

1970  
OTT

# **FREE**THINKER

*The Secular  
Humanist Weekly*

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

VOLUME 90, No. 50

Saturday, 12 December, 1970

Sixpence

## **THE CHADWICK REPORT PROPOSES CHANGES IN CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIP, BUT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REMAINS . . . BY LAW (AND BY HOOK OR BY CROOK) ESTABLISHED**

The report of the Archbishops' commission on Church and State, which was published on Thursday, contains proposals for changes which would give the Church of England final authority over its worship and doctrine, and alter the present procedure for the appointment of bishops. But the C of E's position as an established Church would be maintained. The commission was appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in accordance with a resolution passed by the Church Assembly in 1965, and was under the chairmanship of Professor Owen Chadwick. It received evidence from over 70 individuals and organisations, including the National Secular Society whose president, David Tribe, has issued a Press statement—the text of which is given below—in which he declares that the report contains nothing to bring a spark of joy to the "unchurched millions . . . and the non-Christian religionists".

*David Tribe writes:* With *The Fourth R* (the Durham Report on Religious Education) and now *Church and State* (the Chadwick Report on Establishment), the Church of England is gaining a reputation in 1970 for well-presented, lucid reports on intricate subjects, moderately expressed and not un mindful of contrary views. In this latest report, for example, one paragraph (Number 30) is devoted to outlining the submissions of the National Secular Society, the only testimony identified in the text, while in the former document there were many references to the NSS and one to myself. Gratifying as these mentions may be, it would be even more gratifying if the recommendations bore them some resemblance, not because we have any particular organisational claim to recognition but because our views enjoy widespread tacit or active support throughout the country. Indeed, one of the words most commonly on the lips of harassed clerics today is "secularisation"; not, it is true, "secularism" (though this is far from absent), but out of the same sociological stable.

### **Logic of Disestablishment**

In the Majority Report there is no serious attempt to refute our case for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. Indeed it is acknowledged to have "abstract justice". Why then was it not accepted? In the first place the Archbishops' Commission was set up to investigate changes "if the work of the Church is to be executed more effectively in the modern world and if unity with other Churches is to be advanced". Any "radical" proposals that emerge have these ends in view and no other, and amount to an attempt to escape the inconveniences of establishment without losing any of the privileges. The logic of disestablishment is spurned because it "would be likely to include: (1) a severing of the organs of the State from all public connections with Christianity; and (2) a measure of disendowment. Both these would entail loss to the effective work of the churches in this country". Now, it may be said that any body set up by the Church of England could hardly be expected to come to any other conclusion. Since however the Church is established, its reports are likely to gain a quasi-official status, while because the document is "ecumenical" in tone the unwary are likely to proclaim it as "liberal". It cannot therefore be

stated too strongly that as far as the great unchurched millions, and the non-Christian religionists, of this country are concerned there is nothing here to bring them a spark of joy.

The second reason given for failing to accept the logic of the situation is that the English are not interested in abstract justice: "Englishmen do not willingly wind themselves up to the abstract". Abstract "justice" is however invoked to argue that clerics of the Roman Catholic Church, then the Church of Ireland, the Church of Scotland and so the Church England, should be allowed to enter the House of Commons (with which we agree); and that because there are Anglican bishops in the House of Lords there should be "representation of other Churches by using the system of life peerages". Not a word about ideologically representing the *majority* of the population, whose world-views fall outside Christianity along other religious, or humanist, or political paths. To adapt Madame Roland, "Oh Abstract Justice, what injustices are committed in thy name".

### **Opinion Polls**

The third reason is that in some sentimental way the English like to think of themselves as "Christians" and so "they are not likely to be pleased by legislation which might suggest that the English people as a whole were going unChristian". Needless to say no solid evidence is presented for this thesis, though there is an appendix which refers to numerous opinion polls (are they still brazen enough to show their faces after the June election?) where people are supposed to have made Christian noises. Not even the commission can make too much of this one and admits: "If most ordinary Englishmen are polled about Church and State they know nothing about it, do not care about it, and have no complaints about any arrangements that might be found to exist". By the same token, they are unlikely to complain about any changes which might be made. With much greater force it could have been said a year ago, when the abolition of capital punishment was mooted, that "they are not likely to be pleased by legislation which might suggest that the English people as a whole

*(Continued on back page)*

## SOUTH AFRICA'S CASSANDRA

JULIUS LEWIN

Fifty years ago, on 10 December, 1920, there died in Cape Town a woman whose memory deserves to be saluted—Olive Schreiner. She first won fame from her novel, *The Story of an African Farm*, written when she was 23 and published in a few years later, in 1883. But the best of her writing was not in the form of fiction; it was in the essays and articles in which she predicted that the racial situation in South Africa would reach the stage it has.

In 1912 she wrote: "We are narrowing our political and social rights. We are trying to withdraw even educational advantages from the mass of our people, who are Africans... When we have had our big native wars, and dispossessed the Africans of his land, we may get cheap labour for the mine-owners and the farmers, but we shall have created such a terrible proletariat as will be our ultimate undoing".

Who was this woman gifted with such insight as made her a remarkable political prophet?

Olive Schreiner's father was a German missionary, her mother the daughter of a Congregational minister in London. Olive was born at a lonely mission station in the mountains between the Cape colony and Basutoland (now Lesotho). Perhaps because she had no formal schooling (Bernard Shaw remarked that his education was interrupted by his schooling), Olive evidently learnt at an early age to think for herself, not to think like other people. By the time she was ten, she had rejected the Bible and become an atheist. Like Shelley, she found herself at war with the world of orthodoxies precisely because she believed in supposedly Christian virtues such as social justice and love of humanity. Her individual search for knowledge was thereafter untrammelled by superstition. She read Spencer, Darwin and Mill. Later when she came to London, she was close to Havelock Ellis and counted among her friends Marx's daughter, Eleanor, as well as various leading liberals. They all encouraged her to go on writing and she did although ill-health plagued her year after year.

### Three Causes

Olive was a complete liberal in the heyday of British liberal thought. Perhaps it would be truer to say that she seemed to have radical ideas in the marrow of her bones. Hers was the best kind of radicalism which cannot be confined to one political party or put at the service of a single cause. In fact, three major causes were always close to her mind and heart.

The first was the cause of racial equality. She saw, long before anyone else in South Africa did, what price would in the long run be paid for keeping Africans and the Cape Coloured people in subjection.

"If, blinded by the gain of the moment," she wrote in 1908, "we see nothing in the black man but a vast engine of labour; if to us he is not a man but a tool; if we reduce the Bantu-speaking people to the condition of a great seething ignorant proletariat—then I would rather draw a veil over the future of this land. For a time such a policy may pay us admirably, both as to labour and land, but can it pay ultimately? . . . What if, when the day comes, as it must, when hostile fleets gather round our shores, and the vast bulk of our inhabitants should cast eyes of indifference, perhaps of hope, towards them?" But the white

ruling class paid no heed to Olive's repeated warnings in her own day and to this day.

The second cause that Olive championed in its early years was what is now called women's liberation. In 1911 she published *Woman and Labour*, a passionate plea for the removal of all the social, economic and legal disabilities that prevented women from achieving full equality with men. Those who were then struggling for women's enfranchisement recognised Olive as a noble ally.

The third cause she strove to advance was opposition to war. When she saw the Boer war looming ahead, she warned Britain that it would produce a legacy of lasting bitterness. If ever there was a sordid imperialist war, it was the Boer war. Britain won the war but lost the peace that followed because the guilty men were ready to appease the Boers. (Laski said later that "the British have a genius for forgiving those whom they have grievously wronged".) It was in this period that Afrikaner nationalism began to take root. In order to appease the Afrikaners, British policy sacrificed the interests of the Africans whom it was supposed to defend. From the time of the peace treaty in 1902, Britain conceded that the franchise should be limited to white men, thus betraying the hopes of liberals like Olive's brother, W. P. Schreiner, who had been prime minister of the Cape colony.

### Futility of War

Having observed the destruction wrought by the Boer war, Olive exerted herself in her last years to warn people everywhere against the folly and futility of war as a means of settling social problems. And by the time she died in 1920, she had perceived—as very few had then—the tremendous significance of the Russian revolution as a turning point in world history. When my aunt, Ruth Alexander, who was a friend of hers, saw Olive shortly before her death, Olive was excited about the news, just received, that General Denikin and his troops had been expelled from Russia. The end of the invasion was in sight, the blockade would be lifted, and the Russians would get badly needed food and medical supplies.

If Olive were alive today, she would be astonished at little that is happening because she foretold so much, so truly. But she believed that the radical tradition of which she was a part would continue to grow, as it has.

A character in one of Olive's novels says something that might well be her own epitaph: "Where I lie down, other men will stand, young and fresh. By the steps that I have cut, they will climb: by the stairs that I have built, they will mount. At the clumsy work, they will laugh; when the stones roll, they will curse me. But they will mount, and on my work; they will climb and by my stair".

## THE COST OF CHURCH SCHOOLS

By DAVID TRIBE

Foreword: MARGARET KNIGHT

4s (plus 6d postage)

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

103 Borough High Street, London, SE1

## RELIGION IN HOSPITALS

DENIS COBELL

Until comparatively recent times one of the most important people in the hospital hierarchy was the chaplain. Second only to the medical superintendent, his influence on the managing board of many hospitals carried considerable weight. Under the National Health Service things are rather different; but many unbelievers may be surprised to learn that hospital chaplains still hold their appointments under terms, conditions and salaries given by the Department of Health and Social Security. In Britain today there is a continuing decline in church attendance and religious observation. I think it is monstrous that the meagre resources available for maintaining the nation's health should be squandered to perpetuate superstition, when it is clear the majority of people *do not believe!*

What are the duties of a hospital chaplain? Not, as some staff mistakenly believe, simply to minister to the needs of patients from their respective denomination; but to purvey the spirit of Christianity to the whole hospital community. I have had my ability to care for patients brought into question on one occasion by a hospital chaplain, when I voiced my opposition to Christian views. Doctors of my acquaintance have had their opinions put severely to the test by a chaplain. The official policy of the DHSS states: "The religious or personal beliefs of hospital doctors and nurses are entirely a private matter and at no time in their training or service could these convictions govern their acceptability for employment in the hospital service". In practice, as many instances have shown, this rule is not always strictly observed.

Doctors seem less prone to religious discrimination than nurses. Not so long ago I heard of a girl who intended becoming a student nurse, whose application was refused on the grounds that a person who was an atheist would not be able to help patients face the "great unknown" in their dying hour. In my experience, few patients are close enough to consciousness at this time to worry about such issues.

### Public Money

I have no personal grudge against most hospital chaplains of whatever religious persuasion, and have found many of them to be quite friendly chaps. There is no need to stop concessional visiting hours for a person's own rector, priest or rabbi; but I see no reason for the official attachment to hospitals of Anglican, Roman, Free church, or Jewish chaplains on a paid whole or part-time basis, as at present. Those who wish for the attendance of chaplains presumably support a church with their own money already, so why should the rest of us who have little or no religious inclination be penalised? The hospital chaplaincy service is estimated to cost the considerable sum of £800,000 per annum in England and Wales.

The remuneration of hospital chaplains out of public funds should surely be the chief source of their condemnation. The DHSS states, "hospital chaplains are paid on a salary scale of £1,704-£1,965 rising to £2,085 after seven years' continuous service, plus a house/accommodation or if this cannot be provided, an allowance instead". I often wonder what patients would think if they knew that the chaplain was paid more than the house surgeon or ward sister, who also have to pay for their accommodation out of their salaries!

When a patient is admitted to hospital it is still customary to ask him or her their religion. Most people probably say "C of E", and unwittingly give justification for the Anglican chaplain to visit them. But it is not legally binding on patients to admit their views on this subject, although I have heard of nurses expressing surprise when a patient states their absence of belief in the almighty. When my wife recently gave birth to a premature baby whose survival was unlikely, she explicitly refused its baptism, which was nevertheless carried out by an over-eager nurse. This duty is one which, despite her lack of religious attachment, a nurse is expected to carry out. A *Freethinker* reader also tells of visits from an Anglican chaplain when she had specifically requested she did not want his attention. The only possible interest a patient's religion can have to hospital authorities is in the event of death. A Roman Catholic will want the last rites before he is dead, and a Jew will need a Rabbi to see that he is laid out properly after death.

### Captive Audience

Some patients object to unsolicited visits, mentioned above, from a hospital chaplain when they are ill in bed. However, I suspect the most strong objection is to the ward services these gentlemen still hold in many hospitals, at which all patients become involuntarily a part of the congregation for half-an-hour or so.

I recently attended, much against my better judgement, a commissioning service for a hospital chaplain, conducted by the Bishop of Woolwich, better known as the cricketer, David Sheppard. This service saw the attendance of many hospital dignitaries who, I am sure, do not normally darken the doors of a church each Sunday. This was one peculiar aspect of worship in hospitals becoming a duty. Taking one of his remarks in a slightly different sense than he intended, I thought the Bishop summed up the situation of appointing hospital chaplains very well: "It is very dangerous to pay a person to be a professional Christian in the midst of you"! By all means, let religious and secular organisations send official visitors, who may help patients in their recovery, to hospitals. But let's remove them from publicly paid positions, and keep medicine on the scientific basis which has established it so well in this century.

## LETTER

### Licensing Laws

There is much sense in the latest proposals for a radical change in Britain's licensing laws. Undoubtedly the present restrictions make us a figure of world fun. Worse, in a country which depends increasingly on tourism for a healthy balance of payments, they are a disincentive to foreign visitors. Not only are most restaurants unlicensed and large chunks of the day unreasonably declared dry, but in some parts of the United Kingdom, because of out-moded sabbatarian laws (derived from days of piety which are, happily at an end), it is almost impossible to get drink—or food, for that matter—on a Sunday.

Probably, as in France under Mendes-France, it will be necessary to have a national campaign to stress the dangers of alcoholism and the virtues of milk. But alcoholism, especially acute alcoholism, is not necessarily the product of long drinking hours. Responsible freedom is always the best safeguard against excess.

DAVID TRIBE, *President*,  
National Secular Society.

## FREETHINKER

editor: WILLIAM McILROY

103 Borough High Street,  
London, SE1

Telephone: 01-407 1251 (editorial)  
01-407 0029 (business)

The views expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the Editor or the Board.

The *Freethinker* can be ordered through any newsagent, or obtained by postal subscription from G. W. Foote and Co. Ltd. at the following rates: 12 months, £2.1.6; 6 months, £1.1.0; 3 months, 10s 6d; USA and Canada: 12 months, \$5.25; 6 months, \$2.75; 3 months, \$1.40.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

National Secular Society. Details of membership and inquiries regarding bequests and secular funeral services may be obtained from the General Secretary, 103 Borough High St., London, SE1. Telephone 01-407 2717. Cheques, etc., should be made payable to the NSS.

Humanist Postal Book Service (secondhand books bought and sold). For information or catalogue send 6d stamp to Kit Mouat, Mercers, Cuckfield, Sussex.

## EVENTS

Belfast Humanist Group, War Memorial Hall, Waring Street, Belfast, Monday, 14 December, 8 p.m., Public meeting.

Eastbourne Humanist Group, New Hotel, Grange Road, Eastbourne, Saturday, 19 December, 7 p.m., Winter Solstice Dinner. Tickets 26s each from David Purdon, 88 Broderick Road, Hampden Park, Eastbourne.

Humanist Holidays, Christmas House Party, Osborne Private Hotel, Freshwater Bay, Isle of Wight, 23 to 28 December. Details from Mrs Mepham, 29 Fairview Road, Sutton, Surrey.

Leicester Secular Society, Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate, Leicester, Sunday, 13 December, 6.30 p.m. Ken Leigh: "Why Toricism has Re-emerged".

London Young Humanists, Friday evening, 18 December, Schmitt's Restaurant, Charlotte Street, London, WC1. Unchristmas Dinner. If planning to attend, telephone Robert Goodson: 789 4308 (home); 622 5511 X 51 (work).

North Staffordshire Humanist Group, Cartwright House, Broad Street, Hanley, Friday, 18 December, 7.45 p.m., Annual General Meeting (followed by bottle party).

South Place Ethical Society, Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, WC1, Sunday, 13 December, 11 a.m., Robert Morrell: "The Resurgence of Thomas Paine". Tuesday, 15 December, 7 p.m., Conrad Russell: "The English Revolution of 1648".

## SEX EDUCATION — THE ERRONEOUS ZONE

MAURICE HILL and

MICHAEL LLOYD-JONES

Foreword: BRIGID BROPHY

5s (plus 6d postage)

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

103 Borough High Street, London, SE1

# NEWS

## HITTING WHERE IT HURTS MOST

The League Against Cruel Sports has launched a new campaign to ban fox hunting from vast tracts of land, and to make Hunts pay for the damage they cause to property. They plan to insert an advertisement in selected provincial newspapers circulating in areas where blood "sports" are practised and supported. The advertisement records a number of recent incidents involving the death of pets, and gives the public clear instructions as to what they should do if they know of, or are involved in such incidents.

The League regularly receives complaints from farmers and landowners about damage and distress caused by Hunts. Raymond Rowley, chairman of the League said: "It is a curious fact that most people, and many farmers too, believe that Hunts are above the Law and that they can ride rough-shod over property and, even if pets were killed in the process, nothing could be done about it. This belief is quite false, and the new campaign, the first of its kind, is designed to help the public assert its rights and at the same time hit the Hunts where it hurts most, by touching their pockets".

It is expected that the campaign will eventually result in thousands of acres of land being banned to hunting.

## FREETHINKER FUND

There was a sharp decrease in donations during November. Expenses are increasing almost every month, and unless more readers and local groups are prepared to regularly make contributions, then the outlook for the *Freethinker* is not too bright. A campaign to promote its sales and influence has started, and we plan to advertise in other journals. All this will cost money; we hope there will be a generous response.

Our thanks to the following: Vera Brierley, £3; J. G. Burton, 5/-; R. F. S. Ellis, 13/4; T. V. Eberhard, £2/18/6; W. R. Grant, 18/6; D. Harper, £1/1/-; N. Leveritt, £1/1/-; T. W. Lines, 10/6; D. J. McConalogue, 8/6; E. A. Napper, 18/6; Professor H. Newman, £1/16/-; A. L. Rowlett, 18/-; J. Sutherland, 8/5; H. Rich, £1/9/6. November total: £16/6/9. 1970 total to date: £203/15/1.

## DIVORCE IN ITALY

The triumph of Italy's divorce reform campaigners was a serious setback for the Vatican and the Pope's stooges in parliament. But it will mean that a large number of Italians — it has been estimated a million — will be able to regularise their marital status.

The work of the Italian Divorce League is to continue, as it will still be difficult for many people to obtain a divorce for financial reasons. Film stars and wealthy socialites will have no difficulty in paying the £600 legal fees, but thousands of lesser mortals will be unable to do so. So the next stage in the campaign is to reduce the cost of obtaining a divorce.

# S AND NOTES

There are now less than a dozen countries in the world where divorce is illegal. They are all dominated by the Roman Catholic Church, and include Southern Ireland.

## HUMANISM AT WESTMINSTER

William Hamling, Labour MP for Woolwich West, is the new secretary of the Humanist Parliamentary Group. He told the *Freethinker* that he estimates there are between 30 and 40 Humanists in the House of Commons and although most of them are on the Labour side, the HPG will have some Conservative and Liberal support for certain reforming measures.

Mr Hamling went on to say: "I regard the social legislation enacted by the last Parliament as an important contribution to the social history of this country. There was a humanity about the last Parliament that was warm and encouraging. It is a great pity that it seems to be lacking now, and I have a feeling that this Parliament will show itself to be one of the most philistine, socially repressive and reactionary for a generation or more".

Speaking of the future work of the Humanist Parliamentary Group, Mr Hamling said their main concern would be in the field of private freedom and human rights. He continued: "An awful lot of people in positions of power would like to limit free speech, free association, criticism of existing institutions and personal freedom. The HPG will have to be more vigilant than ever".

The Humanist Parliamentary Group was formed by the British Humanist Association and the National Secular Society. One of its most active members, Peter Jackson, lost his seat by a narrow majority at the June election when a campaign was conducted against him by local Roman Catholics.

## THE CHURCH IN POLITICS

The Church of England has often been described as the Tory Party at prayer, but the winds of change have blown up many a surplice and cassock in recent times. A member of the General Synod—John Davis, one of the representatives for St Albans—is so alarmed by the leftward drift that he has sent out a letter to 200 members of the Synod on the Archbishop of Canterbury's alleged involvement of the church in politics.

I suppose it all depends what you mean by politics. If the Archbishop and other church leaders supported apartheid and other forms of discrimination, and sang hosannas to Vorster, Ian Smith and Edward Heath, that would be patriotism. But by condemning social evils—and by warning South African whites of their dangerous folly—they are supposed to be undermining Western civilisation.

Mr Davis says the leaders of the church have never consulted the laity, and their views on political questions "are unrepresentative of what churchgoing people think". He is probably right, but the Archbishop of Canterbury is too worldly-wise to formulate his views with the opinion of "ordinary churchgoing people" in mind.

# PUBLICATIONS

TITLE	AUTHOR	Price	Post
Rebel Pity: The Life of Eddie Roux	Eddie and Win Roux	45/0	2/0
RI and Surveys	Maurice Hill	1/0	4d
Religion and Ethics in Schools	David Tribe	1/6	4d
Religious Education in State Schools	Brigid Brophy	2/6	4d
Ten Non Commandments	Ronald Fletcher	2/6	4d
The Cost of Church Schools	David Tribe	4/0	6d
A History of Sex	G. L. Simons	9/0	1/0
Humanism, Christianity and Sex	David Tribe	6d	4d
103: History of a House	Elizabeth Collins	1/0	4d
Freethought and Humanism in Shakespeare	David Tribe	2/0	4d
The Necessity of Atheism	Percy Bysshe Shelley	1/6	4d
The Secular Responsibility	Marghanita Laski	2/0	4d
The Nun Who Lived Again	Phyllis Graham	6d	4d
An Analysis of Christian Origins	George Ory	2/6	4d
New Thinking on War and Peace	A. C. Thompson	1/0	4d
A Humanist Glossary	Robin Odell and Tom Barfield	3/6	6d
The Vatican Versus Mankind	Adrian Pigott	4/0	1/4
Evolution of the Papacy	F. A. Ridley	1/0	4d
Lift up Your Heads	William Kent	5/0	1/0
James Maxton and British Socialism	V. S. Anand and F. A. Ridley	4/0	6d
The Bible Handbook	G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball	7/6	1/2
What Humanism is About	Kit Mouat	10/6	1/6
The Humanist Revolution	Hector Hawton	10/6	1/6
Pioneers of Social Change	E. Royston Pike	10/6	1/6
The Golden Bough	J. G. Frazer	20/0	2/6
Religion in Secular Society	Bryan Wilson	15/0	1/3
The Humanist Outlook	Various	35/0	2/2
100 Years of Freethought	David Tribe	42/0	2/2
Catholic Terror Today	Avro Manhattan	12/6	1/6
Materialism Restated	Chapman Cohen	5/0	1/4
The Martyrdom of Man	Winwood Reade	10/6	1/9
Morality Without God	Chapman Cohen	6d	4d
Catholic Imperialism and World Freedom (secondhand)	Avro Manhattan	15/0	2/2
From Jewish Messianism to the Christian Church	Prosper Alfarc	6d	4d
Man His Own Master	Archibald Robertson	2/6	8d
The Outlines of Mythology	Lewis Spence	2/6	8d
The Dead Sea Scrolls	John Allegro	5/0	1/0
Age of Reason	Thomas Paine	3/6	4d
Rights of Man (paper)	Thomas Paine	7/0	1/4
Police and the Citizen	NCCCL	4/0	5d
The Hanging Question	Edited by Louis Blom-Cooper	15/0	1/0
Rome or Reason	R. G. Ingersoll	1/0	5d
Thomas Paine	Chapman Cohen	1/0	5d
Morals Without Religion	Margaret Knight	18/0	1/2
The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism	Bertrand Russell	6/0	1/0
Why I am Not a Christian	Bertrand Russell	3/0	6d
Impact of Science on Society	Bertrand Russell	6/0	1/0
Mysticism and Logic	Bertrand Russell	6/0	1/0
Authority and the Individual	Bertrand Russell	7/0	1/0
Political Ideas	Bertrand Russell	6/0	1/0
The Conquest of Happiness	Bertrand Russell	9/0	1/2
Marriage and Morals	Bertrand Russell	8/0	1/2
Bertrand Russell's Best	Edited by Robert E. Egner	15/0	1/6
Humanism	H. J. Blackham	5/0	1/0
Comparative Religion	A. C. Bouquet	8/0	1/4
William James and Religion	Gabriel Richard Mason	1/0	5d
What is the Sabbath Day?	H. Cutner	1/3	6d
Human Rights	Peter Archer	3/0	5d
Marriage and Divorce	Various	9/6	1/4
The Freethinker 1969 Bound Volume		32/0	4/6

## THE FREETHINKER BOOKSHOP

103 Borough High Street, London, SE1

Telephone: 01-407 0029

Please make cheques and Postal Orders payable to:

G. W. Foote & Co., Ltd.

## BOOKS

THE WORLD OF THE RANTERS: RELIGIOUS  
RADICALISM IN THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

by A. L. Morton. Lawrence and Wishart, 55s.

Most of the radical groups of the English Revolution have received a good deal of attention from historians of late—the Levellers, the Diggers, the Fifth Monarchists, the Quakers. But the Ranters have been curiously neglected. Connoisseurs were aware of articles by A. L. Morton tucked away in the pages of *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*. But until the book under review was published there had been no full-length modern study of the Ranters as a group.

One reason for this perhaps is that no one wished to claim them as ancestors. The religious sects of the Interregnum, and especially the Quakers, are studied by their descendants in the present century; and the very continuity in change of the history of the Quakers makes them an intriguing object of historical research. The Levellers are (or are thought to be) part of the American democratic tradition, whilst socialists and communists look back both to them and to the Diggers. But none have claimed the Ranters as forebears. This is in fact very unjust. As Mr Morton persuasively shows in this lively book, the Ranters probably appealed more directly to the London proletariat of their day than any other group among the English revolutionaries (pp 100-101). And not only the proletariat of London: "Under the Commonwealth", Mr Morton writes, "the old laws of settlement had broken down and one of the very real if temporary freedoms the Revolution had brought was the freedom to move about in search of work. It may well be that among these migratory workers, unattached and prepared to break with tradition, the Ranters found many of their supporters. This would at least help to explain the rapidity with which they seem to have spread to all parts of the country" (p 90).

The Ranters were never a tightly organised group, and it is difficult to attribute to them a coherent body of doctrine. But they had a series of recognisable attitudes—materialism, hostility to organised religion, rejection of hell, the devil, the Bible and sometimes even God (or equating him with Reason or Nature). They rejected the doctrines of original sin and eternal punishment for the mass of mankind, they preached and apparently practised sexual permissiveness, they used deliberately violent and shocking language. All these characteristics find echoes in the second half of the 20th century. One could perhaps go further, and say that in so far as the intellectual and moral revolution of our times is very largely a rejection of and reaction against the protestant ethic of hard work, sobriety, repression and respectability, the Ranters were in the truest sense predecessors. They were reacting, in a crude plebian way, against the Puritan ethic, against those gloomy and repressive aspects of it which were to survive when the revolutionary democratic fervour of the 1640s and 1650s had been forgotten.

Let me illustrate these points from Mr Morton's book. "We had as lief be dead drunk every day of the week", wrote Abiezer Coppe, "and lie with whores i'th market place; and account these as good actions as taking the poor abused, enslaved ploughman's money from him . . . We had rather starve, I say, than take away his money from him for killing of men" (i.e. to pay the army). Coppe

## FREETHINKER

positively advocated swearing, saying he would rather "hear a mighty angel (in man) swearing a full-mouthed oath . . . than hear a zealous Presbyterian, Independent or spiritual notionist pray, preach or exercise. Well! One hint more; there's swearing ignorantly, i'th dark, vainly, and there's swearing i'th light, gloriously" (p 80). Equally provocatively Laurence Clarkson wrote: "I have perused the Scripture [and] I have found so much contradiction . . . that I had no faith in it at all, no more than a history, though I would talk of it and speak from it to my own advantage; but if I had really related my thoughts, I had neither believed that Adam was the first creature, but that there was a creation before him, which world I thought was eternal" (p 137). "Sin hath its conception only in the imagination", Clarkson continued: "I affirmed that there was no sin but as man esteemed it sin, and therefore none can be free from sin till in purity it be acted as no sin, for I judged that pure to me which to a dark understanding was impure, for to the pure all things, yea all acts, were pure" (pp 77, 133). "Whatsoever is done by thee in light and love is light and lovely". In this spirit Clarkson travelled around England seducing a number of willing female disciples.

Such ideas had their political application in the revolutionary circumstances of the late 1640s and early 1650s. God was the great Leveller, wrote George Foster: he will "level and lay mountains and hills low, even you that are greater and richer than your fellow-creatures" (p 85). He would make "the low and poor equal with the rich". Abiezer Coppe likewise spoke to the rich in the name of the Lord: "Thou hast many bags of money, and behold I (the Lord) come as a thief in the night, with my sword drawn in my hands, and like a thief as I am, I say 'Deliver your purse, deliver sirrah, deliver or I'll cut thy throat'". "The plague of God is in your purses, barns, houses, horses; murrain will take your hogs (O ye fat swine of the earth) who shall shortly go to the knife" (p 87). "Howl, howl, ye nobles, howl honourable, howl ye rich men for the miseries that are coming upon you. For our parts we that hear the Apostle preach will also have all things in common; neither will we call anything that we have our own. . . . We'll eat your bread together in singleness of heart, we'll break bread from house to house" (pp 87, 89). The rich should "bow before those poor, nasty, lousy ragged wretches", whom God the real Leveller would set free as he reduced all men to equality. This was hardly the God of whom the propertied class were used to hearing of in their churches.

This book reprints Mr Morton's brilliant studies of the separatist John Lanseter and the Ranter Laurence Clarkson as well as a couple of more general essays. It has long new essays on the Ranters, on John Saltmarsh, the minister who came closest to the Levellers in his views, and on William Walwyn, the Leveller leader who came nearest to the Ranters. It was probably from Walwyn that they got the idea that "it seems contrary to reason that a man should be punished everlastingly for a little sinning in this world" (pp 146-147). Mr Morton shows that a number of ex-Levellers seem to have turned Ranter after their political defeat in 1649. This particular essay is a masterpiece of sympathetic understanding, well this side of idolatry. The author is refreshingly free from sentiment on the whole subject, acknowledging the crudity of many Ranter ideas

# REVIEWS

whilst clearly relishing their racy outspokenness and establishing their leaders as persons worthy of the serious attention of historians. This invaluable book is the first significant study of an unjustly neglected group who have much to say to our generation, facing as it does the disintegration of the protestant ethic with the civilisation that nurtured it.

CHRISTOPHER HILL

## A HISTORY OF SEX

by G. L. Simons. New English Library, 9s.

Now that the so-called permissive society is quite clearly here to stay, the time is ripe for informed literature on sex. The purely physical aspects of it have been covered in a number of good and some not so good books. G. L. Simons takes the thing a stage further and has provided a book which explores sex in many aspects and which will be read by those interested in sex in the same way as a popular psychology book will be read by those interested in psychology.

The book is crammed full of facts, remarkable, funny, sad, sobering. All of them are fascinating. The tenor of the book is perhaps set by its first sentence: "The penis of the mosquito is less than one hundredth of an inch, that of the blue whale about eight feet". It is factual, interesting and in some way amusing!

Different chapters deal with the subject from different angles, physiological, psychological, historical, religious, artistic and so on. On each aspect Simons writes with extraordinary breadth and not a little depth. For instance in the "Sex and Religion" chapter, as well as a discussion of Christianity and the Bible, we learn delightful details of the activities of obscure popes and nuns and of such sects as the bloodthirsty Euchites, the lascivious Buttlarsche Rotte and most remarkable of all perhaps the Skoptsi! All this as well as Mohammed and Gautama Buddha, not to mention St Thomas Aquinas, St Paul and countless others.

Predictably, Simons does not fight shy of discussing the influence of the religious on sexual behaviour. In his "Psychology of Sex" chapter, he points out with colourful examples the connection between religion and sexual repression and abnormalities. In this and the other aspects he brings to the subject of sex an enlightened rational attitude. He points boldly to the irrationalities and injustices in our sexual codes. A chapter is devoted to "The Status of Women".

The fact that an attractively naked woman adorns the cover of the book should mean that the book will be read by some whose attitudes may be rationalised and upgraded by their reading of the book. But the book is also scholarly in approach and well bibliographed, good reading for all those interested in sex—and who isn't now that its proper to admit to such an interest.

DAVID REYNOLDS

# PAMPHLET

## THE ARBLASTER CASE

Council for Academic Freedom and Democracy. 3s.

Earlier this year, Anthony Arblaster, a temporary lecturer in Manchester University's Philosophy Department, applied for a full-time post there. His colleagues were concerned about the possibility of Arblaster being discriminated against by the Appointments Committee, because a year previously he had criticised the University in a letter to *The Guardian* and subsequently openly supported a student sit-in. But since the Department needed and advertised for a political philosopher (as which Arblaster was especially well qualified) his colleagues could not see how he could fail to get the job.

Perhaps the University Appointments Committee felt this way too, because it decided to ignore the Department's requirements, and the wording of the advertisement, and to appoint instead a general philosopher. This extraordinary decision effectively excluded Arblaster, and many university observers believed that this was the deliberate intention of the Appointments Committee.

The disquiet surrounding this incident was one of the factors contributing to the establishing recently of the Council for Academic Freedom and Democracy. One of the first acts of this Council was to appoint a Commission of Inquiry into the Arblaster case, and the findings are now available as a pamphlet.

The Commission comprised Professor John Griffith, John Saville and Tony Smythe. They were accused of bias even before their findings were published: "Professor John Griffith is not exactly famous for the judicial moderation of his views, Mr John Saville is a Marxist economic historian, and Mr Tony Smythe is the secretary of the National Council for Civil Liberties, which is often highly selective in the causes its champions. What kind of court is this?" (Letter to *The Guardian*, 31 October.)

But if those who were unsympathetic to Arblaster (or, for that matter, his supporters) thought that the composition of the Inquiry committee would ensure a damning indictment of the University of Manchester, then they have been disappointed.

Despite one or two seemingly unjustified exaggerations in Arblaster's favour, the report is a fair one. The report doesn't conclude that there *was* discrimination against Arblaster, just that there is sufficient doubt to justify a judicial enquiry by the University. That there is sufficient doubt is very largely the University's own fault. The University authorities may not have discriminated against Arblaster, but they seem to have gone out of their way to appear guilty. The University of Manchester owes it to itself, let alone to Arblaster, to agree to a judicial enquiry: if it has nothing to hide then it can have nothing to lose.

The Council's pamphlet is not devastating assault on the opponents of academic freedom, but it does provide some useful ammunition. *The Arblaster Case* is obtainable from the Council for Academic Freedom and Democracy, 152 Camden High Street, London, NW1 (3s 6d including postage).

MICHAEL LLOYD-JONES

# TELEVISION: A QUESTION OF BLACK AND WHITE

PETER COTES

What a fate to have been born black in a country like South Africa. And what a fight those who believe in white supremacy are going to put up before they surrender to the blacks the basic human rights. All this was shown very vividly in *The End of the Dialogue*, a *Man Alive* filmed feature (BBC-2) directed by a black African director. Smuggled out of South Africa, the BBC's decision to show it was fiercely criticised by two Tory MPs, members of the pro-South African Monday Club, and by a representative of Vorster's régime over here. In the discussion which followed the screening of what must have been surely one of the bitterest indictments of apartheid to date, Patrick Wall, MP, pro-Ian Smith to a degree, laughed a lot (at what?) in an attempt to brush aside the pictures all too clear to be disputed with conviction. His Parliamentary colleague, Harold Soref, with considerable business connections in South Africa and Rhodesia, looked as black as thunder—no pun intended! The blacks on the programme treated the matter first with gravity, and then with too much emotion. But after what we had just witnessed of man's inhumanity to man, this attitude in the circumstances was only too understandable. For apparently there are still people who refuse to believe their eyes and ears; who refuse to accept abundant proof, even when it is carefully spelt out.

The film was made for the cinema and shown in the *Man Alive* programme presumably because of the public controversy now raging through the Tory Government's decision to sell arms to South Africa. The programme, impeccably and objectively chaired by the calmly impartial Desmond Wilcox, made for "instant" television. The slangy match in the studio, ringing the curtain down on the sombre tragedy of an entire people seen in the film itself, left a nasty taste in the mouth. The Tory lads should have been less patently partisan on behalf of the régime they were attempting to defend, if they had wanted us to take seriously their allegation that the film had been "slanted" as anti-white supremacy propaganda. But not *all* of what we saw can be taken as "slanted", as we know only too well from less biased observers than members of the Right-wing Monday Club.

How can decent citizens accept the horror of what the South African Government representative cared to call "separate development" (a fancy name for an odious system of keeping the black man enslaved as an inferior citizen in his own country)? But at least one might have felt that Messrs Soref and Wall cared more than they did, and were concerned about the "final solution", even if that outcome concerned only financial investment in a slave state. As it was, it looked to one viewer at least, that only the black man cared passionately in this dispute, as well he might. And this was to give a totally wrong impression. For after seeing the film and hearing the discussion, I worried even more than in the past about the South African arms deal, and its physical as well as moral implications. One cannot brush aside a matter of world-wide concern by pretending that an explosive situation, by now only too well known, does not exist. To laugh at such a state of affairs showed not only contempt for proven truth, but a cynical disregard for the fate of millions, white and black, in the years ahead. Callousness and selfishness are much in evidence in the South African Government's treatment of the black population. It leaves a queasy feeling when we see

the scoffers, who are mentally blind to events, making more noise than sense in what should have been a serious discussion about a tragic subject on that little box in our own homes.

The BBC is to be congratulated on its rejection of the South African Ambassador's impertinent demand that the film be suppressed.

(Continued from front page)

were going soft on crime". But the motion was courageously proceeded with in Parliament and now most people have almost forgotten that the gallows ever existed. How much more would this be true of disestablishment. For the fact is that for years theologians have been admitting in academic conferences or senior common rooms, safely away from their own laity, that this is a "post-Christian age".

## "Too Difficult"

Finally, we are told that disestablishment would be too difficult, that "the attempts to convert all the laws of the Church into the rules and trusts of a vountary society would involve a drastic operation not likely to command such wide support in Church, Parliament or nation as to make it practicable". But the proposals which the commission make to free the Church from parliamentary control are themselves complicated, just as the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963, which, *inter alia*, stopped appeal from church courts to the Privy Council, was complicated. From this measure it is argued that church courts should themselves be "public courts"—thus the Church of England should remain established—so as to safeguard the "administration of justice". The blunt truth, as the Bryn Thomas and many other Anglican disciplinary cases have shown, is that these courts are not seen to safeguard justice, their public status should be removed and an appeal given, as with doctors or solicitors, to the Privy Council or the High Court. With a little effort full disestablishment and disendowment could be achieved in the interests of administrative tidiness *and* social justice. The country will soon face decimalisation, and after that, presumably, the recommendations of the Metrication Board. There may be a momentary upheaval, but an eternity of vexatious tinkering will be avoided.

Much of what I have said is in the Minority report, which will, I hope, receive as much attention as the main recommendations. Here any claim that "C of E" form-fillers belong to the Body of Christ is scornfully dismissed. Christians are those who acknowledge that "*Jesus is Lord*"; the "Christianity" of Britain is a "comfortable mix of ancestral attitudes (everything from astrological superstition to yesterday's liberalism), inconsistent both with each other and with the historic gospel", and "a mixture of nostalgia, superstition and genuine desire for faith . . . woolliness which offers false reassurance". The appeal to difficulty in disestablishment is likewise dismissed: "The legal relations of the Church of England with the State are complex, often tangled and irrational: they are not obscure". "Those who argued for disestablishment . . . would have logic on their side." I hope Parliament agrees.