.
6. Glomp, Y. O. U. (1964): *J. Celest. Geogr.*, **4**, 44.
7. Shlemuzzel, U. (1964): *Stellar Soc. J.*, **44**, 4.
8. Tipes, O. I. (1964): *Acta Astralia*, **3**, 33.
9. Laymener Golem I. (1964): *Theomythol. Weekly*, **33**, 3.
10. Bogomol, I. M. A. (1964): *Clin. Theol.*, **2**, 22.
11. Sturebareban, A. (1964): *Proc. Heav. Soc. Metaphys.*, **22**, 2.
12. Khamor, O. (1964): *J. Spectr. Assn.*, **7**, 77.
13. Meshugener, O. H. (1964): *Psychic Proc.*, **77**, 7.
14. Gluses, D. U. (1964): *Galactia*, **6**, 66.
15. Shmendrik, M. Y. (1964): *J. Cosmic Sci.*, **66**, 6.
16. Behema, R. U. A. (1964): *Synopsis Of Abnormal Soulology*. Betelgeuse: The Firmament Press.
17. Laimpatz, H. O. (1964): *Clin. Soulol.*, **5**, 55.
18. Shlepaya Pundreh, M. E. (1964): *J. Med. Theol.*, **55**, 5.
19. Averbotel, N. U. (1964): *Spirit. Stud.*, **9**, 99.
20. Shlemiel, I. C. H. (1964): *Textbook Of Arcane Finance*. Fort Knox Press.
21. Tam, E. K. (1964): *Transcendent. Transac.*, **99**, 9.
22. Huxley, J. (1963): *Nature*, **197**, 8.

Reprinted from Medical Proceedings - Mediese Bydraes, Vol. 10, No. 12, June 13, 1964, pp. 255-257.

Flashback

THE Reverend Arthur Perceval, one of the most aristocratic of her Majesty's chaplains in ordinary, having addressed on two several occasions, letters to her Majesty, protesting in the most solemn terms against the worldliness of the Court, he has been informed that his services will no longer be required at the Court, and that his name will be struck off the list of her Majesty's chaplains in ordinary. (The Leader—March 8th. 1851)

SCIENCE FOR MAN, NOT MAN FOR SCIENCE

THE report which follows tells not of wickedness but of ignorance, ineptitude and a failure in communications'—and there follows the harrowing story of Aberfan.

Heavy industry and heating demand coal, and mining waste is simply thrown up, thrown down, on plain, hilltop or valley, with reckless disregard for the safety of those who live nearby. Forty years ago Professor George Knox warned of the dangers in South Wales, but nothing was done. It might have cost some money.

We have just gone through the nerve-racking experience of sonic booms from planes a fraction of the size of the jumbo jets that are promised us. We must take half an hour off the flight of tycoons criss-crossing the world with things to sell; a half-hour they will lose in traffic jams between airport and city centre.

President Johnson is asking for more money to burn up Vietnamese men, women and children in their own country. The exact increase in billions of dollars escapes me. Meanwhile, on his own doorstep, thousands of negro youths are standing round in slum streets among the litter cleared monthly, longing for proper education and jobs, driftwood waiting for the spark of riot. Their only chance, and an increasing one, of getting away from the embers of the Great Society is a draft to Vietnam. But they can share in the vicarious glories of the space programme, knowing that soon it will be possible to reach a place no one wants to live in at the expense of a planet where everyone must live.

Every hour we hear of some new technological marvel. For two years we have rejoiced at agronomic and gynaecological splendours, wondering why acreages and uterus should be so unresponsive that food production is stationary and population has risen five per cent. Most of us live in cities recalling the monorails, pedestrian precincts and moving pavements that were exhibited in models during our youth. Every day we step out into causeways dissecting our urban paths, competing with hurling ironmongery whose bellow and smog drown the air because the manufacturers do not spend the few pounds to civilise them. Not surprisingly, thousands of us do not reach the other side. If we are old, many of us will not see next summer. We have read of organ replacement and cell rejuvenation for almost a generation, but we know that unless we are wealthy or influential or lucky in lotteries we shall not even see a kidney machine. Some of us will have no serious organic disease but simply die of neglect in the geriatric ward of a sub-standard hospital or in houses where food or fuel runs out and to which help cannot be brought because a telephone was an impossible luxury. If, on the contrary, we have enough money to go to Expo '67 we shall see triumphs of engineering and domestic architecture that someone can presumably afford. Even in England we can visit public buildings with electronically operated doors, though millions of us will return to homes where the draught swirls under the door of our external toilet. Yet we think ourselves lucky we are not among the hundreds of millions still living in bark or mud huts.

As someone originally educated in science I am tired of the amoral self-indulgence of scientists, who would mostly build a hydrogen bomb as soon as an iron lung. Indeed,

David Tribe *President, National Secular Society*

they might prefer to build the bomb as the pay is better. I am tired of the smug purple prose of the science correspondents, who fling their extravagant adjectives into homes that are even more unsafe than our roads. I am tired of the pious claptrap of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and Harold Wilson's building socialism. I am tired of the self-righteous intellectuals who react against this and the superstition of traditional religion, then call upon the biochemist to give them a new one.

As freethinkers we are proud of pioneering the world view which makes the scientific method our problem-solving norm. Despite the foregoing, lives are not today as nasty, brutish and short on average as once they were. But as humanists we are sadly aware that, in terms of both direction and momentum, scientific achievement does not match the vision of its creators or the potential of its tools. In a democratic society this is a failure of conviction and energy where everyone must bear some blame.

FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH

(Continued from page 276)

the principle of Reciprocal Hedonism: do to others as you would they should do to you. Reciprocal Hedonism, of course, as an ethical principle, is faulty. A man apprehended for raping a woman could declare in his defence that he did what he would that women should do to him. Reciprocal Hedonism, the "golden rule", does not bind all persons universally with the equality required by reciprocity. It does not bind kings and queens, for they do not treat others as they expect to be treated; do kings and queens stand in the street to cheer others? The policeman should, on this rule, release his prisoner, for if the situation were reversed, this is what he himself would wish. The golden rule cannot apply to many people who hold unique posts or offices in society: to the judge, the tax-collector, the soldier, probably even the teacher and parent. Moreover, Hedonism itself, the "as you would" part of the golden rule, is untenable as a moral principle, for morality is not based on personal pleasure or wish, since one can desire and even find pleasure in the evil and the amoral. If I want to duel with you, I would that you should duel with me; does this make duelling right and good? Jesus apparently never had any conception at all of the social necessity of morality; each man is to do good to every other, but Jesus never recognised why such conduct is moral rather than merely pleasant, in promoting society's survival. For Jesus, morality was individual, and the Christian tradition has hampered enlarged conceptions of morality which could extend to whole societies, to governments and to international affairs. Christ's teachings have been criticised for such anomalies as paying a worker as much for one hour as others are paid for a full day, but Christian morality is inadequate in far more important ways.

To meet the requirements of today's world, the Church needs to take a fresh look at its doctrines and practices. This series of four articles will lead up to a plea for a new Reformation in the final article. But this second Reformation would be of far greater significance than the former one of the early 16th century, for it should bring with it a thorough revision of modern religion.

(To be continued)

FREETHINKER

Published by G. W. Foote & Co. Ltd.
(Pioneer Press)

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

Telephone: HOP 0029

Editor: DAVID COLLIS

THE FREETHINKER ORDER FORM

To: The FREETHINKER, 103 Borough High St., London, SE1
I enclose cheque/PO (*made payable to G. W. Foote & Co. Ltd.*)
£1 17s 6d (12 months); 19s (6 months); 9s 6d (3 months).
(USA and Canada \$5.25 (12 months); \$2.75 (6 months); \$1.40
(3 months)).

Please send me the FREETHINKER starting.....

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

(BLOCK LETTERS PLEASE: plain paper may be used as order form
if you wish.)

The FREETHINKER can be obtained through any newsagent.

Orders for literature from THE FREETHINKER BOOKSHOP; FREETHINKER subscriptions, and all business correspondence should be sent to the BUSINESS MANAGER, G. W. FOOTE & Co. LTD., 103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, S.E.1, and not to the Editor.

Cheques, etc., should be made payable to G. W. FOOTE & Co. LTD. Editorial matter should be addressed to: THE EDITOR, THE FREETHINKER, 103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, S.E.1.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

National Secular Society. Details of membership 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. Cheques, etc., should be made payable to the NSS.

Humanist Letter Network (International) and Humanist Postal Book Service. For information or catalogue send 6d stamp to Kit Mouat, Mercers, Cuckfield, Sussex.

OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Branch NSS (The Mound)—Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN, McRAE and MURRAY.

Manchester Branch NSS, Platt Fields, Sunday afternoon, 3 p.m.: Car Park, Victoria Street, Sunday evenings, 8 p.m.

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

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

INDOOR

West Ham Branch NSS (Wanstead and Woodford Community Centre, Wanstead, London, E11). Meetings at 8 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of every month.

LETTERS

Lesson on the mount

SPEAKING PERSONALLY I consider the articles by Harry Lamont a lesson on the mount for us all.

The most important factor is that his words thread into a material that we can all understand. By we I include the most important section of our community. People who worked at an early age and hard to keep the nation in an economy that allowed the extended education for our better educated 'gentlemen only'.

Unless our Movement gets to the folk who are able to think but cannot give the correct soundings we may as well join the Salvation Army and march to glory for ever more and after.

There are folk living on high salaries under the excuse of 'well, we must attract the better person'. There are cleaners of toilets saving our nation from serious diseases—they are paid a wage that is sinking beneath the 'give us this day our daily bread'.

Our economy is based on the Christian Rat Race. And if we, as Humanists, wish to declare our moral standards to the full, more of Harry Lamont and a little less of thousands of high words that can never reach the thousands.

You will excuse the chip on my shoulder—I did not put it there.
ARTHUR FRANCIS.

Compulsory atheism?

I DO not understand what Peter Crommelin means by compulsory atheism. Nowhere have I ever heard an atheist even suggesting that it should be compulsory. Everyone should be allowed to think what they like. But I am always ready to discuss my beliefs with anyone interested. Why is atheism dangerous? I have never heard anything so absurd. As to his remark about a godless universe being without meaning this of course is just a hang-over from his early religious teaching. Again he says he does not want to be stopped from thinking freely. Who wants to stop him? In fact the more he thinks the more it will enable him to throw over that supernaturalism to which he clings to so mightily.

I hope Peter Crommelin will go on reading the FREETHINKER and come to realise that a God and the Supernatural are not necessary any more than is religion, which he has now rejected.

LILIAN MIDDLETON.

THE LITTLE MAN

(Continued from front page)

hovels, the slums and the rat-holes, living in misery at the foot of the hills of Rome, away from the rarefied atmosphere of Castel Gandolfo, of the women bearing and rearing a mass of souls for God in unpardonable misery the whole stretch from Milan to Naples, indeed of all those women all over the world whom the little man and the great big mechanism of Roman Catholics have hoaxed and cheated. Hoaxed with the threat of Hell and cheated with the promise of Heaven.

And the aura of sanctity and the air of dignity and the halo of holiness will disappear from their eyes. And they will no longer see the Infallible Representatives of Almighty God but simply a tired and bewildered little man.

FREETHINKER FIGHTING FUND

THE FREETHINKER is the only weekly Secularist-Humanist paper in the country. It is still only 6d. How much do YOU care how many people it reaches? To advertise we need money, and our expenses are ever-increasing. Whose copy are you reading now? Have you got a subscription? Couldn't you contribute something to the Fighting Fund, say 6d or 6s or £6 or £60? How much do you really care about Freethought and helping other people to hear about it? Do, please, help if you can.

The FREETHINKER, 103 Borough High St., London, SE1