

The Freethinker

Volume LXXIX—No. 13

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Fivepence

IT CAN BE SAID without fear of contradiction that every Christian speaker brought forward before the radio, TV, and ITV, has said at one time or other that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the best attested, the most authenticated event in the history of the world. Few of them ever, of course, attempt to substantiate this pious statement, but it is repeated over and over again; and naturally the radio, TV, and ITV would never allow any contradiction to be

broadcast. The clergy all over the world will take every advantage of Easter, which is always celebrated about this time, to ram down more than ever the marvellous truth of the "historical" Resurrection. They will at the same time take care that "the Jews"

must never forget how they crucified "our Lord," and have had to suffer ever since for the greatest crime ever recorded. With this, naturally, they will tell all believers that, while it is true that the Jews crucified Jesus, he was foredoomed to die by his Father in Heaven to "save" everybody—that is, everybody who believes in him. The rest will be "damned." All this is contained in what is called Christian "theology."

Was there a Resurrection?

Very few of our radio and TV fans will question the statements made by priests and parsons about the Resurrection. It is recorded for us once for all in God's Precious Word, and must be believed. Even the "unbelievers" who sometimes form an audience to fire questions at a bishop never question whether Jesus really said everything recorded in the Gospels. They might deny that Jesus was the "son" of God, but never, or very rarely, do they deny the Gospel records of his "sayings."

The story of the Resurrection is in all the Gospels, but it would be difficult to find anywhere else so many contradictions in four short narratives. They contradict each other at every turn, and nowhere more than in the way John contradicts the Synoptics. The truth is the average Christian hardly ever compares the four stories, and this goes particularly for the "unbelievers" collected by the BBC to meet a Christian.

For example, "there was a great earthquake," says Matthew on the morning of the Resurrection. None of the other Gospels mentions it at all. Why? Surely they must have known about it. It is not even mentioned by Josephus, who gives details of hundreds of lesser events. Ask the average Christian who were the first to visit the tomb on the morning of the Resurrection. If he looks it up—which is most unlikely—he will find that John says it was Mary Magdalene *only*; Matthew says it was Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; Mark names three women—Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome; while Luke, not to be outdone in numbers, gives Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James and other women. These inconsistencies, of course, have been noticed by orthodox commentators, and must have given them a genuine headache until someone thought of a

brilliant explanation. The visits were all *different* ones, which would not have been a bad solution, only there is not a hint of this in the faithful—or unfaithful—narratives.

The Empty Tomb

Or take such a simple thing as to whether the tomb was or was not open when the woman or women came. Luke distinctly says it was open; Matthew says it was closed; that is, it was not opened until "the angel of the Lord"

rolled back the stone from the door. Note that the women were not a bit surprised either at the great earthquake or at the "angel" of the Lord. They recognised that it was an angel at once. And what did they see? Matthew says an "angel"; Mark says it

was "a young man"; Luke insists that there were "two men"; while John records that there were "two angels." They cannot even agree as to whether the men or angels were sitting or standing. Luke says that they were standing; Matthew, Mark, and John, for once agreeing with each other, say that they were sitting.

As for the disciples, Luke says only Peter visited the tomb; John says it was Peter and John. John also says that Peter *entered* the sepulchre, while Luke says he did *not*. He only looked into it.

Try and find out from a Christian to whom did Jesus first appear? Mark and John say it was to Mary Magdalene *alone*. Matthew says it was to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. Luke says it was to Cleopas and his companion. Paul, however, throws all these overboard and plumps for Cephas—that is, Peter. He never mentions the ladies in his account (in 1 Corinthians XV).

It is also interesting to learn that, according to Matthew, Mary knew it was Jesus when he first appeared to her; while according to John she "knew not that it was Jesus." Both Mary and her companion touched Jesus, says Matthew; John reports that "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not." Perhaps because he was in his birthday suit!

Galilee or Jerusalem?

But what about Jesus appearing to his disciples? Matthew makes it quite clear that Jesus said to the women, "Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee and there shall they see me." And "the eleven disciples went away unto Galilee," where "they saw him" and "worshipped him." Luke distinctly says that Cleopas and his companion did not recognise Jesus on the way to Emmaus, to which place Jesus went after the Resurrection; so they came back to Jerusalem to tell the disciples and, "As they thus spake Jesus himself stood in the midst of them." That is, the disciples first saw him according to Matthew in Galilee; but, according to Luke, it was in Jerusalem. Poor Dean Alford, who edited a once famous Greek edition of the New Testament, utterly unable in his commentary to make head or tail of this discrepancy, had to admit, "We must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight"—and this of the best attested event in history!

—VIEWS and OPINIONS—

"The Best Attested Event in History"

By H. CUTNER

Jesus and His Disciples

But how did the disciples greet their once dead Saviour now fully alive? Luke says "they were terrified and affrighted"; John says, "Then were the disciples glad." And the upshot of the matter? Were the disciples convinced of the Resurrection? According to John they were; according to Matthew they were not.

Next try and find out how long Jesus remained on earth after the Resurrection? Luke makes it one day; John certainly ten days; Acts forty days. As commentators have pointed out, though Luke is said to have written Acts as well as the Gospel which bears his name, they completely contradict each other.

The Ascension

Every Christian who talks learnedly about the Resurrection being the best attested event in history is fully in accord with the Ascension. Jesus was carried upwards to "Heaven." Ask any you meet to explain the following: The two disciples who were with Jesus at the time of the Ascension were Matthew and John. It is admitted that Mark may have seen the Ascension, but he was not one of the eleven (or twelve) disciples. Luke was not either; and in any case, he did not see the Ascension. Now, who ought to have recorded the wonderful event which knocks most space fiction into a cocked hat—the people who were there and saw it, or those who did not see it? Well, the answer

is that Matthew and John (who saw it) say *nothing whatever* about the Ascension; the passage in Mark containing it, that is, the last twelve verses, if not spurious, is "suspect"; "omitted by the two oldest Greek manuscripts," says the Revised Version. So the whole of Christendom believes in the Ascension because somebody who did not see it, records it!

It would be a great mistake to imagine that even if the average Christian knew all the facts given here, it would make the slightest difference to his belief. The more lunatic the stories, the more they are swallowed by a convinced believer—even in this year of grace 1959. The radio, TV, and ITV will blare out the "truth" of the Resurrection all "Holy Week" and Easter Week if possible.

The Resurrection is not only completely *unattested*, but is nonsense on the face of it. The belief that Gods never die but are "resurrected," comes from Paganism, which has quite a number of them at hand. Nobody now believes these "myths," but the myth of Jesus may well take centuries to eradicate. Ninety years ago was published a brilliant analytical work with the title *The English Life of Jesus*, by Thomas Scott. It was probably written in collaboration with the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox. Both writers believed in the existence of Jesus as a man—but what do they say of the Resurrection? "Of the *historical* resurrection of Jesus we have no evidence whatever."

Hate

By R. READER

Of all human emotions, hate causes the greatest destruction to human happiness, harming both the person who feels it, and its object. Furthermore, it sets up an intractable vicious circle. Strong hate produces changes in body metabolism and the blood. Since this changed blood is fed to the brain, corresponding modifications take place in the brain. Indulgence in hate eventually produces blood changes which provoke fresh hate thoughts, and so on. it is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the chronic hater is literally poisoning himself with his own thoughts.

Something very similar to this vicious circle was set up in Germany before and during World War II. A whole nation absorbed and ruminated the hate-suggestions emitted by its leaders, and a welter of unspeakable cruelties and atrocities followed. It was this collective auto-intoxication which made it possible for a Nazi doctor, whose professional training had taught devotion to the alleviation of suffering, nevertheless to have an aged prisoner dragged from his sleep and placed in a tub of ice and water to measure his resistance to cold.

Since hate is such a great enemy of human happiness, humanity would obviously do well so to organise its affairs that the smallest possible amount of this dangerous stuff is generated. With a smirk, the believer will tell you that he is doing this very thing by urging us to love one another. To which we may ask why, by its opposition to *effective* birth limitation, the Church is making it *impossible* for us to love one another?

Look at the chaotic fabric of contemporary life. Is it any wonder that, far from loving one another, the total hate content of the world has never been higher? For millions, life is a wild uncertain scramble, a frenzied rushing hither and thither to secure the very necessities of existence—and by necessities is meant not just food, shelter, clothing, and entertainment, but above all that modicum of self-importance which is vital for human well-being, and to which every human being aspires. It is

this that explains the paradox of so many people who have never been so well off in their lives, from the purely material standpoint, yet being less happy than the others. Every human being needs a certain feeling of significance in his relation to society. He needs to feel that society takes him into account. But today, on the contrary, the individual is becoming ever more deeply submerged in the crowd, not because of "materialism," "conservatism," "socialism" or any other "ism," nor yet because he does not grovel sufficiently frequently on a cold stone floor, or moth-eaten mat, but simply because there are too many of us living on the surface of the earth. The priest recommends remaining humble and meek (the better to get a stranglehold)—a remedy that the Church itself takes good care not to follow. (What was humble, self-effacing, and meek in the crowning of John XXIII?)

The result is that, as this sense of significance becomes ever harder to obtain, so the hate-content of humanity rises. A jaundiced view? Well, open any newspaper. This union versus that employer; this wage claim versus that wage claim. Professional hates. Atrocities behind the Iron Curtain. Political hate. New taxation measures. More hate. Two new murders. Hate again. And observe how, on the occasion of an outburst of violent hate, the phenomenon often takes place in *crowds*.

Overpopulation is like a crystal with a myriad facets, one of which, the food question, was mainly dealt with by Malthus. If the latter had a fault, it was surely that he dealt mainly with this one aspect of the problem. Today, intensive birth limitation is the only way out of the baffling paradoxes and enigmas, material, mental, and moral, that together make up the contemporary world malaise.

—NEXT WEEK—

BIOLOGY FOR CATHOLICS

By DR. EDWARD ROUX

John Dewey

By COLIN McCALL

JOHN DEWEY has suffered from the occupational hazard of philosophers: he has been popularised. Popularised, I am told, with rather disastrous results. To the list of misused philosophic terms (Materialism, Epicureanism, Marxism, *et al*) we must now add Pragmatism, with which the name of Dewey is associated, though Peirce was its actual inventor. How far the American perversion of Deweyan pragmatism has gone is hard for us in Britain to tell. It has, I understand from talks with an American History Lecturer, affected teaching in a number of schools and universities, where subjects like Medieval History may be dropped from the curriculum as being of no "use"; while it is widely misrepresented in commerce and in many aspects of advertising.

To the philosophic-minded, the situation is full of interest—and irony. In the symposium, *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (Northwestern University, U.S.A., 1939), Bertrand Russell remarked on the "harmony" between Dewey's outlook, "where it is distinctive," and "the age of industrialism and collective enterprise." Russell had, in fact, made the same point as long ago as 1922, finding the "love of truth obscured in America by commercialism of which pragmatism is the philosophical expression." But Dewey had then retorted that this statement was of the "order of interpretation which would say that English neo-realism is a reflection of the snobbish aristocracy of the English and the tendency of French thought to dualism an expression of the alleged Gallic disposition to keep a mistress in addition to a wife." And replying again to Russell in the 1939 symposium, Dewey wrote: "And I still believe that Mr. Russell's confirmed habit of connecting the pragmatic theory of knowing with obnoxious aspects of American industrialism, instead of with the experimental method of attaining knowledge, is much as if I were to link his philosophy to the interests of the English landed aristocracy instead of with dominant interest in mathematics."

Now, a hundred years after Dewey's birth, Lord Russell might seem justified in saying "I told you so!" But I don't think it is as simple as that. Indeed, in this matter I am with Dewey. Grant that no philosopher is completely independent of his environment; that his outlook will be "of his time"; that he will draw on the language in current use. These I readily grant because I regard them as essential qualities in any worth-while philosopher. The third is crucial in the present case. Dewey did draw on language in current use. In doing so he ran a risk. But what was the alternative: a special language "for philosophers only"? A mathematical language? Abstruseness? He chose to run the risk and I, for one, am glad he did. I am glad, even though his philosophy has been perverted. Abstruseness might have saved him from that fate but, in itself, would have been a worse one. It has been said that there is no "common referent" for the layman to get into Dewey's thought, but I shouldn't consider his a difficult philosophy, and reasonable intelligence should enable you to get a good deal out of it.

There will always be someone prepared to debase a noted thinker and adapt his ideas for special ends. Commercialism, we know, is all-powerful in some sections of American life (though by no means in all) and, in those sections, strongly influenced by the big advertising agencies of Madison Avenue, Dewey and pragmatism have

been used to give a spurious scientific or philosophic basis to (in Dewey's phrase) "obnoxious aspects of American industrialism." If Russell was right, the wheel has turned full circle. But was Russell right? Let us go back to Dewey's own words which followed that phrase: "instead of the experimental method of attaining knowledge." This is the valid context for his pragmatism which, he said, "affirms that action is involved in knowledge, not that knowledge is subordinated to action or 'practice'." And for Dewey, as for Peirce, "truth" ("if the word must be used") was "the ideal limit of indefinitely continued inquiry."

Whether or not one agrees with Dewey, it seems insufficient to treat this view as a "philosophical expression" of American commercialism, even though the latter has perverted it to its own ends. It is true that Dewey concerned himself with practical problems, that he looked forward, rather than back; that he was anti-traditionalist. (He once said in Russell's hearing that, having emancipated himself with some difficulty from the traditional orthodox theology, he wasn't going to shackle himself with another.) But, though these were grave sins in the eyes of some philosophers, they were not in Russell's. "To my mind"—the latter wrote—"the best work that has been done anywhere in philosophy and psychology during the present century has been done in America. Its merit is due not so much to the individual ability of the men concerned as to their freedom from certain hampering traditions which the European man of learning inherits from the Middle Ages . . . sophisticated America, wherever it has succeeded in shaking off slavery to Europe . . . has already developed a new outlook, mainly as a result of the work of James and Dewey." And he found this new outlook "embodied in the so-called instrumental theory of knowledge."

Indeed, Russell's few, though important, differences with Dewey must not be allowed to blind us to their many agreements. And in *A History of Western Philosophy*, it seems to me that Russell found the true basis of Dewey's philosophy: not American industrialism but evolution. He conceives thought as an evolutionary process, said Russell. And that is getting us somewhere. Dewey had no use for absolutes: he was dealing with the temporal world and his philosophy was adapted to this. His emphasis was upon inquiry, and the "truth" of any present proposition is "subject to the outcome of con-

(Concluded on next page)

SCIENCE QUIZ

1. Which planet is nearest to the sun?
2. What is a light year?
3. What is heavy water?
4. What is the ionosphere?
5. What is the most obvious (fossil) link yet found between reptiles and birds?
6. Can blue-eyed parents have a brown-eyed child?
7. Had the I.G.Y. any precursors?
8. (a) Giraffes grew long necks by stretching up to their food on trees. (b) Giraffes grew long necks because the short necks failed to get sufficient food and therefore did not survive. Which of these views was put forward by Lamarck and which by Darwin?

(Answers on page 101)

This Believing World

A witness to a divorce case who was an hotel proprietor and a devout Roman Catholic said recently in court that he had lost the hotel's register. Later, he pulled it out from his raincoat pocket, and when told by Judge Baxter that he was a deliberate liar, he said that as a Catholic he was against divorce. What the Judge said to this pious Catholic may be worth again putting on record—"You are a liar and a perjurer. You are liable to go to prison for a long time. Fortunately for you, I think you are a fool. . . ." The devout Catholic, a Mr. P. McHale, is going to see his parish priest about it!

★

A party of magistrates at Taunton in Somerset went to see a "Nudist" film the other week, and decided that it could be shown on weekdays but under no circumstances on a Sunday—the Lord's Day. It is astonishing how frightened so many pious Christians are of the "nude" on a Sunday even to the extent of refusing to have a bath on the Holy Day—though it is *not* the Sabbath but the Pagan Day devoted to the worship of the Sun. Perhaps they remember that in the Gospels "our Lord" is never shown to have taken a bath on any day except when he was baptised.

★

And talking again about the Sabbath Day we note that the *War Cry*, the journal issued by the Salvation Army, has an article about it entitled "Saturday or Sunday— which?" where it is recognised that "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit given at Pentecost," Christians were obliged to throw overboard the special command to keep the Sabbath Day holy, and take over the "Lord's Day"—the Day on which we are told "our Lord" rose from the dead. When Jesus said that he had not come to destroy the law—that is the Jewish law—but to fulfil it, the word "fulfil" is *crucial* here, says Major Burrows, the writer of the article. It means that his followers could throw over at once one of the Ten Commandments. That is why Sunday now is the Sabbath Day and not Saturday. It is just as simple as that.

★

In any case when it comes to a "show down" on the "Sabbath" question, the supporters of the Lord's Day Observance Society rally around, as far as possible, in overwhelming numbers, and Sunday is saved. Children will now not be allowed to play football on a Sunday in Leicester parks, while after what the Leicester *Evening Mail* calls "a good deal of pompous and irrelevant moralising," the Leicester City Council decided by only a two-vote margin that the citizens of what used to be a progressive town must not go to its cinemas at 4 p.m. but at 6 p.m. Cannot they do something about it? Of course they can. At the next election they should clear out the pious humbugs.

★

Edited by Bishop Wand, the "Sunday Times" has been giving its readers pictures of the "children of the Bible" with pen and pencil. The pen part is taken bodily out of the Precious Word, but the accompanying drawings invariably show *English* children. That such nonsense is perpetuated in one of our foremost Sunday journals, proves how hard-pressed is religion these days. If David—one of the Bible children described—really lived, he must have been brown, like all Semitic peoples in the East. He certainly could not have looked like an English child. The same goes for Jesus who, if he ever lived, must also have been brown. But he is always shown as a true Anglo-Saxon.

Fr. Hugh Bishop—an Anglican—was the hero of TV's "Meeting Point" on religion the other Sunday, and it was his duty to defend or expound Prayer. It must be said, however, that a more feeble attempt than his could hardly be thought possible. He was, of course, full of "getting in personal touch with God," but what he meant by this farrago of nonsense, he was quite unable to tell us. Even his audience, in part "unbelievers," kept smiling at his "fuddled" talk, which might have impressed medieval and ignorant believers and no one else. But in these days of apathy and "blatant" unbelief, its utter futility was comical.

JOHN DEWEY

(Concluded from page 99)

tinued inquiries." It is "provisional; as *near* the truth as inquiry has *as yet* come, a matter determined *not* by a guess at some future belief but by the care and pains with which inquiry has been conducted up to the present time."

The main distinction between Dewey and Russell was, I think, noted by the former: a distinction between his own "thorough-going empiricist" view and that of the analytic and linguistic schools. "The exclusive devotion of Mr. Russell to discourse," he said, "is manifested in his assumption that *propositions* are the subject-matter of inquiry . . . But according to our [Peirce's and Dewey's] view . . . *things and events* are the material and objects of inquiry, and propositions are *means* in inquiry, so that as conclusions of a given inquiry they become means of carrying on further inquiries." [Italics here, as in other quotations, are in the original.]

I see no "cosmic impiety" in this attitude, as Lord Russell does. It is to my mind an attitude in keeping with a scientific age. And the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. have, after all, got artificial planets in orbit round the sun. Lord Russell might reply that this will not be of much use to humanity if those great nations devastate the world with nuclear war. But that is another matter, and no one would have agreed with him more readily than John Dewey who, well over half-a-century ago, was asking us to treat our moral and social ideas with objectivity. Unfortunately, as he said after the first atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima, the physicists had beaten the humanists in the objective courage they had applied to their raw materials. I dare assert that the world would be a good deal safer if Dulles and Eisenhower had anything like the modern outlook of their late fellow-countryman. Perhaps their successors will rescue Dewey from his usurpers for the good of all.

LAST CHANCE FOR TICKETS
FOR THE

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY
53RD ANNUAL DINNER

followed by DANCING

SATURDAY, 28th MARCH, 1959
(Day after Good Friday)

ALL at the PAVIOURS ARMS
WELCOME PAGE STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1
RECEPTION 6.0 P.M. DINNER 6.30 P.M.

Vegetarians catered for Evening Dress Optional

Guest of Honour: C. BRADLAUGH BONNER
(President, World Union of Freethinkers)

TICKETS 21/- each from the Sec., 41 Gray's Inn Rd., W.C.1

THE FREETHINKER

41 GRAY'S INN ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1.

TELEPHONE: HOLBORN 2601.

Hon. Editorial Committee:

F. A. HORNIBROOK, COLIN MCCALL and G. H. TAYLOR.

All articles and correspondence should be addressed to THE EDITOR at the above address and not to individuals.

THE FREETHINKER can be obtained through any newsagent or will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad): One year, £1 10s.; half-year, 15s.; three months, 7s. 6d. (In U.S.A.: 13 weeks, \$1.15; 26 weeks, \$2.25; 52 weeks, \$4.50.)

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

Details of membership of the National Secular Society may be obtained from the General Secretary, 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1. Members and visitors are welcome during normal office hours.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Banch N.S.S. (The Mound).—Every Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN, MURRAY and SLEMEN.
 London (Marble Arch).—Meetings every Sunday from 5 p.m.: Messrs. L. EBURY, J. W. BARKER and C. E. WOOD.
 London (Tower Hill).—Every Thursday, 12—2 p.m.: Messrs. J. W. BARKER and L. EBURY.
 Manchester Branch N.S.S. (Deansgate Blitzed Site).—Every weekday, 1 p.m.: G. WOODCOCK. Sunday, 8 p.m.: Messrs. WOODCOCK, MILLS and WOOD.
 North London Branch N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead).—Every Sunday, noon: Messrs. L. EBURY and A. ARTHUR.
 Nottingham Branch N.S.S. (Old Market Square).—Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY. Sunday, 6.30 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

INDOOR

Birmingham Branch N.S.S. (Midland Institute Cinema, Paradise Street).—Sunday, March 29th, 6.45 p.m.: J. WHITBURN, "In the Beginning."
 Bradford Branch N.S.S. (Mechanics' Institute).—Sunday, March 29th, 7 p.m.: A Lecture.
 Central London Branch N.S.S. (The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road).—Sunday, March 29th, 7.15 p.m.: 50th Anniversary Memorial Meeting: "Francisco Ferrer—Freethought Martyr 1859-1909."
 Wales and Western Branch N.S.S. (Bute Town Community Centre, Cardiff).—Tuesday, March 31st, 7.30 p.m.: Rev. H. A. PRICE, M.A., "The Science of Dreams."
 West Ham and District Branch N.S.S. (home of Mrs. F. Hayhow, 230 Hainault Road, E.11).—Thursday, March 26th, 7.45 p.m.: Friendly Discussion, introduced by Miss E. TRACEY (Christian). Mr. R. SORENSON, M.P., hopes to attend.

Notes and News

DOM AUGUSTINE MORRIS, Abbot of Nashdom, of the Anglican Order of Benedictines, is contributing a series of articles to the *Sunday Times* on "Is Christianity True?" We couldn't hope to deal with them all, even if they deserved it, but number 5, "The Jesus of History," will be considered later in these columns by Mr. H. Cutner. For the moment we turn to some of the letters that the series has prompted. "Nothing is more astonishing than the modern inability to approach the concept of God logically," wrote one correspondent, who thought the Middle Ages were ages of reason and the present era "possibly the most unreasonable in the history of mankind." To that we can only exclaim "astonishing"! Many other writers were also surprised that people should find Christian dogma incredible but, if they are open to persuasion, a letter from our own Henry Meulen should convince them. He presented the dilemma of Christianity with remarkable compression, concluding: "To appeal to reason, said Newman, is to set foot on the slippery slope to atheism. But if religion is to be accepted on faith alone, which religion is to be chosen, and on what grounds? Surely the choice must depend on reason. The dilemma remains."

The Freethinker Sustentation Fund

PREVIOUSLY acknowledged, £153 10s.; C. J. Cleary, 5s.; C.M., 5s.; Anon, 2s.; W.H.D., 2s. 6d.; V. Kilpatrick, 10s.; Dr. E. Roux, 10s.; O. E. Fox, 2s. 6d.; M. Byrn, 10s. 6d.—Total to date, March 20th, 1959, £155 17s. 6d.

IN the March issue of his satirical Freethought paper, *La Calotte*, M. André Lorulot expresses his appreciation at our printing his article, "The Fruits of May 13th" (translated from his other paper, *La Raison*) on the front page of THE FREETHINKER, January 23rd, 1959. Our reprinting, he says, has brought him "a number of approving and encouraging letters from different countries." And he quotes one writer from Brussels, who showed our mention (THE FREETHINKER, 5/12/58) of "that brilliantly irreverent French Freethought paper, *La Calotte*," to some Belgian detractors, who "were astonished to see this approval of you in such a serious paper as that of our very serious English friends." Well, we couldn't keep it a secret for ever; we do have a good laugh occasionally, particularly at *La Calotte*.

★

Is this your problem? ask Edana Romney and Edgar Lustgarten in the *Sunday Express*; and on March 15th, their case concerned Mary, a regular churchgoer and deeply religious girl who, to her horror, had fallen in love with an atheist. The girl had thought she would be able to tell an atheist "just as you can always tell a murderer," but unbelieving Tom was "really good" and had a "heart of gold." What's more, he was cheerful in his unbelief. Poor Mary had had quite a shocking experience. Her parents may—as Mr. Lustgarten said—have "instilled their own deep sense of reverence into their child" "not with severity but with gentleness," but prejudices are prejudices, no matter how they are instilled. And although Tom had said, "I don't mind what your beliefs are, darling, but count me out of it," Mary felt she couldn't marry a man who didn't believe in God. A pity, as her two advisers said, but such a marriage would lack a common foundation. "One must be careful not to confuse religion with morality; not to equate character and belief," they added pertinently. Mr. Lustgarten might have cleared up one further point. Can you always tell a murderer?

ANSWERS TO SCIENCE QUIZ

1. Mercury. 2. The distance travelled by a beam of light in a year. 3. That in which the hydrogen content is not the usual one of atomic weight one, but deuterium (heavy hydrogen) of atomic weight two. (Hydrogen is known to exist in three forms, the third being "tritium," consisting of one proton and two neutrons and having atomic weight three.) 4. In a belt about 60 to 300 miles above the earth atoms are ionised (split into positive and negative parts) by the effect of the sun's rays. In this belt the reflection of wireless waves occurs. 5. Archæopteryx, which had feathers and wings and could fly, yet possessed a reptilian tail, mouth and teeth. 6. No. Brown being dominant and blue recessive, a blue-eyed person must carry blue on both sides, for if he were blue/brown he would have brown eyes. Blue-eyed parents therefore contribute blue/blue and blue/blue and the offspring's eyes cannot be other than blue. 7. Yes, though comparatively limited in character: they were the International Polar Years of 1882-3 and 1932-3. Compared with some two dozen nations which took part in the latter, 68 took part in I.G.Y. 8. (a) by Lamarck, (b) by Darwin. Biologists have abandoned Lamarck's vitalistic hypothesis. G.H.T.

The End Justifies the Means

By F. A. RIDLEY

RECENT EVENTS, particularly in Cyprus where a campaign of marked violence and assassination has just led to the proximate creation of a new and probably Christian state, have once more brought into prominence the complex and highly controversial problems of "Ends and Means". For, no doubt if the the Republic of Cyprus lasts long enough to evolve like all earlier nations, its national mythology—its actual historical origins—will be enveloped in the mists of legend. The stark fact has undoubtedly been that the latest Mediterranean state actually owes its existence as a separate political entity to terrorism carried out in open defiance of all civil and even military law. The Republic of Cyprus will actually be founded, not on any political movement, nor even on open civil war, but on naked assassination and upon the blood of their mostly unarmed and unsuspecting victims. Nor is this something without precedent, since previous cases of a similar nature have existed. Most notably and much nearer here than in Cyprus, the Republic of Eire, formerly Southern Ireland which also owes its separate existence as a sovereign state to the similarly successful activities of masked gunmen—with the late Michael Collins as the Irish "Colonel Grivas"—who also registered a brand of terrorism which obtains no recognition even in the military text books of reputedly "civilised" warfare. The complex problems involved in what may be described as the ethics of assassination—when and where does "legitimate" war pass into plain murder?—have often enough been discussed, and a famous contemporary dramatist, Sean O'Casey, has put the only possible case—i.e. that of stark necessity in face of overwhelming odds—of the Irish and, by implication that of the Cyprus gunmen perhaps as well as it could be put. Here, we will merely record the surely obvious fact that several of the world's political entities owe their very existence in the first instance to plain unadorned cold-blooded murder, not once but repeatedly as a recognised political and military strategy relentlessly conducted over a lengthy period.

This obvious fact raises again—and in an urgent and sharp form—the ancient adage, "the end justifies the means". For if sovereign states which actually have become (in the case of Eire) or will presumably soon become (in the case of Cyprus) highly respectable members of the United Nations, etc., can achieve such a destiny initially as a result of successful campaigns of terrorism, which set at naught every recognised law and moral precept whether in the Decalogue or the civil codes, surely it is thereby demonstrated *ipso facto* that the end does actually justify the means. This would further appear to be so even in relation to Christianity and to Christian states. For it can hardly be disputed that Eire, the historic creation of Collins and his gunmen, is perhaps the most fanatically Roman Catholic land in the world, and all contemporary evidence suggests that the future Republic of Cyprus, the similar historic creation of Colonel Grivas and his Eoka gunmen, will be effectively dominated by Archbishop Makarios and by the Cyprus version of the Greek Orthodox Church. Two Christian states which owe their very existence to their respective founders' successful defiance of the sixth commandment: "Thou shalt not kill." Does not this fall completely into line with the famous formula that "the end justifies the means"?

This formula is usually ascribed to the Jesuits but as a modern writer on this subject has forcibly demonstrated, this common assumption is not entirely correct. It requires some qualification before it can be accepted. As our authority notes, Loyola and Co., "never taught that any means, even though it be criminal from the standpoint of Catholic morals, was permissible, if only it led to the 'end', that is, to the victory of the Catholic Church". Our author goes on to describe such an alleged mental attitude on the part of the Jesuits as "an internally contradictory and psychologically absurd doctrine"; as taken literally, it undoubtedly is. What the Jesuits did actually teach was that since their "end"—that is the victory of Rome—was a good thing, actions could be performed in its cause which would not have been permissible had they then been conducted in the service of a bad or indifferent cause. It is a matter of historical fact that the famous Company at times interpreted this permission very feely, e.g. Jesuit casuists openly advocated the assassination of heretical rulers—the books of Frs. Suarez, Mariana, Escobar, etc., which took this line were burnt in Protestant lands, including England, by order of the governments concerned. It is, of course, also a fact that certain pupils of the regicide Jesuits actually put, or tried to put, the teachings of the holy fathers into practice by killing heretical rulers obnoxious to Rome. Henry IV of France and William the Silent of Orange were their most eminent victims, while Queen Elizabeth I and James I had narrow escapes. That dynamic parliamentary reformer, Guy Fawkes, was also a pupil of the Jesuit experts in regicide. However, it is undoubtedly correct to state that the Jesuits never said that *all* means were justified by their ends, and this qualification should be noted. Indeed, a little critical thought is enough to show the psychological impossibility of such a contention, even though the accusation was often actually made in the heat of current theological controversy which, as is well known, is the most acrimonious and unfair of all.

The fact, of course, is that the Biblical prohibition "Thou shalt not kill" is a relative and not an absolute prohibition; an interpretation which would have saved a lot of ink—if not blood—had it been more generally realised. As our authority comments very aptly: "Thus shooting in itself is a matter of indifference; shooting a mad dog that threatens the life of a child, a virtue; shooting with the aim of robbery or murder, a crime". All that the Jesuit regicides did was to extend this conception to Catholic and Protestant rulers. The latter alone could, as heretics, be killed without any transgression of the moral law. In the same way, murderers, bandits, and, no doubt, if at all capable of any such abstract ethical conceptions, the Christian gunmen of Collins and Grivas—and perhaps the theologians of the Makarios school—put the soldiers of the occupying power in the same category as the earlier heretics who could "lawfully" be assassinated. At any rate, whatever the precise explanation, it is now evident that the famous adage, "the end justifies the means," is still by no means a purely academic concept.

A number of attempts have been made at voluntary chapel; but these have rarely been successful.

—The Public School in the New Age, by GEORGE SNOW.

God's Chosen People

By DR. VITALI NEGRI

(Concluded from page 92)

IN HIS WORK, the *Siraj*, Maimonides listed 13 Judaic principles or articles of belief which, within a century, had been accepted as unimpeachable by the great majority of Jews. Unfortunately, the unethical enforcement of these principles, hereby given in part, implanted a seed which, in time, sprouted into a forest of anti-Judaism:

"(1) Belief in the existence of a Creator; (2) Belief in His unity; (3) Belief in His incorporeality; (4) Belief in His eternity; (5) Belief that all worship and adoration are due to Him alone; (6) Belief in prophecy; (7) Belief that Moses was the greatest of all prophets; (8) Belief in the revelation of the law to Moses at Sinai; (9) Belief in the immutability of the law; (10) Belief that God knows the acts of men; (11) Belief in reward and punishment; (12) Belief in the coming of the Messiah; and (13) Belief in the resurrection of the dead."

These principles, received by the common people with great devotion, were assigned a place in the synagogue ritual (the hymn "Yigdal" in the book of daily prayer), with the following degrees of penalty imposed upon those who refuse to accept them:

"If a man believes these articles, he is included in the category of Israelite, and it is a duty to love him. Should he be led to commit transgression by the urgency of his lust and dominance of his lower nature, he will be punished for his offences, but he has a share in the future world. If, however, he rejects any of these articles, he has withdrawn himself from the category of Israelite; he has denied the principles of Judaism, he is a heretic and unbeliever, a lopper of the tree, and it is a duty to hate him."

From Moses to Moses, we find the same implantation of hate. Moses, the Law-giver, declared: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy." Twenty-five centuries later, Moses Maimonides repeated the same blunder.

Today, 800 years after Maimonides, these same principles and laws, and the same brand of hatred, prevail among those who have remained orthodox Jews. Among such there is still no intermarriage with those of other religions; no freedom from the old dietary laws; no serving or eating of the food that is not "kosher"; no admission into the temples of those who are not Jews and who have not been properly circumcised; and no admission of women into the temples except on special days, at which time only the balcony is open to them.

In regards to the importance of women in the Judaic religion, it is interesting to note the context of one of the daily prayers of the morning service which states: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God! King of the Universe, who hath not made me a woman."

The orthodox Jew still adheres to the belief of his favouritism in God's eyes and gives thanks for it by repeating daily the word written down for him in his prayer book: "Blessed art thou, O Lord! King of the Universe, who hath chosen us from all nations, and hath given us his law . . ."

In contemplation of the arrogance and hatred which men bear each other, we should strive to remember there is no effect without a cause. Ignorant humanity has created its own gods and religions. Insanely we have made these gods and religions the very causes of human injustice, immorality, and crime. The Jews in their origination of the Old Testament are the progenitors of a mythology

accepted by Christianity and Mohammedanism. Superstition and ignorance, plus the emotional drive which seeks to cover weakness and assert superiority, form the base of the Bible myths, including that of a "chosen people."

Most certainly in our modern age of enlightenment, there is no place for precepts which perpetuate myths. Even for those who have not yet been emancipated, it must be difficult to appreciate the motives of a God who would choose and bless a particular people only to make them continually suffer. One wonders it has not occurred to them to question if their God is not either a complete sadist or perhaps the Devil in disguise?

Thomas Paine, in the conclusion of *The Age of Reason*, gives his own comments:

"Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of 'His chosen people,' we must suppose that people to have been an example to all the rest of the world of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation of ruffians and cut-throats as the ancient Jews were; a people who, corrupted by and copying after such monsters and impostors as Moses and Aaron, Joshua, Samuel and David, had so distinguished themselves above all others on the face of the known earth, for barbarity and wickedness. If we will not stubbornly shut our eyes and steel our hearts, it is impossible not to see, in spite of all that long-established superstition imposes upon the mind, that that flattering appellation of 'His chosen people' is no other than a lie the priests and leaders of the Jews had invented, to cover the baseness of their own characters, and which Christian priests, sometimes as corrupt and often as cruel, have professed to believe."

It should be realised, however, that much of the ancient orthodox Judaism is no longer as prevalent among the Jews as it was. The modern Jew is more or less a reformed Jew, or no Jew at all. He intermarries with other religions; he eats what everyone else eats; he merges his interests and activities into the life of the total community instead of concentrating solely on the Jewish community.

Most scientifically trained individuals recognise the absurdity of an ethnological distinction drawn arbitrarily between Jews and non-Jews. As descendants of Shem, the ancient Jew was a Semite, which means a member of the Caucasian race represented in ancient times by the Babylonians, Assyrians, Aramaeans, Phoenicians, etc.

Today, every Jew as a member of a migratory group exposed for thousands of years to radial dispersions, represents, in part (and despite all religious precautions to the contrary), an assimilation of the physical and cultural characteristics of the non-Jews among whom his ancestors settled.

The Jews as a people forced to struggle for survival have necessarily grown strong with the struggle. Small as they are numerically, they have made themselves vitally felt in all cultures and in all branches of human endeavour. Among the great figures in world history who come from Jewish backgrounds are Spinoza, the greatest philosopher (in my opinion), Freud, the greatest psychologist, Einstein, the greatest scientist, Karl Marx, the greatest socialist and idealist, and men like Disraeli, ex-Prime Minister of England, Blum, ex-Premier of France, Bergson, the philosopher, Dr. Salk of the Salk vaccine, and innumerable

others who have been notable contributors to mankind's welfare, culture, and intellectual advancement.

Today, with the restoration of Palestine to the Jews—a move which many feel has been a mistake—it is nevertheless reassuring for those of us who look forward to a gradual dissolution of religion among all mankind, to learn that in the new Israel, a republic copied after the United States, the Judaic religion and the State are in a great degree separate, and that from all indications it appears to be the wish of the youth of Israel to widen this separation.

Suffice it to say that only with religion swept away, and its ridiculous superstitions forever silenced, can men hope to emerge as free individuals, unhampered by religious antagonisms, and recognised solely on the merits of their intelligence and accomplishments.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SUNDAY TIMES

It is to be hoped that the series of articles appearing in the *Sunday Times* has not escaped the notice of staff writers of THE FREETHINKER. Two articles have already appeared on consecutive Sundays, under the caption "Is Christianity true?" As both have been contributed by the Abbot of Nashdom, Dom Augustine Morris, and no contrary opinion has yet been published, it would appear that the Editor does not regard this a question to be debated and discussed, but merely as a proposition to be affirmed by a professional apologist.

This writer has already responded to the two articles published, pointing out, among other things, that the Dom's argumentation is specious and most unconvincing, primarily because he does not attempt to define the terms of the propositions he affirms. He argues that Christianity is true and that God exists, but makes no effort to define Christian, Christianity, or God.

I have castigated the Editor for his partiality in this matter in giving an entirely free hand to an interested apologist, whilst suppressing contrary views. I look forward to Mr. H. Cutner's acid comments in THE FREETHINKER and offer the suggestion that a FREETHINKER communication might instruct the Editor of *Sunday Times* as to the Rules of Controversy.

H. DAY.

[Please see Notes and News.—Ed.]

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS

In THE FREETHINKER of January 30th Dr. Duhig says that Jesus did support war (Matt. X, 34-38; Luke XII, 51-53); that Jesus had malignant hatred for people who could not agree with him (Matt. XXV, 41); and that He "compelled" his hearers to come in his fold (Matt., 8-13; Luke XIV, 23). Is Dr. Duhig so shortsighted that he cannot see in the cited texts but one meaning, namely the one that suits his hatred to Christ and his Church? In the cited texts Jesus proclaims God's love as supreme, and that, in consequence, his disciples have to fight for it against all those who would interfere with it, being these, as often happen, the members of one's own family. Besides, there is no salvation except in Jesus Christ, hence we are "compelled" to follow him, if we want to be saved.

With regard to Matt. XXV, 41, Christ's final sentence on the wicked, "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire . . .", is not an expression of "malignant hatred," but an expression of justice against those who have no brotherly love: "For I was hungry and you gave me not to eat . . . Amen, I say to you, as long as you did it not to one of these least, neither did you do it to me." And what about Christ's pardon of the adulteress (John VIII), the parables of the prodigal son, of the lost sheep, his love for children, and so on?

The titles that Dr. Duhig attributes to Jesus are only worthy of a man like Dr. Duhig himself: vain, silly, ignorant, unjust, hypocritical, menacing, arrogant and cruel. What a shame, Dr. Duhig!

G. M. PARIS (Editor *The Faith*, Malta).

REPLY TO THE ABOVE

I am at present compiling a book on the true character of Jesus judged from what he is alleged to have said. I am using English and French translations of the N.T. and where these are doubtful, I consult my copy of the Greek Testament issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1914, approved by all the Christian Churches, including the Roman Catholic, and presented to me by a distinguished R.C. cleric for a favour I did him. Out of his own mouth, Jesus is convicted of egotism, vanity, megalomania, insulting language, threats, cruelty, hypocrisy, injustice, laziness, enmity towards family life, absurdities, silliness, the idea of exclusive salvation, lies, contradictions, bad faith, repudiation of solemn promises, advocacy of war, hatred of sincere unbelief, and other oddities and indications of poor character. Each rubric as above is confirmed by quotations from the mouth of Jesus, running into about 500. The book should be out this year and I shall be happy to send the Maltese reverend complimentary copies and a supply at a discount. If he has any real reply, which I gravely doubt, I hope it will not be accompanied by personal abuse, so typical of Catholic apologetics. This common and intemperate attitude always seems to me to indicate a sense of defeat and inadequacy: a man with a good case does not have to use such methods.

(Dr.) J. V. DUHIG.

Some think the clergy first found out the way,
And wine is the only spirit by which they pray.
But others, less profane than so, agree
It clears the lungs and helps the memory;
And, therefore, all of them divinely think,
Instead of study, 'tis as well to drink.

DEFOE, *The True-born Englishman*.

IS SPIRITUALISM TRUE? By C. E. Ratcliffe.

Price 1/-; postage 2d.

THE WORLD MENACE OF CATHOLIC ACTION.

By A. Stewart.

Price 1/-; postage 2d.

THE POPES AND THEIR CHURCH.

By Joseph McCabe.

Price 2/-; postage 4d.

CAN MATERIALISM EXPLAIN MIND? By G. H. Taylor.

Price 3/6; postage 6d.

THE PAPACY IN POLITICS TODAY.

By Joseph McCabe.

Price 2/6; postage 5d.

A SHORT HISTORY OF SEX WORSHIP.

By H. Cutner.

Price 2/6; postage 6d.

FREEDOM'S FOE—THE VATICAN.

By Adrian Pigott.

A collection of Danger Signals for those who value liberty. 128 pages. Price 2/6; postage 6d.

THE DOLLAR AND THE VATICAN: Its Character, Methods and Aims.

By Avro Manhattan.

3rd Edition—Revised and Enlarged.

Price 21/-; postage 1/3.

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING.

By Chapman Cohen.

Series 1, 2, 3, 4. Cloth bound.

PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS IN MODERN THOUGHT.

By Chapman Cohen.

Price 3/- (specially reduced price); postage 5d.

MATERIALISM RESTATED (Third edition).

By Chapman Cohen.

Price 5/6; postage 7d.

PAMPHLETS FOR THE PEOPLE.

18 of Chapman Cohen's celebrated pamphlets bound in one volume. Indispensable for the Freethinker.

Price 5/6; postage 8d.

WHAT IS THE SABBATH DAY? By H. Cutner.

Price 1/3; postage 4d.

AGE OF REASON.

Thomas Paine's masterpiece with 40-pages introduction by Chapman Cohen.

Cloth 4/-; postage 7d.

HOW THE CHURCHES BETRAY THEIR CHRIST.

British Christianity critically examined. By C. G. L. Du Cann.

Price 1/-; postage 3d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK (10th Edition).

By G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball.

Price 4/6; postage 6d.

A CHRONOLOGY OF BRITISH SECULARISM.

By G. H. Taylor.

Price 1/-; post 2d.

THE YEAR'S FREETHOUGHT

The Freethinker for 1958

NOW AVAILABLE

BOUND VOLUME - 27/6 Postage 2/-

Limited number only

THE PIONEER PRESS

41 GRAY'S INN ROAD . LONDON . W.C.1