

The Freethinker

Volume LXXXIII—No. 42

Founded 1881 by G. W. Foote

Price Sixpence

ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25TH, the controversial German play, *Der Stellvertreter* translated as *The Representative*, opened in London. The sensational theme of this play by Rolf Hochhuth, is the admission, in the author's evident opinion the deliberate and criminal omission, of Pope Pius XII (1939-1958), to protest to Hitler against his extermination of the German and European Jews, against the Nazi "Final Solution" of the Jewish question by the Nazi gas chambers and by the firing squads of the Gestapo. I have not myself yet seen or read this play except for a single poignant scene recently reproduced in the columns of *The Observer*, and in any case I make no pretensions to being a dramatic critic. This powerful and polemical play is reviewed elsewhere in these columns. The only comment that I will make here upon the author's general theme, is that the essential motive that actuated Pope Pius, was political and not religious or moral. For had Pius spoken out on the then Jewish question, or even more so, had he excommunicated the entire Nazi regime as he had the power to do, the effect of this in a still largely Catholic Germany and Europe, would certainly have been to embarrass Hitler's war effort seriously and could even conceivably have turned the scales against Germany and have led to her defeat in the bitter struggle that the Nazi Reich was then (1943) waging against her to East and West.

Had Germany crashed at this juncture, at a time when the Western powers had not yet opened the second front in the West, this must have led to the Russian occupation of the whole of Western Europe after the collapse of the Nazi "New Order" and, from the Vatican's point of view, to the universal victory of atheistic Bolshevism and to the downfall of Rome's political and perhaps even religious power. It is this fact that explains the Pope's absolute silence with regard to the horrors of the concentration camps and gas chambers. It must also be remembered that Pacelli owed his initial election as Pope to the fact that he was already known as the German expert of the Vatican. Whilst the temptation is to judge Pius from a moral angle (for is not the Pope the Vicar of Christ and expressly and by definition infallible on morals?), the professional ex-diplomat Eugenio Pacelli, formerly Papal Legate in Germany, German expert of the Vatican and former Secretary of State, was concerned solely with the political aspects of the problem. The real conclusion to be drawn from this sorry business, is that at bottom and in essentials, the Church of Rome is primarily a political institution and only secondarily concerned with religion and morals. For the Papacy is still "the Ghost of the Roman Empire sitting crowned on the grave thereof" as Thomas Hobbes classically defined it three centuries ago.

Jehngiz Khan and the Telegraph Wire
The brief twelve-year regime of the Third Reich (1933-45) constituted without any doubt one of the most appalling incidents in recorded history. The Gestapo and its

concentration camps and gas chambers rivalled in sheer brutality, and far surpassed in technical efficiency, even such earlier human monsters as Nero and Jenghiz Khan, Torquemada and Ghislieri (Pope Pius V) and their respective Spanish and Roman Inquisitions. The Russian publicist, Alexander Herzen, once described the Tsarist regime as "Jenghiz Khan plus the telegraph wire", but this surely is even more true of the Hitler Reich. And to

add to the horror, this monstrous atavism, this collective return to primitive savagery eventuated not in some backward land, but in the most technically advanced land in Europe, in the midst of a cultural heritage that boasted such

giants as Beethoven, Mozart, Hegel, Goethe, Schiller and Schopenhauer, not to mention the Jew, Heine, whose poems were ascribed in Nazi text books to "an unknown author".

Certainly the Hitler episode constitutes one of the most extraordinary throw-backs in world history. I must confess that none of the explanations put forward to explain it appear to do so more than very partially. Perhaps the nearest approximation to an explanation is that the Nazi Reich emerged on to the stage of world and German history as the end-result of a number of very various factors all of which happened to converge at a particular moment in history. No one cause that has been adduced to explain this ghastly phenomenon in and by itself, appears to have been at all equal to its production, and nowhere was this more so than in relation to Hitler's appalling final solution to the Jewish question.

The Socialism of Fools

If the initial arrival of Hitler in the seat of power was due to an abnormal combination of abnormal circumstances, his "solution" of the Jewish question was similarly the ultimate effect of the combined operation of dissimilar causes, partly economic and partly ideological in character. Moreover it can relevantly be added that neither was new in German history and neither certainly was invented by Hitler or by Alfred Rosenberg his anti-Semitic ideologist-in-chief.

The Jews, as an unpopular religious and economic minority, had always been liable to be made the scapegoats when anything went wrong in the German Reich, even far back as the Crusades, when fearful pogroms were perpetrated in the Rhineland cities by Crusaders *en route* for the East. In modern times, German demagogues had made the Jew, with his alien appearance and his privileged economic status (real or imaginary) the object of their denunciations. In this field Hitler had many predecessors. So familiar, in fact, was anti-Semitism as an instrument of reactionary politicians, that long before *Mein Kampf* ever saw the light of day, the famous German Socialist, August Bebel, made the surely classic statement: "Anti-Semitism is the Socialism of fools"; viz. the Jew became the scapegoat for the inequalities of German capitalism.

However, whilst the economic motive behind anti-Semitism, whether in Germany, Tsarist-Russia or else-

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

Pius XII and Hitler

By F. A. RIDLEY

where, was certainly always powerful and often predominant, it would be pushing the economic interpretation of history over the edge of absurdity if we were to deny that ideology also discharged an important role in preparing the way for Hitler's anti-Semitism. In Germany especially, where (unlike this country, for example) ideas are taken seriously and actually originate action of a positive kind!

For under the Nazi regime, the Pan-German nationalism of Bismarck and the Kaiser was raised virtually to the level of a new religion with systematic Teutonic thoroughness. The Aryan Germans became a new "chosen race", wholly different in kind to the non-Aryan lesser breeds without the law. And lo and behold, confronting them on German soil, they found another and far older "chosen race", the people of Jehovah, the Jews. It was henceforth one "chosen race" against another: Hitler versus Jehovah; *Mein Kampf* against the Mosaic Law. It is, I submit, this fact above all that explains the ferocious hatred with which the Nazis regarded the Jews. For the other races whom they persecuted with perhaps equal brutality (e.g. the Gypsies who, it is too often forgotten perhaps on account of their poverty and illiteracy, also faced a final solution in Hitler's New Order) the Nazis felt only contempt as inferior specimens, but the Jew was a rival. He, too, was a "chosen race". As my friend George Maranz, himself a Jew, but a freethinker, phrased it classically, "Both the Nazis and the Zionists know *what* a chosen race is, they only disagree as to *which* it is". Hitler versus Joshua (whose traditional methods were very similar) *Mein Kampf* versus the Book of Ezra (the Jewish racist Scripture *par excellence*)! Here perhaps we have the spectacular high light of Hitler's extraordinary career.

The End of Chosen Races

The Hitler episode constitutes a frightful warning to mankind, for it indicated that progress is never safe from the spectre of decay: that "in the midst of life, we are in death"; that beneath the technical trappings of even the most advanced industrial civilisation, the primeval savage still lurks waiting only for the chance to "rationalise" his savagery in ideological forms. Both the Semitic Jews and the Aryan Germans eventually paid dearly for their racist "delusions of grandeur", but it is much to be hoped that the survivors (both Aryan and Jewish) have learned the ultimate lesson that these terrible events have burned into the conscience of mankind. The day of "chosen races" is over, whether chosen by gods or men, by Hitler or by Jehovah.

PROVOCATIVE PROTESTANT

CANON John D. Pearce-Higgins who at his appointment as Vice-Provost of Southwark Cathedral in May, protested at having to assent to the 39 Articles, delivered his first sermon in the cathedral on October 6th, and was again provocative. He agreed with the Bishop of Woolwich that "the old man in the skies, with a beard" must go, but "when this Humpty Dumpty of an old image has been shattered it does not seem as though all the Queen's chaplains or all the regius professors of divinity quite knew how to put the pieces together into a new and better image" (*Daily Telegraph*, 7/10/63). Thanks to science, said the Canon, "we have pushed God to the confines of our lives. We no longer pray to Him about crops and fertilisers, about the everyday things of life which we can do for ourselves". And he was sure that God intended us to "get on with" these things. Even so, "if the world is not organised and run by a benevolent and rational power, we really are in trouble", the Canon concluded.

Could Pius have Intervened?

THE FOLLOWING letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* on October 8th, 1963.

SIR—Surely this is the gravamen of the controversy aroused by *The Representative*: how would the Germans have reacted had the Pope intervened on behalf of the doomed Jews?

The Pope himself (in the play) exculpates his evasion by assuming that any attempt by him to rescue the Jews could have evoked dire Nazi reprisals against his own coreligionists.

If anybody believes that I would advise him to read *Rescue in Denmark*, by Harold Flender, which I have been proud to publish. This soul-lifting book—one of the noblest in the whole literature of the war—tells how the Danes, and their courageous King, defied the Nazis and saved Danish Jewry from being deported to the death chambers.

On the night of October 1st, 1943 (chosen because it was the Jewish New Year) the occupying Germans swooped down on Denmark's Jews in a massive raid. It had been planned with typical Teutonic thoroughness as a part of the Final Solution. But it turned out to be the most stunning fiasco in the annals of the Gestapo.

Within 24 hours of getting the tip-off about the raid (from a German official, no less!) the brave Danes had "spirited away" their Jewish compatriots, and of the 8,000 Jews marked down for extermination fewer than 300 fell into the hands of the Nazi murder squads. It was an astonishing "disappearing act".

And not only did the Danish people thwart the ruthless Germans who were occupying their country, but they defied and humiliated the mighty Reich Government itself. According to eyewitness accounts, when the news of the failure reached Berlin, both Hitler and Himmler "became raging mad with indignation". The arch Jew-killer Adolf Eichmann rushed to Copenhagen, but by then the rescued Danish Jews had been safely ferried across the Kattegat to the hospitable shores of Sweden.

There were no reprisals or other dire consequences such as the inarticulate Pope feared. And thus did two small nations, far less powerful than the Vatican, write one of the finest chapters in the history of the war. And, to their eternal glory, by so doing they helped to restore our faith in human decency, honour and courage.

Yours faithfully,
MARK GOULDEN (London, W.C.2).

CENSORED CATHOLIC

ROBERT KAISER may be—said George Armstrong of *The Guardian* (2/10/63)—"the first author to be banned by the Church and blessed by the Pope on the same day". Mr. Kaiser was among the journalists received in audience on October 1st. He had previously been congratulated by fellow journalists because the Holy Office (formerly the Holy Inquisition) had instructed Catholic bookshops in Rome to withdraw his book, *Inside the Council*, from their counters, along with that of another Catholic writer, Xavier Rynne. Both Kaiser and Rynne were highly critical of the Curia, and the Holy Office in particular during the last session of the Ecumenical Council. Neither book has been translated into Italian and, Mr. Armstrong remarked, "the Holy Office's decision when publicised abroad can only boost sales of the two books in Britain and the US".

"The Representative"

By COLIN McCALL

Paul VI and Pius XII

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN—concerned as ever with fairness, of course—has "requested" the Royal Shakespeare Theatre Company to print "an authoritative Catholic opinion" in all its Aldwych Theatre programmes for Rolf Hochhuth's *The Representative*. We are therefore privileged to read a letter written to *The Tablet* by Pope Paul VI, who conceives it his "duty to contribute to the task of clarifying and purifying men's judgment on the historical reality in question—so distorted in the representational pseudo-reality of Hochhuth's play—by pointing out that the character given to Pius XII in this play (to judge from the reviews in the Press) does not represent the man as he really was: in fact, it entirely misrepresents him". Pope Paul, it will be noted, has neither seen nor read the play, yet he knows that it "entirely misrepresents" Pius XII. Had the present Pope read it, he might have found it unnecessary to acquit Pius of cowardice, which is not only not among Hochhuth's accusations, but is expressly rejected by the German author, viz.: "it is in no way the purpose of the play to imply that it was out of fear of Hitler that he [Pius] kept silence—as a leading historian has maintained".

Significantly, Pope Paul spends more time refuting this than he does the allegation—which Hochhuth does make—that Pius's conduct was dictated by political opportunism. In fact, no defence whatever is made against this much more serious charge (one cannot help being a coward). Pope Paul simply denies it, adding that, "It would be just as true—and as slanderous—to assert that his [Pius's] government of the Church was motivated by considerations of material advantage".

And that is all the Pope has to say on this crucial point, on which, as a friend and protégé of Pius XII, he could have spoken at least with knowledge. Without any direct knowledge of the play, on the other hand, he finds that its thesis "betrays an inadequate grasp of psychological, political and historical realities". And, had Pius "done what Hochhuth blames him for not doing", it would have "led to such reprisals and devastations that Hochhuth himself, the war being over and he now possessed of a better historical, political and moral judgment, would have been able to write another play, far more realistic and far more interesting than the one that he has in fact so cleverly but also ineptly put together . . .".

Not bad that, is it, on the mere basis of press reviews? A fine example from the top for Catholics to follow in controversy.

But "the long and short of the matter" is, Pope Paul says, that an "attitude of protest and condemnation such as this young man blames the Pope for not having adopted would have been not only futile but harmful . . .". That is Paul's defence of Pius. It is the only defence that can be offered (no one has suggested that Pius was unaware of what was happening to the Jews). It is the defence that is offered in the play itself and—rightly in my view—found wanting. Of course I should not expect to see eye-to-eye with Pope Paul, even if he had seen or read the play. But he might, I suggest, have refrained from the suggestion, couched in unctuous language ("though please God it is not so") that Hochhuth was "insufficiently endowed" with "ordinary human integrity". He might indeed have gone a little further into Pius's "political opportunism".

The Play

The printed English version of *The Representative*, a translation by Robert David MacDonald (Methuen, paperback 16s., hardbound 25s.) runs to 268 pages, plus the important 63-page historical appendix. It is in the latter that Hochhuth supports his thesis with documentary evidence. Pius XII's part in the Concordat, for instance, when he was Secretary of State. "It is not the Pope [Pius XI] who is behind the agreement with Hitler", said Reichschancellor Brüning to Count Harry Kessler, in Paris in 1935, "but the Vatican bureaucracy, and its mouthpiece Pacelli. They have in mind an authoritarian state, and an authoritarian church controlled by the Vatican bureaucracy, which can conclude an eternal alliance with one another".

In 1946, Pacelli, now of course Pope, argued that the Roman Catholic Church would have suffered persecution by Hitler had there been no Concordat. But Hochhuth points out that in 1934, "when Hitler's SA were providing the bandsmen and the organisers at the Exhibition of the Holy Robe in Trier", it "hardly seemed probable that he would persecute the Church, nor that he would, nine years later, occupy Rome. (And even when this happened Pacelli at no time reckoned on an occupation of the Vatican)". In the year the Concordat was concluded, Pius XI was informed by a Jewish convert, Dr. Edith Stein, of the reign of terror against the Jews in Germany, "although admittedly he never answered the letter, which was delivered to him personally". And "Pius XI stated that the Concordat was a platform from which to protest".

Yet, as we know, little use was made of the "platform". *Osservatore Romano* could be strong enough when condemning Stalin's invasion of Finland ("calculated crime, law of the jungle, most cynical aggression of modern times"): similar condemnation of Nazi atrocities was noticeably lacking. Sir D'Arcy Osborne, British Ambassador to the Holy See, is quoted with approval by Pope Paul, describing Pius XII as "the most warmly humane, kindly, generous, sympathetic (and, incidentally, saintly) character that it has been my privilege to meet in the course of a long life". But in August 1943, Sir D'Arcy declared that in the course of 1942, "he had repeatedly requested the Pope to make formal condemnation of the German atrocities".

After the Pope's 1942 Christmas message which condemned the horrors of war in general terms, the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, had said to Sir D'Arcy: "You see, the Holy Father has taken notice of your Government's recommendations". The Ambassador explained that such a comprehensive condemnation was not exactly what the British Government had been asking for. This, as Hochhuth indicates, is confirmed from various sources, but notably from *Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers*, 1942, Volume 3, Washington, May, 1961.

Pius XII, as Hochhuth says, spoke "two completely different languages". At one moment he was "the objectively calculating politician in his intimate circle"; the next he would speak "officially". In these "cautiously banal, flowery, imprecise utterances and strings of clichés, which always moralised round and about the general subject of the war . . . he never once named by name a single

(Concluded on page 332)

This Believing World

The "Daily Express" (September 30th) proudly presented its Christian readers with yet another variation from the well-known portraits of "our Lord". In general, Jesus is painted like a nobleman of the Renaissance, instead of an Israelite—which he must have been if he really lived. Now and then, fervent believers are horrified when an artist departs from the current tradition. We are therefore pleased to give publicity to Mr. John Bratby's courage in painting himself as Jesus.

★

A half-page reproduction in the journal gives us Mr. Bratby himself standing by his huge mural destined for a Jesuit college, and shows Christ complete with halo—though unfortunately a comparison between the two heads reveals that Mr. Bratby missed getting a likeness. What we got was a scrubby, unshaven workman—a carpenter?—looking as much like a brown Jew as an Australian aborigine. We leave it to theologians to hammer out whether Jesus really belonged to the working-class, or was of royal blood, a King, or the Prince of Peace. It's a subject for Jesuit subtlety.

★

Canon H. W. Montefiore, who comes from a very Jewish family but has found Jesus personally as his Saviour, does not like Article 13 of the famous Thirty-Nine Articles. He was, however, according to the *Daily Telegraph* (September 30th) "prepared to make the Declaration of Assent". According to Dr. Pusey, once the revered Head of all Anglo-Catholics, you must believe in the lot to be a true Christian. His exact words were, "Any deliberate rejection of the faith on any one point is in fact a rejection of the whole habit of faith". The poor Canon admitted, "it was hard to subscribe to each and every article".

★

Very few people know the 39 Articles, so here is Article 13: "Works done before the Grace of Christ and the inspiration of Christ are not pleasure to God, as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ". No wonder the Canon "couldn't take it". Of what use was the Judaism of his ancestors? "I cannot believe", said the Canon sadly, "that every single action of every member of the Jewish faith has the nature of sin". Whether he can or cannot so believe he *must* do so to remain a true Anglican.

★

In spite of the beautiful Christian tolerance the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster showed on TV and the radio for "our separated brethren" recently, we wonder what he thinks of the Holy Office's banning of two authors writing about the affairs of the Vatican Council (*Daily Express*, October 1st)? The Vatican warns booksellers not to sell them, nor the book by 34-year-old Dr. Hans Kung, theological professor of Tübingen University, West Germany, who wants the Church to "face up to internal reforms". Booksellers who flout the Vatican "can run into grave difficulties".

★

With a "smashing" portrait of Lord Dowding who commanded the RAF in the Battle of Britain", the *News of the World* initiated an inquiry into "Beyond the Veil", that is, Spiritualism. As Lord Dowding is a believer in Spiritualism, even fairies at the bottom of your garden, he is bound to stimulate faith in spooks. The series is being written by John Deane Potter who refreshingly tells us that he has spent a long time with "experts" competent to deal with "supernatural phenomena".

And what does Lord Dowding himself think of the "experts"? Thank heaven, Mr. Potter tells us—"It's not such a bad thing to be a bit cracked. It sometimes lets the light in". Fancy calling such people as—on second thoughts we had better not give any names. To call — and — "a bit cracked" might bring us in for heavy damages for libel. However, we can give the title of the book which profoundly influenced Lord Dowding. It was, *Life Beyond the Veil*, by the Rev. Dale Owen, which we read at the time it was published, and which was a fine example of "space fiction". It was, alas, almost killed by contemptuous laughter.

"THE REPRESENTATIVE"

(Concluded from page 331)

politician, a single country—except Poland—nor the actual fact of the deportations carried out over a period of years". Mussolini said that the 1942 Christmas message was "full of platitudes and might just as well be by the priest of Predappio"—the village where Mussolini was born. Pope Paul would like Rolf Hochhuth to "forebear from trifling with subjects of this kind and with historical personages whom some of us have known". Hochhuth is not "trifling", as indeed Pope Paul's decision to write a "refutation" would seem to prove. And in the historical appendix (which, again I emphasise, Pope Paul has not read) the playwright gives reasons and sources for his various scenes and characters. In my opinion the facts are unanswerable.

The Aldwych Production

How does the Aldwych Theatre cope with *The Representative*? It cuts it, of course, by more than half. It adds a rather unnecessary commentary and perhaps unnecessary film sequences of Nazi soldiers, deportation of Jews in cattle-trucks, crematorium ovens, bulldozing of corpses, etc. I am not in theory opposed to the incorporation of film, nor to reminders of Nazi atrocities, but I feel that the play is powerful enough to speak for itself. Nevertheless, it is a production to be seen. I cannot agree with some critics that it is badly acted. Alan Webb makes a splendid Pius, and Alex McGowen must have improved enormously after the first night as the Jesuit Father Riccardo Fontana. Of the remainder, Gordon Gostelow as Gerstein deserves mention, and on the whole the Nazis are better than the priests. But above all, Clifford Williams, the Director, must be congratulated. Despite many harassments he has given us an unforgettably moving and disturbing play.

Mr. Peter Forster (in the *Sunday Telegraph*, September 29th) is correct, I think, in calling *The Representative* an "epic pageant, historical documentary of a compelling kind", which approaches imaginative tragedy towards the end. The great scene is, of course, that in which Riccardo confronts the Pope. And Pius's letter, as Hochhuth reminds us, must not be treated as a review sketch; it is a simple quotation from *Osservatore Romano*, perhaps not by the Pope personally, but certainly known to him. And Hochhuth says:

It is not the author's fault that this garland of paper flowers should here be strewn on the grave of the victims—and with a pretention, a gesture, a pathos whose hypocrisy is all the more frightening since patently none of those present, least of all the Pope, could have believed that the protest had any practical value.

Question

Why didn't the Lord Chamberlain request the printing of an "authoritative" opinion by, say, Mr. Colin Jordan in the Aldwych Theatre programme, to counteract "misrepresentation" of the Nazis in *The Representative*?

THE FREETHINKER

103 BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON, S.E.1
TELEPHONE: HOP 2717

THE FREETHINKER can be obtained through any newsagent or will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates: One year, £1 17s. 6d.; half-year, 19s.; three months, 9s. 6d. In U.S.A. and Canada: One year, \$5.25, half-year, \$2.75; three months, \$1.40.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 103 Borough High Street, London, S.E.1. Details of membership of the National Secular Society may be obtained from the General Secretary, 103 Borough High Street, S.E.1. Inquiries regarding Bequests and Secular Funeral Services should also be made to the General Secretary, N.S.S.

Lecture Notices, Etc.

OUTDOOR

Edinburgh Branch NSS (The Mound).—Sunday afternoon and evening: Messrs. CRONAN, McRAE and MURRAY.
London Branches—Kingston, Marble Arch, North London: (Marble Arch), Sundays, from 4 p.m.: Messrs. L. EBURY, J. W. BARKER, C. E. WOOD, D. H. TRIBE, J. A. MILLAR.
(Tower Hill). Every Thursday, 12—2 p.m.: Messrs. J. W. BARKER and L. EBURY.
Marseyside Branch NSS (Pierhead).—Meetings: Wednesdays, 1 p.m.: Sundays, 7.30 p.m.
North London Branch NSS (White Stone Pond, Hampstead).—Every Sunday, noon: L. EBURY
Nottingham Branch NSS (Old Market Square), every Friday, 1 p.m.: T. M. MOSLEY.

INDOOR

Birmingham Branch NSS (Midland Institute, Paradise Street), Sunday, October 20th, 6.45 p.m.: D. H. TRIBE, "Honest to God or Honest to Man?"
Conway Discussions (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1), Tuesday, October 22nd, 7.30 p.m.: DR. BERYL HARDING and MRS. AUDREY HARVEY, "London's Homeless Families".
Leicester Secular Society (Secular Hall, 75 Humberstone Gate), Sunday, October 20th, 6.30 p.m.: PERCY DOWNEY, "The Case Against Fluoride".
Manchester Branch NSS (Wheatsheaf Hotel, High Street), Sunday, October 20th, 7.30 p.m.: G. A. MILLS, "May Day in Moscow".
Marble Arch Branch NSS (The Carpenter's Arms, Seymour Place, London, W.1), Sunday, October 20th, 7.30 p.m.: F. A. RIDLEY, "After Pope John XXIII".
North Staffordshire Humanist Group (Guildhall, High Street, Newcastle-under-Lyme), Friday, October 18th, 7.15 p.m.: A MEETING.
South Place Ethical Society (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1), Sunday, October 20th, 11 a.m.: RICHARD CLEMENTS, OBE, "The English Constitution: Changes in the Last Hundred Years".

Notes and News

THIS MIGHT be called *The Representative* number, since much of it is devoted to Rolf Hochhuth's controversial play now running at the Aldwych Theatre, London. In Views and Opinions, F. A. Ridley gives the historical-political background, while Colin McCall deals with the play itself, and we also reprint a letter by publisher Mark Goulden. The Marble Arch Branch of the National Secular Society continues to distribute leaflets ("Do you know that the Roman Catholic Church has tried to censor this play?") outside the theatre, and Mr. W. J. McIlroy, Branch Secretary and NSS General Secretary-elect, is organising a party-visit to the play.

★

THIS SUNDAY, F. A. Ridley will speak to Marble Arch Branch (in the Carpenter's Arms, London, W.1) on "After Pope John XXIII". It should be a fascinating lecture for students of the papacy. Cardinal Montini was in the privileged position of having the blessing of both Pius XII ("One day you'll see, he will be Pope") and John XXIII,

and his election was widely predicted. What was not expected was that it would be welcomed by the "conservatives". "Those who were most deeply moved, and who did nothing to hide their joy", said the Italian magazine *Espresso* (July 1963), "were men like Ottaviani, Micara and Spellman". Of course Montini was a product of the Curia, but he had pledged, if elected, to follow John's policy. The danger from the "left" must have been particularly strong for Montini to have been a compromise.

★

UNDER A picture of the Archbishop of Canterbury laughing heartily, the *Guardian* (9/10/63) reported an accusation of blasphemy levelled at the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Basil Guy) by the Archdeacon of Aston (the Ven. M. T. Dunlop), during the Convocation of Canterbury. It was blasphemy, Mr. Dunlop said, to adduce the supposed "maleness" of the Almighty as an argument against allowing women to fill the office of Reader in the Church of England. "God is neither male nor female, but spirit . . .". It was also treating metaphors "as though they were steps in a logical syllogism". The Convocation later agreed to admit women as Readers.

★

HOW MANY priests will there be in France in the year 2000? Very few, judging by the drop in the number of ordinations in the last decade: from 1,028 in 1951 to 567 in 1959. There are 47,000 priests for 46 million people, or one to every 1,000 said *Le Figaro* (25/9/63). In South America the position is even worse: one priest to 5,000 faithful.

★

SOUTHWARK Catholic Children's Society reported "a very steep rise" in the number of expectant unmarried mothers interviewed last year. The figure rose to 661 for the year ended in March, compared with 565 the previous year (*Daily Telegraph*, 1/10/63). Father Lionel Munns, secretary of the Society, which covers South London, Kent, Surrey and Sussex, said: "The number rises each year, but last year's increase was higher than usual". Half the unmarried mothers were under 21.

★

DAVID LOW, the cartoonist, was an Agnostic. Nevertheless, his widow and friends felt that there should be a memorial "service" for him in the Friends Meeting House, London, without clergy, hymns or lesson. We are sure no Freethinker will disagree with this. It was a pity, though, that the *Guardian*, in announcing this (3/10/63) should go on to describe Low as a "man of strong Christian instincts", when presumably it meant that he was kindly and virtuous. Although admitting that David Low was unable to accept the theology and liturgy of any Church, the *Guardian* still tried to claim him as having "Christian instincts". In fact, as an Agnostic, his morality was humanistic.

★

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY received an invitation from the local Salvation Army, to attend a "Citizens' Service" on October 13th, and a covering letter from Major Eric A. Carby saying: "It gives me satisfaction to include your organisation. You are truly part of city life". In politely declining the Major's invitation, Leicester Secular Society Secretary, C. H. Hammersley, compared it to "inviting a society of vegetarians to a barbecue". In turn he invited Major Carby to speak at the Secular Hall. This is the second religious "invitation" the Leicester Secular Society has received lately. The other (which was reported on September 6th) requested the pleasure of a contribution to the rates of St. George's Parish Church.

Logic and Emotion

By G. L. SIMONS

THE OPPONENTS of logic often maintain that the rationalist neglects the emotional side of man, being concerned only with his intellectual faculties. In this way an attempt is made to discredit the philosophy based on reason by suggesting that it is incomplete, ignoring part of human personality which is real, influential and important. But such critics are mistaken in their interpretation of the rationalist position. The man who bases his philosophy on reason allocates a place for both logic and emotion and by so doing clearly shows that the apparent dichotomy between man's emotional and reasoning faculties is unreal, and only seems to occur when the relationship between feeling and reasoning is misunderstood. But before attempting to state this relationship it is worthwhile to point out an objection to the philosophies which are in principle opposed to logic.

If a man holds beliefs which are non-logical (as opposed to logical or illogical) it is difficult to conceive how these notions could be entertained. If such beliefs exist it is not possible to represent them using a symbology which has an inherent logical structure. For the logical nature of the symbology will serve only to distort the concept which, being non-logical cannot be represented by an alien symbology.

The essential point to realise is that ordinary language is a system of symbology with a logical structure. The words "and", "not", "or", "some", "all", etc., are all logical operators, and all nouns, verbs, etc., represent concepts in a constant fashion, i.e., in any sentence where nouns, verbs, etc., occur these words stand for certain unchanging concepts. In short verbal terms stand for specific things *and not their negations or anything else*. Hence the whole of language assumes an inherent logic which is thought to conform to the world.

The implications of these comments are far-reaching. For it follows that if a man holds non-logical beliefs these can never be communicated. For they can never be formulated in a language which has public significance. He cannot define new terms that he wishes to use, since his definitions would have to be self-consistent and constant, turning his thoughts into a logical system. Moreover he could never use his non-logical beliefs to form the premises in a system which could be used to investigate the world. For the public world changes according to laws which are discoverable and which have justified the creation of a logical language to discuss them. Thus the non-logical beliefs of a man must co-exist with his logical (or illogical) beliefs but can never interact with them or give him cause to act in one way rather than another.

All this assumes the possibility that non-logical thoughts can be conceived. I confess that I cannot conceive of any and also believe it unlikely that anyone else can. For our imagination is triggered by experience of our environment, and the concepts we understand are of the same logical nature as the laws that we perceive in the world. Because of this it seems unlikely that there is a peculiar form of non-logical concept (which it is impossible to define by any means whatever) which can be entertained by some people but not by others. In short I am strongly inclined to doubt that anyone can have thoughts about reality which are not either logical or illogical in nature. To me the non-logical concept of reality is a meaningless concept. However I do not wish to be dogmatic in suggesting that there is some sort of logical impossibility about

the existence of such thoughts. (Although with a careful definition of "thought" I believe that this would be found to be the case.) If, however, such thoughts can be conceived then I deny that they can be conveyed from any person to another. In short anyone who claims to hold non-logical beliefs must keep them to himself and admit that when he tries to express them he is talking nonsense. It seems to me that all philosophies which are opposed to a logical interpretation of the world are subject to this fatal objection.

In attempting to understand the place of reason and the place of emotion in human affairs it is important to be able to distinguish between the nature of empirical (or scientific) statements and ethical (or aesthetic) statements. The clarification of this distinction has been one of the main contributions to philosophical thought by the English empiricist tradition, from the time of Locke and Hume to that of Russell and Ayer.

Empirical statements (those of both science and common-sense) purport to express facts about the world. They are formulated according to logical rules, and are used to derive other statements which are said to follow according to either deductive or inductive logic. The important point is that such statements are held to be formulated according to an *objective* system of rules, i.e. the rules are the same for everyone, e.g. scientists throughout the world share the same basic methodology—observing, experimenting, formulating hypotheses, testing, etc. Whenever an empirical statement is formulated any scientist could indicate under what circumstances the statement would be verified or falsified. Thus in a sense the scientist proceeds according to rules which are *outside himself*. If he wishes to understand reality and to be able to predict future events in some field (which is what the scientist is primarily trying to do) then he must adhere to basic rules of procedure which have been derived from an observation of how the world works.

Ethical statements, however, are of a completely different kind. For there is in principle no way of verifying an ethical statement by reference to the nature of the world. Some thinkers have attempted to do this (e.g. the evolution-type ethical systems of Spencer and Nietzsche) but have merely indicated their own emotional reaction to men in society. The ethical criteria adopted by Nietzsche, for example, are just as arbitrary as those adopted by Jesus. In neither case can it be legitimately claimed that the recommended moralities had the degree of objective significance which characterises the typical empirical statement. The importance of these remarks is obvious.

Ethical statements are such that *in the last resort* they can be verified by no experience or authority unless a quite arbitrary principle is elevated into a pre-eminent position. If this occurs it is essential to realise that it can only be done for emotional reasons. For it is emotion and not reason which is the motivator of man. Reason is his tool for understanding the world and for organising his philosophy in a rational, self-consistent framework. Man's emotional reactions to society are logically prior to his attempt to formulate consistent theories about the world. The faculty of reason is young. There is also a sense in which all intellectual endeavour is emotionally motivated. Superficially this signifies that emotion is more important than reason. In the sense that there would be no cause

for the exercise of reason without the presence of emotion this is true. But if our criterion of importance is, for example, maximum human happiness then it is false. For passion uncontrolled by logical considerations is more likely to lead to misery than happiness. And it is because of this that reason is so vital a tool in the modern world.

When a man states that this or that action is right or wrong all he is doing is evincing his emotional reaction to the action. He is assigning no quality to the action other than its capacity to effect his feelings in a certain way. (This assumes that he is voicing his own opinions and not merely quoting the conventional attitude to right and wrong.) He is asserting nothing that has empirical significance unless he definitely relates his judgment to an empirical state of affairs by saying, for example, a stable economy is a good thing. But when this sort of definition occurs the problem is only removed one stage, since it is then necessary to inquire what the reason is for maintaining the "rightness" of a particular social state of affairs. Eventually a statement will be reached which is basic, i.e. which cannot be justified by more primitive statements. It is at this level that emotion rules supreme and logic has not begun. However as soon as this initial emotional reaction is used for the formulation of a moral system then logic is vital. For logic indicates which beliefs can co-exist with which other beliefs, and which moral beliefs (which we can define as "prejudices") must be sacrificed if the more important basic ideals are to be preserved. To understand this fully it is necessary to make a distinction between two levels of moral beliefs.

The first level is the one at which a person initially registers his reaction to people according to his inherited mentality and the way this mentality has been affected by early environment. The second level is the one at which moral beliefs are formed partly according to the initial emotional reaction, partly according to a manipulation of empirical evidence. An illustration may help to clarify this point. Suppose one man dislikes all Negroes merely because he dislikes dark skin; a second man dislikes all Negroes because he believes they are dirty. The first belief is of a different logical order than the second. In both cases there is an emotional reaction to a type of person. But in the one case the only approach which could be tried to change the man's belief would be of an emotional sort, e.g. through exhortation. In the other case the required evidence is of a purely empirical variety. To show that coloured people are not unusually dirty is an empirical task which, when complete, convinces the honest person. It is clear that the two forms of belief exist at a different level. It follows that what is termed prejudice can only exist at the second level, that in this context prejudice is a moral belief which either goes against or beyond the available empirical evidence.

The place of logic should now be clear. Logic is an organising tool which should be used to eliminate prejudice and to encourage emotional reactions to people which lead to more happiness in the world and less misery. I freely admit that my desire for more worldly happiness is quite arbitrary in the sense I have indicated. But it gains strength when it is realised that it is in such a philosophy that most people stand to gain in the only way that has real significance for them—in an increase in the feelings and joys which are widely held to make life worth living.

Just Published
THE TIME HAS COME
By JOHN ROCK

A Catholic Doctor's Proposals to end the Battle over Birth Control.
18s., plus postage
from THE FREETHINKER Bookshop

Adoption in America

IN THE September issue of the American Freethought magazine, *The Liberal*, Allen Strasburger describes the influence of religion in a north-eastern state welfare agency primarily involved in the foster care of children. The majority of the children are either Negro Protestants or white Catholics, though they often come from families where religious training is not very strong. When we get the children, Mr. Strasburger says, "we place them with foster parents who believe it is their duty to indoctrinate them in all the superstition and irrationality of their religion. Our foster parents, indeed, have a mandate to do just that". When a mother brings her child for placement, she is asked to specify the religion in which she wants it to be raised. "If she does not specify a religion or if we accept a foundling for foster care, our state board of managers assigns a religion to the child", and, as the child grows up, the social worker is "required to ascertain at intervals the level of religiosity in the foster home".

When a couple applies to the agency for foster children, the name of a clergyman is "required" as a religious reference. "If the applicants are unable for some reason to get a religious reference" says Mr. Strasburger, "they are turned down by us, no matter how acceptable they may be otherwise. They are denied children, of course, if they are atheists or agnostics. They are rejected also if they are religious but not churchgoers". Mr. Strasburger asks, what can be done to challenge this situation? And he believes one step, at least, is possible in the US. "A courageous non-churchgoing couple who would like to have foster children in their home and who qualify in other ways (such as health, warmth of family life, and acceptance of problems) should apply to be foster parents. When rejected for lack of a religious reference, they should fight the matter through the courts. If they win, they will secure a measure of freedom from religion for thousands and perhaps ultimately millions of children".

Points From New Books

THE SMALLER PRESSES are of particular interest to the freethinker. Miraculously, some survive in this killing age of mounting costs, and they still manage to present us with books which are not built to formulae. Novels, poems and treatises that would never appear with the big publishers (who tend to look on literature as merchandise) may find life with these off-track publishing firms, and it is the life of such books which helps to release our thoughts from the conventions of the cliché. That is why one welcomes the publication by The Hand and Flower Press of two plays by Antony Borrow, just issued at thirty shillings each: *Don Juan (a comedy with shadows, in three acts)*, and *Bluebeard (a drama in three acts)*.

Mr. Borrow is a young scientist who has done a great deal for young writers with vital experimental ideas by editing little magazines and broadsheets. His plays are fired by philosophical speculation. There are fine set scenes in which problems of good and evil and man's destiny are proposed in situations which are truly dramatic. It is possible that the author has not all the skilled dramatist's expertise in using the comings and goings of characters as story-telling and character-revelation; and, in fact, he is not above resorting to a shouted name to introduce an entrance. Yet this is mere youthful impatience, a desire to get on with such a theme as how

a man can destroy God. Here, for instance, is an example of the provocative thought taken from a speech by Gilles de Rais in *Bluebeard*: "... We have to build a new sanctity out of evil. Evil is but the unloved thing taking revenge. How we shall love her! Until she flowers into an incandescence that will transfigure creation."

Incidentally, both these plays have been performed by one of the few surviving little theatre clubs which undertake a similar creative function to that of the small off-beat publishing house, The Hovenden Theatre Club.

OSWELL BLAKESTON.

WRITER AND PAINTER

OSWELL BLAKESTON is a man of many interests and remarkable imagination. He is, in fact, an artistic experimenter, by no means only in the literary field. At present he is exhibiting at an exhibition of contemporary painting at the Madden Galleries, 69 Blandford Street, London, W.1, and his latest book, *Working Cats*, has just been published by Elek at 16s.

CORRESPONDENCE

AGNOSTICS ADOPTION BUREAU

Readers of THE FREETHINKER will be interested to hear that the British Humanist Association has now formed an Agnostics Adoption Bureau to investigate the problems of Agnostics, Atheists and Humanists who are unable to adopt children from the established religious organisations.

A copy of the Report of the Working Party on Adoption convened by the BHA can be obtained from the Bureau, c/o the BHA, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8. (Please send a s.a.e.)

The amount of help that Humanists will be able to give must depend on the financial support that is forthcoming. May I suggest that any of your readers who are concerned with the problems of adoption should write to us and, at the same time, contribute generously so that we can first of all find out exactly what needs to be done and then have the power to do it?

I have also felt for some time that Humanists might be able to make a real contribution to the welfare of unmarried mothers and their babies by offering friendship and practical guidance to young women from the time the doctors declare them to be pregnant. Far too many of them are unable to turn to their own families or friends for help at a time when sickness and fear must be borne in secrecy. The dangers and temptations during these first weeks are obvious, yet plans must be made with a cool head.

Would any Freethinker families who might be willing to offer a warm-hearted, constructive friendship to such young women and also those who might do even more and take an unmarried girl into their home during the weeks before and after the birth of the child, write to:

Dr. D. S. Ball (Chairman of the Agnostics Adoption Bureau), 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8.

This is, I think, a real opportunity for us to prove to the uncommitted but non-religious people outside the Humanist Organisations that Humanism isn't just talk.

(MRS.) KIT MOUAT

Secretary to the Agnostics Adoption Bureau.

PENGUIN CLASSICS

Aristotle:	Ethics, 5s.
Homer:	The Iliad, 4s. 6d.
Homer:	The Odyssey, 3s. 6d.
Lucian:	Satirical Sketches, 3s. 6d.
Lucretius:	The Nature of the Universe, 3s. 6d.
Machiavelli:	The Prince, 3s. 6d.
Montaigne:	Essays, 7s. 6d.
Nietzsche:	Thus Spoke Zarathustra, 5s.
Rabelais:	Gargantua and Pantagruel, 7s. 6d.
Stendhal:	Scarlet and Black, 6s.
Tacitus:	Annals of Imperial Rome, 5s.
Voltaire:	Candide, 3s. 6d.

Plus postage from THE FREETHINKER Bookshop

WHAT IS GOD?

Mr. Crommelin suggests that the mind, and aesthetic and moral values are non-physical aspects of reality. This I strongly contest. There is much reason to think that eventually an explanation of mental faculties will be possible in terms of neurology and cerebral activity. Also, aesthetic and moral judgments are derived from our emotions, and it is apparent that our emotions are physically based, e.g. the effect of hormones.

Hence I see no justification for the assumption that mind or values can be excluded from an empirical context. The value of atheism, for example, consists in its capacity to promote human happiness, which is inferred from observed behaviour. This is quite empirical in nature.

The meaning of a word *does* depend upon context, as Mr. Crommelin suggests—but not *only* on context. The sentence "There is a speelhosh in my room" would, I assume, communicate nothing to Mr. Crommelin. The context is not sufficient to give "speelhosh" a meaning; it must be defined using words that have public significance, i.e. they must be empirical in connotation. Indeed, since language grew up empirically, how is any other interpretation of meaning possible?

G. L. SIMONS.

[This correspondence is now closed.—ED.]

OBITUARY

ARNOLD BOULANGER

At the World Union of Freethinkers Congress in Duisburg, I learned of the death of Arnold Boulanger a few weeks earlier, at the age of 88. When he retired from the presidency of the Belgian National Federation of Freethinkers four years ago he had served in that office for 29 years. For many years he gave as many as fifty Freethought lectures annually. As President of the National Federation and Vice-President of the World Union he was invaluable. Punctual, precise, reasonable, devoted, a rock of solidity and withal, kindly and generous, Boulanger will not be forgotten easily by those who knew him.

Beginning wage-earning as a miner, later taking surface work, he rose to be director of the Misherou Factories, for he had the gift of organisation. He sat in Parliament becoming Senator after the war, as a Communist. He said however to me, as he declared to other Freethinker colleagues that if he had to choose between Freethought and Communism he would choose Freethought. It grieved us all in 1959 to see him who had seemed untouched by time crippled by a stroke.

C. BRADLAUGH BONNER.

MARRIAGE GUIDANCE COUNCIL BOOKLETS

All About Your Wedding, 2s. 6d.

L.S.D. of Marriage, 2s. 6d.

The First Five Years of Marriage, 2s. 6d.

Sex in Marriage, 2s. 6d.

Starting a Family, 2s. 6d.

A Home of Your Own, 2s. 6d.

Making Ends Meet, 2s. 6d.

Parents Growing Old, 2s. 6d.

RECENT PAPERBACKS

FOUR PENGUINS BY JOSEPH CONRAD

Victory: An Island Tale, 4s.; The Secret Agent, 3s. 6d.; The Nigger of the Narcissus, Typhoon, and Other Stories, 4s. 6d.; Nostromo, 5s.

Anger and After: A Guide to the New British Drama, by John Russell Taylor, 5s.

The Family Life of Old People: An Inquiry in East London, by Peter Townsend, 5s.

The Gentle Art of Mathematics, by Dan Pedoe, 3s. 6d.

A History of British Trade Unionism, by Henry Pelling, 5s.

Literature and Criticism, by H. Coombes, 3s. 6d.

The Necessity of Art: A Marxist Approach, by Ernst Fischer, 4s. 6d.

Voters, Parties, and Leaders: The Social Fabric of British Politics, by J. Blondel, 4s.

The Western Intellectual Tradition, by J. Bronowski and Bruce Mazlish, 7s. 6d.

Change of Life, by Joan Malleon, 2s. 6d.

African Profiles (completely revised), by Ronald Segal, 7s. 6d.

A History of Latin America (from earliest times to Castro), by George Pendle, 4s.

The Science of Animal Behaviour, by P. L. Broadhurst, 3s. 6d.

Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social History, Edited by T. B. Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, 4s.

Electricity Without Dynamics: The Coming Revolution in Power Generation, by James Gardner, 3s. 6d.

The Kon-Tiki Expedition, by Thor Heyerdahl, 4s.