

1973

The FREETHINKER

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

Founded 1881 by G. W. FOOTE

Vol. 93, No. 5

MAY 1973

6p

ON LIBERTY

—THE LEGACY OF JOHN STUART MILL

John Stuart Mill, who died a hundred years ago, was one of a galaxy of brilliant men and women who were drawn into and around the freethought movement of the nineteenth century. Many of the causes for which Mill stood have a curiously contemporary ring today, and it is good to see that the memory of "the Saint of Rationalism" and the author of *On Liberty* is so highly honoured in his own country. Freethinkers owe Mill much: it was he who lent his name, and his purse, to Charles Bradlaugh's first election contest in 1868, and thereby lost his own Parliamentary seat to the devout W. H. Smith as a consequence of the Christian 'backlash'. Above all, it was Mill who secured the extension of the great principle of liberty to the forgotten fifty per cent of the Victorian population: women.

Champion of women's rights

Mill's championing of the cause of feminism was a good blend of theory and practice. Besides his book *On the Subjection of Women* he presented the women's suffrage petition to Parliament and in 1866 proposed an unsuccessful amendment to Disraeli's franchise Bill which would have given women the vote.

Even after his Parliamentary career was finished, Mill appeared in 1871 as principal witness for the abolitionists before the Royal Commission on the iniquitous Contagious Diseases Acts, which provided for the compulsory 'examination' of women in garrison towns on suspicion of prostitution. After giving a polished academic explanation as to why the Acts were not "justifiable in principle", Mill went on to suggest that if defenders of the Acts were sincere, then they should be consistent and provide legislation for the examination of men seen frequenting brothels. Some of the respectable gentlemen hearing evidence nearly choked to death on that one! (The Acts were finally repealed in 1885).

Results of Mill's work today

Tributes to Mill have come from some unexpected quarters; even the latest issue of Mrs. Whitehouse's *Viewer and Listener* has quoted him—apparently as a sort of prophylactic measure against "complete freedom" and "complete licence":

As soon as any part of a person's conduct affects prejudicially the interests of others, society has jurisdiction over it, and the question whether the general welfare will or will not be promoted by interfering with it, becomes open to discussion.

Yet we cannot altogether be blamed for feeling that the Clean-up-TV and Festival of Light brigades are the 'spiritual' descendants of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, which saw to it that the young Mill was sent to prison for handing out birth control tracts to the urban poor of his day. Championed by the secular and rationalist movement in the nineteenth century, contraception has come into its own in the twentieth, and has given to humanity that most ennobling of freedoms: woman's

control over her own body and reproduction rate. We have good cause to be proud of John Stuart Mill.

Liberty, freedom, 'permissiveness'—call it what you will, or malign it how you like—is a subtle thing. It is denounced as an empty cant-phrase, or transmogrified and prostituted by the selfish and the stupid; it tends to grow long hair and beards, or wear outlandish clothes; it does not grow in neat rows nor does it make the trains run on time. But it is highly infectious, which is why its enemies always fear it. Yet when the accretions and the humbug are stripped away, something durable, yet almost indescribable remains, which lies very close to the human heart and the inner levels of men's minds. Give men freedom, and they may not build Utopia; they may be decadent and foolish in the eyes of some. But whatever the disadvantages of liberty, the alternatives are invariably terrible and horrifying. A society without freedom soon becomes brutalised, corrupt, inward-looking and intellectually stultified.

The everlasting struggle

Nor, as some imagine, is freedom—in a society at any rate—a static thing. It has to be championed and defended, especially verbally, or else it will atrophy and be squeezed out. If trampled upon in one age, and however thoroughly exterminated, it will spring up, as perennial as the grass, in the next to claim its inheritance and the allegiance of decent human beings. It depends for its healthy growth, above all, on originality of thought and unimpeded communication: not for nothing is this paper called *The Freethinker*.

The struggle for liberty, which Mill loved so much, is part of our human condition; it is one of those 'old battles' that are never finished: each in his or her own generation has to take sides—only the context changes. And it requires no power of prophecy to predict that, long after these pages have yellowed and crumbled into dust, the spirit of that "lightning of the nations", liberty, will still worry and vex the authoritarian mind, yet also animate our children's children with a message that only an artist, or a poet like Shelley can really express, moving "from heart to heart . . . scattering contagious fire into the sky".

THE FREETHINKER

Editor: NIGEL SINNOTT

698 Holloway Road,
London, N19 3NL

Telephone: 01-272 1266

U.K. ISSN 0016-0687

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

POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Inland and Overseas

Twelve months: £1 Six months: 50p

U.S.A. and Canada

Twelve months: \$3.00 Six months: \$1.50

Please make cheques, etc., payable to G. W. Foote & Company. (Foreign subscriptions by cheque or International Money Order, please.)

The Freethinker can also be ordered through any newsagent.



THE NEW PREMISES

This month finds *The Freethinker* ensconced in its new premises at 698 Holloway Road, London N19 3NL. We are not yet fully unpacked, and we therefore ask the indulgence of readers in any case of delay in answering mail and so on. The move itself was more an experience of hard work rather than of excitement, apart from one little incident when a young helper narrowly missed being squashed when a huge marble bust of Charles Bradlaugh decided to vacate the old premises at Borough High Street the quick way—by rolling down the stairs!

01-272 1266

The above is our new telephone number. The receiver is one of these modern, plastic contraptions, and clashes horribly with our gas lighting, anti-macassars, potted palms and sepia-coloured photographs on the walls, but one has to suffer for the sake of progress. In any case, this number is also shared with G. W. Foote & Company and the National Secular Society, and we therefore feel obliged to mention it on that account.

We take this opportunity once more to ask readers (particularly overseas) to publicise our new address and telephone number. *The Freethinker* and its publishers still occasionally receive letters posted to addresses vacated twenty years ago—and we still receive the odd letter addressed to Mr. G. W. Foote, which we are unable to forward as he died in 1915!

NEWS

NIXON AND WATERGATE

Were the Watergate 'bugging' scandal to bring about the downfall of President Nixon this paper would shed few tears; neither, we suspect, would freethinkers in the United States. Few American Presidents have done more than Richard M. Nixon to erode that country's constitutional separation of church and state.

At the time of writing it seems probable that Nixon himself will survive the Watergate crisis, and we are quite prepared to believe that he personally had no complicity in the affair. Nixon is, however, rather typical—if writ large—of the sort of second-rate politician who uses the clerical-religious lobby as a boost to his election chances. And like many second-rate politicians, he has surrounded himself with even lesser men, the result of which we see.

PRIEST EXECUTED

The execution by shooting of Father Shtjefen Kurti in Albania will do much to promote the cause of the Catholic Church in the Balkans. Whether Fr. Kurti was shot for baptising a child in a labour camp, as the Vatican claims, or for "anti-State propaganda, sabotage and espionage", which is Tirana's version, the fact remains that the 'punishment' was grossly excessive for any peacetime crime. The best way of promoting any ideology, good or bad, is to furnish it with a stock of martyrs.

THREAT TO FREE SPEECH

The National Secular Society has condemned the "undemocratic and intolerant behaviour" of Stalinist and Maoist students who attacked Professor H. J. Eysenck at a meeting at the London School of Economics. N.S.S. President, Barbara Smoker, said: "Whilst not necessarily agreeing with Professor Eysenck's views on race and intelligence, we feel strongly that he should be allowed to state his case without molestation by political louts." Such behaviour, she added, was a threat to all who valued freedom of speech.

One normally thinks of the beating-up of opponents as being the preserve of the ultra-right, but such tactics are not alien to the ultra-left. The thugs who attacked Professor Eysenck were doubtless familiar with the writings of Mao Tse-tung, and one of his quotations that it is *not* fashionable to quote in trendy-leftist circles is "Deprive reactionaries of the right to speak."—Better garrulous 'reactionaries' and 'heretics' than the tyranny of the right or left!

SNAKES AND POISON

"They shall take up serpents," according to St. Mark. "and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." Recently two members of the 'Holiness Church of God in Jesus' Name', in Newport, Tennessee (where else?) took this father of the Church at his word and drank strychnine: they died. A local judge has subsequently forbidden the sect to handle venomous snakes, but poison is still okay, it seems.

I.A.S. EXPANSION SCHEME

At its annual general meeting in London on 14 April the Independent Adoption Society agreed to implement a working party report which recommended the employment

S AND NOTES

of a full-time director and three additional case workers, which will require a total annual expenditure of £30,000, most of which it is hoped will be raised by voluntary subscription.

"We intend to develop our service to the child with special needs, including the handicapped and the infant whose age might formerly have precluded adoption," said Mr. Derek Mackay, Hon. Secretary of the I.A.S. "The Society also plans to expand its services to newly-born babies and unmarried mothers," he explained. "We shall seek to improve our techniques of selection and education, making full use of casework, group discussion and other appropriate methods to ensure that adopters are given the maximum assistance and support both before and after placement of a child."

Mr. Mackay also paid tribute to the "devoted work" of the Society's Appeal Committee and its chairman, Mr. Gordon Brunton, as a result of whose labours the expansion has been made possible. Since its foundation in 1965 (originally as the Agnostics' Adoption Society) the I.A.S. has placed over 300 babies and helped nearly 600 mothers. It has also provided babies for a number of adoptive parents who had previously had applications refused by other agencies solely on the grounds that they were not "churchgoing Christians".

25 YEARS FOR 'MEDIUM'

Peter Niesewand, we are pleased to see, is out of prison in Rhodesia. There are others not so fortunate. At a secret trial in Salisbury on 18 April last, a 'spirit medium' by the name of Madzika Mhako was sentenced to 25 years' hard labour on three charges, one of which alleged that he "had accompanied, encouraged, and purported to protect terrorists and porters by means of his supposed supernatural powers" (*Guardian*, 19 April). Evidently the Smith régime is as superstitious as Mr. Mhako who will, perhaps, be able to use his supernatural powers to get out of gaol.

WHERE ARE THEY NOW ?

Anyone remember the Jesus-freaks—the beautiful, naïve young things who floated around in the sun last summer in their thousands and their tens of thousands, wagging their index fingers at the skies and chanting "J-E-S-U-S: Jesus!"—or selling copies of *Buzz* and other excruciating ephemera? Well, there was *another* 'Jesus Festival' this year, held near Manchester last month: it attracted about two hundred people, according to *The Guardian*. As for the 'Jesus Liberation Front'—anyone remember the Jesus Liberation Front?—this, according to the *Daily Telegraph* (23 April) now has a vast, "committed" membership "of about 20". Oh, how great are the mighty fallen!

Another epoch-making 'first' for Christianity! On 8 April Danny La Rue became the first drag artist to preach in Old ham Parish Church. (The founder of this paper might have disputed that.)

BE WARNED

The Order of Christian Unity has reiterated its demand that contraceptives should carry Government health warnings. Well, why not? We are all in favour of keeping the

public properly informed. We are even prepared to carry 'spiritual' health warnings on the back of *The Freethinker*: "Reading this paper may prejudice your chances of salvation and set you on the slippery slope to everlasting torment in Hell."

But of course fair's fair: if we are having health warnings on contraceptives, then what about the same procedure for religious propaganda? What about "Warning to married women: Catholicism may damage your health"? And how about this for the *Book of Common Prayer*: "Warning by H.M. Government: God and Jesus may not exist, and the contents of this book may be a load of old rope"?

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

Freethought has lost one of its best apostles; Utilitarianism its ablest English teacher. . . . Born the 20th May, 1806, the son of one famous alike as the historian of India, and as a political economist, John Stuart Mill has in less than fifty-seven years left, if not the indelible, at any rate, the strongly marked, traces of his powerful mind on English thought and literature.

The women of England will have to mourn the clearest brain and most careful pen enrolled in their service. The world entire—whether dissident or agreeing—wherever thinking men are found, will unite in sorrowing for the passing away of one so able and ready to instruct his followers.

—Charles Bradlaugh in the *National Reformer*, 18 May 1873, on the death of John Stuart Mill (8 May 1873).

NINETY YEARS AGO

The Council of University College, London, have disgraced themselves, and what is of far more importance, have disgraced the college. For the first time, we are ashamed of being a Fellow of University College, London. Without one word of warning, the council have refused entry to a Botany class to two women, on the ground that "there is a prejudice against them." And one of the women has literally done nothing in public, save lecture on science and receive official commendation for her method of teaching! Not a few old and young students of University College read this paper. We ask them to let this degenerate council know how painful is their cowardly and disreputable conduct to all University College men.

—Dr. Edward B. Aveling, Interim Editor (while G. W. Foote was in Holloway Gaol), in *The Freethinker*, 27 May 1883. (The two ladies concerned were Annie Besant and Alice Bradlaugh.)

OBITUARY

Mr. A. E. Stringer

We regret to announce the recent death in Dublin, after a long illness, of Albert Edward Stringer, a reader of *The Freethinker* for many years.

Born in 1888, Mr. Stringer was educated at Clonmel, Belfast and Trinity College, Dublin, and after graduating served in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers and as a Captain in the Royal Engineers. He married in 1917 and in 1920 joined the Bengal Nagpur Railway for which he became Deputy Chief Engineer. In 1945 he retired to Dublin where—"on the advice of Voltaire"—he cultivated his garden.

RICHARD STRINGER writes: "He was a mild and charitable man, most reluctant to criticise others, except the mighty and extortionate, and to within a week or two of his death he retained a lively interest in, and an encyclopaedic knowledge of, comparative religion and allied studies. He also had a voracious appetite for material on rationalism and freethought."

Mr. Stringer is survived by his daughter, his younger son and five grandchildren, to whom we offer our condolences.

PAINÉ 'RELICS' ACQUIRED

Thanks to the financial help of two *Freethinker* readers, Mr. and Mrs. J. Collins, of Lewes, Sussex, the Thomas Paine Society has been enabled to acquire a major share of the W. W. Bartlett Paine collection which was recently auctioned at Hove.

R. W. MORRELL writes:

The collection came on to the market following the sudden death of Miss O. M. Bartlett, W. W. Bartlett's daughter, who had inherited it from her father. W. W. Bartlett did a great deal to make Paine better known and appreciated, and was active in freethought circles in the south of England during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth. He corresponded with many leading freethinkers, among them G. J. Holyoake, Moncure D. Conway (Paine's biographer) and Ernest Truelove; and many of the letters he received from them are included in the material that has now come to the Thomas Paine Society.

Undoubtedly the most important single item in the collection is the original document announcing Paine's marriage to his first wife Mary Lambert. Dated 27 September 1759, it is the earliest known paper signed by Paine, and as far as we can establish at present it has never been published. It was discovered too late to be used as an illustration to Audrey Williamson's new biography of Paine (due to be published by Allen & Unwin in June).

The collection also contains two locks of Paine's hair, one cleaned by Moncure Conway for exhibition purposes. Other items include a large number of American leaflets, pamphlets, freethought journals, prints and photographs. All this material is the sort that is usually lost, but is the stuff that history is made of. The T.P.S. owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. and Mrs. Collins for making it possible for it to purchase this collection.

Plans are well in hand for the dinner to be held in London later this year to mark the Thomas Paine Society's tenth anniversary. For further details contact Mr. Robert Morrell at 23 Pinders House Road, Nottingham, NG2 3EG.

We are informed by the Trade Union, Labour, Co-operative-Democratic History Society that plans for the establishment of a national Museum of Labour History at Limehouse Town Hall are almost completed and await only the Tower Hamlets Council's formal approval. The T.U.L.C. History Society also celebrates its tenth anniversary this year. Its secretary is Mr. Henry B. Fry, 31 Churtfield Road, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 7JZ.

FREETHOUGHT HISTORY

The first of the Freethought History and Bibliography Society's new series of lectures will be held on 14 June, the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Ballynahinch. The speaker will be William McLroy, General Secretary of the National Secular Society, talking on "The Influence of Rationalism on the Irish Rebellion of 1798." Mr. McLroy was himself born in Ballynahinch, Co. Down. (For further details see "Events" on the back page.)

President Marcos of the Philippines has estimated that more than a million people have fled their homes as a result of the civil war between Moslems and Christians on the islands of Mindanao and Sulu. Religion is such a comfort.

CATHOLIC CONGRESS 'RACIST'

The Catholic Church's massive public relations exercise, the 40th International Eucharistic Congress ended in Australia on 25 February last, with 120,000 people attending the final ceremony in Melbourne Cricket Ground. There were, however, one or two notes of dissent. Pope Paul, who sent a recorded message to the Congress, also received a letter of protest from right-wing Ukrainian Catholics in Victoria who accused the Vatican of "condoning the persecution of the Church" in the Ukrainian S.S.R.

From the left came another voice of protest. On 23 February the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee passed a resolution which said: "We declare the Congress a base for the indoctrination of racist ideas in the minds of those Aborigines attending the Congress." It also condemned "the underhand tactics employed by the Roman Catholic Church in disuniting the Aboriginal people." According to the *West Australian* (Perth, 24 February) the Consultative Committee also "condemned the staging of a separate mass for Aborigines at the Congress".

CHRISTIANS ONLY NEED APPLY

The following appeared in the *Glasgow News* of 10 April, as a sequel to a story the paper had published about discontent among local teachers over appointments to guidance jobs:

In Caithness all applicants to guidance posts were asked as a first question at their interview whether they were active Church members. One teacher with a striking record of youth and extra-mural activities had to confess to being an atheist. He did not get one of the posts.

In fact all those appointed were active Church members. One of the most interesting appointments was an elderly assistant teacher, notable for her recent refusal to run her department as a temporary measure when the principal teacher resigned, and for her conscientious avoidance of any extra-mural activities. She was, by chance, wife of the convener of the education committee. Her husband retired from the appointments committee long enough for his wife to be appointed.

The post carried an extra responsibility payment of £700 a year.

"Why knock the Church?" we are naïvely asked from time to time. "You are flogging a dead horse." But most of the 'dead' specimens we come across seem to have lost none of their bigotry.

Our esteemed friend, the late Mrs. Altmann-Gold, used to collect foreign postage stamps as a means of raising money for a number of charities and good causes which she supported. Since her death, however, we have had no one to whom to send the wide variety of foreign postage stamps and covers which we receive from all over the world. If readers know of any worthy enterprises, particularly any of relevance to the humanist movement, that use foreign postage stamps as a source of fund-raising, will they please let us know.

P.O.R.N.

A Welsh reader, currently exiled to one of the better London suburbs, has drawn our attention to the interesting initials of the wording stamped in bright scarlet on the wrappers of copies of *The Freethinker* sent out to postal subscribers: "Post Office Registered Newspaper."—So that's what the word means!

Because of the additional burden of work created by the recent move, it is regretted that Bill McLroy may not be able to resume his "Jottings" column for some months.

TWO CENTENARIES OF JOHN STUART MILL

ERIC GLASGOW



John Stuart Mill
(by kind permission of the Mansell Collection)

In 1973 we celebrate two distinct centenaries of the great British philosopher, John Stuart Mill (b. 1806). First there is the centenary of his death, which occurred on 8 May 1873, the end of a life of strenuous intellectual endeavour, during which he had produced, amongst other works, his famous *Principles of Political Economy* (1848), *Auguste Comte and Positivism* (1865), and his *Essay on the Subjection of Women* (1869). It is impossible to separate Mill from his links, of friendship if not of active collaboration, with such other luminaries of the Victorian Age as Tennyson, Carlyle, Henry Fawcett, and John Morley.

However, obituary notices rarely make very stimulating reading; and so the second centenary of John Stuart Mill, which we should celebrate in 1973, is decidedly the more memorable. It is that of the posthumous publication of Mill's *Autobiography*, a book which I have never been without since my undergraduate years. If it is not the most substantial or most objective of all Mill's books, it is certainly the most human and most evocative. Yet in comparison with the rest of Mill's many works—such as his *System of Logic* (1843) or *On Liberty* (1859)—the *Autobiography* is easily overlooked, or even disdained.

Mill's childhood

Since 1873 there have been other editions, of this highly engaging book; but the one which I have edited, with an extremely lucid introduction, by H. J. Laski for the Oxford "World Classics" Series in 1924. For us today, the *Autobiography's* relevance is probably its story of

emotional harmony and discovery, mediated chiefly through the poetry of Wordsworth, after the prolonged and severe intellectual servitude of the youth who is said to have begun Greek at the age of three; before he was 14 he had read extensively in Greek, Latin, mathematics and logic, had begun philosophy and political economy, and "already possessed the intellectual acquirements of a well-educated man". But, as a direct outcome of this rigorous, exacting, and concentrated discipline, the young Mill was deprived of the relaxations and the diversions of a normal boyhood. He "never was a boy"; and the loss cramped and stifled his development, both as a person and an intellect, until at last he was able to discover, in poetry and scenic beauty as well as travel, acceptable and accessible sources of delight and renewal.

Such, in its essence, is the message of J.S. Mill's eloquent *Autobiography*. It should still indicate, even today, the folly of the most limited and restricted interpretation of secularism: we must always have a philosophy that can mount an appeal to the whole man, and not merely to reason alone—so that there must be room, even in a world controlled and determined by reason and thought, for the poet, the creator, and even the dreamer. Man can live by reason alone no more than he can live by bread alone—at least, in the narrower and unimaginative understanding of what reason can and should involve. That is certainly not a conclusion which can be any the less valid now than it was then, a century ago; and it is one which is fortified by reading of Mill's *Autobiography*, an occupation which is ripe for either repetition or initiation, during this year of the centenary of the book's publication.

PUNCH, OR THE LONDON CHARIVARI.—MARCH 30, 1867.



MILL'S LOGIC; OR, FRANCHISE FOR FEMALES.

"PRAY CLEAR THE WAY, THERE, FOR THESE—A—PERSONS."

Mr. Punch's view of Mill's feminism, 1867

(Courtesy of the Mansell Collection)

"The utility of religion did not need to be asserted until the arguments for its truth had in a great measure ceased to convince."

—John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)

FROM PAUL TO MARK: A DEVELOPMENT IN CHRISTOLOGY

G. A. WELLS

The Jesus of Paul and the Jesus of Mark seem to have little in common. How did it come about that Paul's view of Christ was succeeded by the very different one presented in the gospel? I shall try to show that Mark's portrait of Jesus combines what Paul believed with very different ideas put out by Christian teachers who had disputed Paul's authority.

Paul believed in a supernatural Jesus who assumed human flesh and was crucified on earth at the instigation of evil supernatural powers. Paul was utterly unconcerned with when or where this happened—he does not give it an historical setting—because he was convinced that Jesus lived an obscure life on earth; so obscure that, until he manifested his true power at the resurrection, even the demons failed to recognise who he was: "Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Corinthians 2:8). In coming to earth Christ "emptied himself" of his divine form, and humbly assumed "the form of a servant" (Philippians 2:7). His life culminated in a shameful and ignominious death on the cross in "weakness" (2 Cor. 13:4). It is also surely in order to stress the weakness and obscurity of the earthly Jesus that Paul insists—in a context where he equates keeping the Jewish law with "slavery"—that Jesus was "born of a woman, born under the law" (Galatians 4:4).

Paul's purpose in preaching such an inconspicuous Christ was to show how worthless are the things of which men are normally proud. In submitting to live in obscurity and die in shame, Christ "made foolish the wisdom of the world" (1 Cor. 1:20). Most scholars believe that a crucified Jesus was very inconvenient to the early Christians, and was accepted only because the brute fact of the historical crucifixion could not be denied. Paul of course realised that the crucifixion of the Messiah was unacceptable to orthodox Jews, but far from being embarrassed by it, he made it his whole basis for demonstrating the superiority of the new faith; for he complained that Jews "boast" before God of keeping the complicated stipulations of the Jewish religious law; whereas he himself has "no righteousness of mine own", no legal rectitude (Phil. 3:9). And he goes on to link his own renunciation of these values with Christ's death, which has abrogated all worldly standards.

Paul's weak and obscure earthly Jesus is of course incompatible with the gospel portrait of him as a worker of prodigious miracles. Indeed, Paul comes very near to expressly denying that Jesus was the miraculously powered Messiah of Jewish expectation, for he says: "Jews ask for signs, and Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified" (1 Cor. 1:22). Equally incompatible with Paul's statement that the demons crucified Jesus because they failed to recognise him is the gospel allegation that it was precisely the demons who recognised his true dignity and status. For instance, the "unclean spirit" he drives from a man says to him: "I know who thou art—the Holy One of God" (Mark 1:24).

Paul and his Christian rivals

Where, then, do these very un-Pauline traditions, strongly represented in Mark, come from? Now it is obvious from

what Paul says that other Christian teachers did not share his stress on humility. He complains that they are "puffed up" in their consciousness of their "knowledge" and their "spiritual gifts". These included ability to prophesy, to heal, and to make and interpret ecstatic utterances (1 Cor. 12:8-11). Paul's rivals, then, designated him as weak, and themselves as men of power, able to perform miracles and receive visions. He replies that his own achievements include all this (2 Cor. 12:1-6, 11-12), but that he would rather not boast about such matters, since in his view the Christian missionary authenticates himself not by visible demonstrations of his power, but by undergoing the humiliation and persecution that characterised the life of Jesus (2 Cor. 4:9-11).

Some of his rivals, however, preached what he called "another Jesus" (2 Cor. 11:4). The late Professor S. G. F. Brandon has based a great deal of his theory of early Christianity on the supposition that this "other Jesus" was the historical Jesus of the Jerusalem Christians who—so he interprets 2 Corinthians 5:13—accused Paul of being "beside himself". Brandon supposes their argument to have been that, while they were sober followers of an historical preacher, Paul's religion was based on unreliable visions. But study of his epistle shows that his rivals were even more given to ecstatic experiences than he, and that the difference between him and them in this respect was that he regarded such experience as part of the private religious life, not (as they did) as the basis of public missionary work. Thus he writes to his flock that if he is beside himself, it is for God; while if he is "of sober mind" it is for them (2 Cor. 5:13). The doctrine implied here is the same as that stated openly in 1 Corinthians 14:2 and 18-20, where he says that when a man is using the language of ecstasy, he is talking with God, not with men, for no man understands him, and that it is therefore preferable, in the congregation, to speak five intelligible words, for the benefit of others, than thousands of words in the language of ecstasy.

A man of signs and wonders?

How are we to understand the "other Jesus" of Paul's rivals? As he complains that they are full of self-confidence and boast of their miraculous powers, it is quite likely that they regarded Jesus as having led a life like their own—a life of power, eloquence and wisdom. They will have agreed with Paul that the pre-existent Christ did come to earth as the man Jesus, but not that he displayed his true strength by living in weakness and obscurity. If they asked themselves at all what sort of life he had lived, they would surely have assumed that he—from whom they derived their great powers—had worked miracles and had been as conspicuous as they themselves were. In my view, traditions of this kind, on the part of such men, helped to originate the very un-Pauline tradition, strongly represented in the gospels, that Jesus was a man of signs and wonders.

The kind of teachers of whom Paul complains were familiar figures in the Hellenistic world. The pagan philosopher Celsus wrote about A.D. 178 of itinerant Jewish

prophets known by the term 'divine man' who introduced their unintelligible utterances with such formulas as "I am God" or "I am divine in spirit". Paul's Christian rivals were thus missionaries who had adopted the methods of Hellenised Jewish propaganda. When they arrived in a Christian community, they presented themselves, so Paul implies, with "letters of recommendation" (2 Cor. 3:1), and these have been interpreted (for example, by the theologian Professor H. Köster) as documents in which miracles they had worked were recorded and certified by the churches they had visited. It would have been easy for traditions which stamped the historical Jesus as a 'divine man' to find acceptance in such communities.

Even Paul himself, for all his stress on humility, claims to have won gentiles to Christianity by the force of "signs and wonders" (Romans 15:19), and does not dispute that God has appointed "miracle workers" within the community (1 Cor. 12:10 and 28). His suggestion, then, is that mighty works may be expected wherever the Christian mission goes; and so it was natural that a later generation would have little understanding for a weak Jesus who had lived incognito, and would find the Christology of Paul's rivals more to its taste.

Mark's attempt to combine two traditions

The most prominent characteristic of Mark is that it is an attempt to combine these two incompatible traditions of an obscure and a prominent Jesus. The first half of the gospel presents him as *the* thaumaturge, whose appearance is *the* event wherever he goes. Such miracles show the advent of the Messianic age, that "the kingdom of God is at hand" (1:15). Great emphasis is also laid upon his teaching—not because its content is of interest (it is seldom indicated at all) but because, like his miracles, it displays his power. "He taught them as having authority" (1:22). In the final chapters, however, he works few miracles, addresses himself to disciples rather than to a crowd, and is finally deserted even by them. Here he is the lonely suffering figure of Pauline Christology, and the evangelist's message is the Pauline one that the Christian's lot is to share this suffering (8:35; 10:29; 13:11).

Mark tries to bring the two halves of his work into consistency by introducing what has become known as the "Messianic secret". It is not a very apt phrase, as the title of Messiah is only one of many which Mark uses to indicate Jesus' true supernatural status. The point is that, according to Mark, this status is not understood by the people who come into contact with him, not even by his closest disciples. Hence Dibelius has designated Mark "the gospel of secret epiphanies". Although in the opening chapters Jesus works one miracle after another, only supernatural powers (such as the demons he casts out) recognise his divine status; and he repeatedly orders the people to keep silent about the miracles, and the demons not to betray that he is the Son of God. On the two occasions when his disciples recognise that he is more than human (8:30 and 9:9), they too are told to keep silence—in the latter case "until the Son of Man should have risen again from the dead". This is in accordance with the Pauline view of a Jesus whose true strength was revealed only after his crucifixion—a view which is also emphasised by Mark's story of the centurion who, seeing the supernatural signs attending Jesus' death, cried "Truly, this man was the Son of God" (15:39). There is wide agreement that Jesus' injunctions to keep silence about his

miracles and his Messiahship—even in circumstances where the injunction could scarcely be obeyed because the miracle was so public—is an artificial and doctrinal factor governing the whole gospel, and a feature which shows that the work is not an uncomplicated and straightforward record of events which can be taken at its face value as history. It is a device which enabled the evangelist to synthesize the incompatible Christologies of earlier Christianity.

The demons' acknowledgement that Jesus was divine—one of the un-Pauline features of Mark—arises naturally when Jesus is put into an historical context. The Pauline Jesus is first and foremost a supernatural being, and the demons failed to recognise him during his sojourn on earth (the time and place of which is not specified) because he had assumed a temporary disguise. But the Markan Jesus lives the life of a man in a specific historical situation, and the evangelist had to safeguard against any suggestion that he might be just a man, and not supernatural at all. The problem was particularly acute because the Messianic secret compelled Mark to represent human beings as blind to his true status. And this left only supernatural beings—the demons, and the voice from heaven at his baptism and transfiguration—to authenticate him.

WHY ?

I often wonder why it is
 That folk who go about their biz
 With quiet conscientious zeal,
 Considering how others feel
 And brightening up the darkest place
 With modest unassuming grace
 Are always left to fade and die;
 Praise and promotion pass them by;
 Their work gains no rewarding fee,
 No "Thank you" from the powers that be,
 While other folk who rant and rave
 Who shirk and let the others slave
 Who look for things to grumble at
 Demanding this and taking that
 Seem always to have all the luck
 No matter how they pass the buck;
 Though held in awe they get instead
 Approving pats upon the head;
 Authority with fawning smile
 Rewards their every whim and wile;
 The rampant ones go on and on
 The meek ones just get trodden on.
 There seems to me I fear to say
 No justice in the world today.

CHRIS HARRISON

FREETHINKER FUND

Because of the upheaval of moving and changing banks we are only able at this time to acknowledge donations received during the early part of April. Later donations to the Freethinker Fund will be acknowledged in our next issue.

Our thanks to: J. Ancliffe, 41p; W. W. Crees, 50p; E. Hughes, £1; E. (?) Hughes, £1; Robert H. Scott, £2.60; E. Wakefield, 45p. Total for April: £5.96.

CHARLES THE LAST?

F. A. RIDLEY

—SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE BRITISH MONARCHY

This month the Establishment celebrates what it believes to be the thousandth anniversary of English monarchy. Freethinker readers may prefer to commemorate the foundation in Birmingham on 11 May 1873 of the National Republican League by, amongst others, Charles Bradlaugh and G. W. Foote. Anyway, we humbly beg to mark this relevant and meaningful royalist millennium with F. A. Ridley's respectful tribute to monarchs past, present—and future? F. A. Ridley is a veteran freethinker and socialist, and also a former editor of this paper.

On 30 January 1649, Charles Stuart (Charles I) was executed in London by order of an English revolutionary tribunal. Rather surprisingly perhaps, this act of regicide caused little contemporary comment upon the European continent. In fact, the European monarchies all solicited the assistance of the powerful regicide government of the English Republic. However, there was one notable exception: upon the distant confines of Europe, Tzar Alexis of Russia expressed his horror at the execution of the King of England. Henceforward, he declared, no English revolutionary guilty of regicide should be permitted to set foot on the soil of 'Holy Russia'. (Writing at this present date, one can perhaps venture the comment that, in politics as well, the dialectical principle of recurrence also occurs!)

The deposition and execution of Charles Stuart marked the effective end of the old absolute monarchy which had existed in England since the Norman Conquest in 1066. As the pioneer English socialist, Gerard Winstanley, already percipiently noted at the time of Charles's execution, it was the Norman Conquest that had imposed upon England the Continental system of absolute monarchy. It was this monarchy, one that had reached its zenith under the Tudors in the sixteenth century, that so abruptly came to an end on the Whitehall scaffold in 1649. Subsequent attempts to restore it, notably by James II and his Jacobite successors in the following century, were defeated by the military and financial power of the English bourgeoisie: most notably at the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1788 that again overthrew the Stuarts. A final rearguard action on the part of George III towards the end of the eighteenth century ended in total defeat and in the spectacular loss of England's American colonial empire. Since then, throughout the last two centuries, the British monarchy seems to have resigned itself to the rôle of a glorified rubber stamp upon the decrees of successive British Governments.

The post-restoration Monarchy

Monarchies, like stamps (including rubber stamps), are themselves subject to the successive fluctuations of market-laws. Since its restoration in 1660, the British monarchy has passed through several periods, each marking an era in its political evolution. The additional reason why the regicide Republic originally decided to restore the exiled Stuarts in 1660 was tersely noted by John Thurloe, Cromwell's former Secretary of State: "Not his own strength, but our divisions, will bring Charles Stuart back."

However, when the Stuart monarchy was restored on terms, it was still haunted by the memories of the defunct absolute monarchy and failed to keep its side of the bargain. Hence another revolution, in 1688, and two subsequent civil wars, in 1715 and 1745, proved necessary to get rid of the Stuarts. After the death of the last Stuart to reign under the terms of the Restoration Settlement, Queen Anne (1702-1714), the bourgeois (Whig) ruling class, newly

installed by the Revolution, resolved to insure themselves against any further insubordination on the part of the Monarchy by importing a dynasty of foreign figureheads from Germany. So, on the death of Anne, "George in pudding time came o'er, and moderate men looked big", as that acute recorder, the Vicar of Bray, noted at the time. For the past two hundred and sixty years the Hanoverian dynasty has occupied the throne of Great Britain—by the Grace of God and the permission of the British bourgeoisie.

"Small, breast-bested wanderers"

This description of our present dynasty, coined by the Victorian republican Charles Bradlaugh, is equally apt in both form and substance. Since the precise value of the Hanoverians (in the eyes of what Disraeli was later to term as "the Whig Oligarchy", who installed them) was that they were totally unacquainted with British institutions, or, in the case of George I, even with the English language. So with only a brief aberration on the part of George III, apparently advised by the ex-Jacobite Bolingbroke, the Hanoverians docilely accepted their rôle as royal puppets manipulated by their Whig Masters—an unpopular and usually powerless adjunct of the British Constitution. Popular opinion, during this inglorious era, appears to have been accurately summarised in Thackeray's satirical verses:

George the First, you know, was vile.

Viler, George the Second.

Has any mortal ever heard

Of anyone like George the Third?

When George the Fourth to Hell descended,

Then God be praised, the Georges ended.

—A Dynastic epitaph!

Royalty and the cult of imperialism

However, during the long reign of Victoria (1837-1901), more precisely during its second half, a qualitative change took place in the social content of the British monarchy. This change had actually little to do with Victoria herself, who, to begin with, was not notably more popular than her "wicked uncles" had been; even the Tory Duke of Wellington had predicted revolution in England in 1831. The change in the status of the monarchy was primarily due to the cult of imperialism that set in with Palmerston and Disraeli and coincided with the maximum expansion of the British Empire. Imperialism needed a symbolic mystique, and this was provided by the monarchy. In 1875, Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India, and Kipling later popularised the imperialist cult of "the Widow of Windsor" as the effective symbol of a far-flung Empire. Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, in 1897, became an imperialist orgy! Imperialism provided the British monarchy with a new psychological and political basis. As I have elsewhere noted, the British monarchy in recent years has been "feudal in form but imperialist in substance". Successive colonial wars fought in defence of the Empire simultaneously glorified its royal symbols.

The spectacular collapse of England's World Empire during the generation since 1945, has demonstrated that the imposing nineteenth-century imperialist giant had feet of clay; while its royal figureheads, like Mohammed's

famous coffin, are now suspended on the historical horizon without any visible means of support. No longer buttressed by Divine Right, as were the Tudors and Stuarts, nor the glittering symbol of a world-wide empire; and no longer even tolerated—as were the early Georges—by the conventions of a monarchical society, the monarchy becomes

merely an expensive and useless appendage to present-day bourgeois society. Under such circumstances, it surely appears rather rash to give the heir to this decrepit throne the same name as that of King Charles I, with whom absolute monarchy ended. Will Charles III also go down history as "Charles the Last"?

REVIEWS

BOOKS

A SHORT HISTORY OF WESTERN ATHEISM

by James Thrower. Pemberton, £1.40 (60p paper).

This is an attempt to show how atheism throughout the course of history has persistently found expression in opposition to equally persistent religious thought. It is a valuable compendium of references to the literature of the subject, and is packed with excellent material ranging from classical antiquity through the Middle Ages to the modern scientific period.

However, the argument between the two schools of thought is much deeper than a swaying battle of words, otherwise there would not exist such institutions as the Church of England and the Vatican. These bodies own and control vast stretches of land, have great political power, can influence the heads of states, and have large sums invested in industry. Therefore, directly or indirectly they affect the lives and well-being of millions. Logical Positivists may assert that the statements "God exists" or "God does not exist" are equally nonsensical, but this does not reduce the social power of organised nonsense to vanishing point; nor does it make the public statement "I am an atheist" meaningless. On the contrary, it is an indication of where the individual stands *vis-à-vis* the social power of organised religion. It cannot be an isolated mental attitude only.

Unfortunately this short history of western atheism tends to become the story of a battle of ideas, of arguments between individual philosophers. This is certainly the case as it is presented for the pre-Socratic, Socratic, Hellenistic and Roman periods. At first blush a beginner might well wonder how these fellows managed to spend so much time and energy chewing over the actions of the gods. How did they live? Who made their breakfasts? All of them appeared to live—and survive—in a philosophic and social vacuum. These were the days of slave societies, and the relationships between slave-owner and slave were bound to reflect themselves somehow in the tacit assumptions and the imagery of their thinking. Without this background it becomes difficult to visualise why theism or polytheism should appeal to one, and its opposite to the other. To refer it to the "spirit of the age", or very generally to the "high level of life of the time and place" does not take us very far. By the fifth century Aristotle had already separated the sheep from the goats—those who described the world in terms of myths and the supernatural, and those who accounted for it by means of natural forces. It is believed that the Milesian thinkers were familiar with the mathematics of Egypt and Babylon, and that Thales had successfully used this knowledge to predict the eclipse of 585 B.C. It is therefore to be expected that the concept

of "Law and Order" in nature as opposed to the whims of the Gods was already becoming part of the mental equipment of the philosophers of the "well-ordered" and prosperous island of Miletus. This in itself did not mean that by the end of the so-called Classical Period it was already recognised and accepted that explanations of natural events must be sought within the framework of natural law. On the contrary, it is not so long since eminent scientists in this country were assuring us that since so much of Nature's behaviour could be expressed in mathematical form and explained in terms of mathematical symbolism, God must himself be a Pure Mathematician; and today, although even theologians hesitate to use the word *miracle*, the very existence of natural laws is frequently offered as evidence of a supernatural designer.

But because the author has concentrated his attention almost entirely on the arguments for and against atheism, divorced from the social background or the state of society in which the argument is aroused, he has left out of his account a fundamental change in the whole situation which has occurred during this past thirty years. Who today really accepts the statement, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth"? Everyone who has given any thought to it, including all ministers of religion, would seek to brush it aside as emanating from a primitive society. Who, bearing in mind the Hitlerite incinerators, the millions of innocent victims of war, the sufferings of those who have perished by flood and famine, would now assert in all seriousness that this is the work of an all-powerful beneficent being? A succession of eminent theologians at 7.45 a.m. on B.B.C.4 tell us blandly that the stories of the loaves and fishes, the turning of water into wine, the Resurrection and the rising from the grave are all parables. In my youth these were taught at school as "Gospel Truth", descriptions of actual events. They have now degenerated into figures of speech. Religious dogma has retreated before the disillusioned multitude, and the world of science and reason, into the inner subjective world of meditation. There you can imagine what you like and there is no one to deny your findings. A logical analysis of a physical problem, say by mathematical methods, has at least a great deal of modern technology behind it to justify the expectation that its findings may be closely linked with the actual world. This does not mean that a logical conclusion must necessarily be the mental analogue of an externally and objectively existent process. After all, there is such a thing as imagination. It does, however, appear to point a way for the experimentalist to set up a controlled causal situation. Causality is a human contrivance. A machine or a computer can function repetitively under guidance in that way. But no matter how strongly an individual may feel in his "inner being" that there exists an entity he calls God, all-powerful and all-merciful, there is nothing to suggest that he is not merely talking to himself. Verification demands thought, feeling and action, and the possibility of verification by others. All this is not a question of words, not merely an argument, however aspects of it may have been conducted throughout the ages by lone philosophers in their studies. The institutions that

profess to be religious and propound certain ethical principles cannot themselves possibly practise them. They exist and depend on their functioning in a society that is based on a flat denial of these principles, an acquisitive society, one that relies on "profit" and human inequality. In a market economy what can be meant by the assertion "The labourer is worthy of his hire" and "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's"?

In the present book the author tries his best to deal objectively with his subject without committing himself, without taking sides. Finally therefore he asks, "Has man perhaps some other mode of apprehending and understanding the reality which surrounds him, that has yet to be articulated? I don't know". This is the agnostic attempting to opt out of a situation. There is no such option; whether or not a God exists, religious institutions do, and they affect the lives of us all because they exist side by side with us in the same society.

HYMAN LEVY

SCEPTICISM by Kai Nielsen. Macmillan, £2.50.

This book is one of the New Studies in the Philosophy of Religion edited by Dr. W. D. Hudson. Although these have, it seems, been promoted to hardcovers they still must not be confused with the series edited by John Hick to which Professor Nielsen's earlier *Contemporary Critiques of Religion* belonged. Nielsen begins here by distinguishing the religious scepticism which he expounds from various sorts of radical philosophical scepticism: "A religious sceptic, as I use the term, is an atheist or an agnostic" (p. 5).

One key distinction is that between God-talk construed in some fairly anthropomorphic way and God-talk construed in a more sophisticated and elusive fashion. In the former construction claims that there is a God are, surely, straightforwardly false albeit perfectly intelligible. In the latter the crudity of such straightforward falsehood is avoided only at the price of incoherence. Since most believers shift between these two poles, interpreting their faith at one time in one way, at another time in the opposite way, and sometimes even in both at once, there is inevitably confusion and conflict as to whether we should speak of falsity or of coherence or of meaninglessness. All are at least partly right and, by the same token, partly wrong.

Since Nielsen is a philosopher writing primarily for his fellow philosophers he concentrates upon the more sophisticated of the two poles, and upon the various fashionable ways in which one may make what seem to be, but really are not, assertions. Thus Nielsen notices how the late Bishop of Durham, Dr. Ramsey, developed the idea of insight through disclosure situations. In these God is, he urged, revealed in terms of various models as "father, mother, nurse, brother, husband, friend, warrior, shepherd, farmer, metal-worker builder, potter, fuller, physician, judge, tradesman, king, fisherman, and scribe."

Ramsey himself raised, but failed to meet, the crucial question: "Must not this whole talk of models therefore presuppose some knowledge of God which is quite independent of models and against which the success (or failure) of a particular symbol or model can be measured?" Clearly this is true: if God is appropriately to be thought of as like a father or a fuller it can only be because in fact in some respect he is like a father or a fuller; and it must make sense to talk of a comparison between the symbol or model and that of or for which it is a model or a symbol.

Yet Ramsey for good reasons wants to deny that "there can be any knowledge of God which is independent of models". The true moral thus seems to be: either, at best, that no one can here be in a position to know which if any of the proposed models fit, or even whether there is anything with which they should be compared; or else, at worst, that the whole idea of a disclosure of such a God through such models is incoherent and without sense.

The readers who most appreciate Nielsen's critical acumen in disposing of some recent religious apologetic will also be most distressed by certain signs of a self-blinded insensitivity elsewhere. Thus Nielsen is able without any indications of embarrassment to write: "... many a good Marxist, utterly atheistic in his orientation to the world, strives to make it the case that the oppressed will be free ..." (p. 14).

Maybe Nielsen pressed would try to make out that Marxism-Leninism is not truly Marxism; and hence that most of the millions who claim the Marxist name are not really true Marxists. Certainly we have all seen moves of this kind made by spokesmen of an older faith; and maybe there is indeed, perhaps in both cases, an enormous gap between the doctrines and intentions of the epigoni and those of the Founder. But anyone who without embarrassment, and hence without appropriate disclaimer, speaks in the same breath of Marxism and of liberation must thereby make his own professions of concern for the oppressed suspect. Concern cannot, it seems, extend to those who are oppressed by Marxist-Leninist régimes. It contrives not to know the facts about the U.S.S.R. which Bernard Levin so regularly and rightly draws to the attention of the readers of *The Times* or to notice that the régimes of the Socialist bloc are the first in history literally to fence their frontiers, and to guard these fences with guns pointing inwards. It is not only to religious faith, or to the faith of other people, that the freethinking critical intelligence needs to be applied.

ANTONY FLEW

WHICH BIBLE? edited by David Otis Fuller. Marshall, Morgan and Scott, £1.50.

Not the least of life's mysteries is the way in which men of high academic attainment can yet believe in the literal truth of the Bible. The ten savants who contribute to *Which Bible?* are Protestant fundamentalists and proud of it; in Dr. Fuller's opinion just the chaps to determine which, if any, of the various versions of God's Word now in use is the genuine article. Modernism and Roman Catholicism they denounce as enemies of true religion, the former for denying, among other historical verities, the great age of Methuselah and the reality of Noah's Ark and Jonah's Whale. Odium theologicum is here in plenty, occasionally relieved with bathos, as when we read of Professor Robert Dick Wilson of Princeton tearfully breaking off a lecture to assure his students that

"Jesus loves me, this I know
For the Bible tells me so."

The godly scholars labour mightily to demonstrate that the King James Bible faithfully reproduces the pure scriptures of the primitive church, while other translations, such as the Douay and the Revised Version of 1881, are based on corruptions of early heresiarchs embodied in the Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. In general the level of reasoning is higher than would appear from Dean Burgon's rejection of Sinaiticus on the ground that God would never have allowed it to reach the monastery waste-paper

basket from which Tischendorf rescued it, if it were really one of the only two copies of His unadulterated Word then in existence.

Dr. Benjamin G. Wilkinson contributes an interesting and reasonably objective history of the most notable editions and translations of the Bible from the time of Constantine onwards.

R. J. CONDON

THE PSEUDO-REVOLUTION: A Critical Study of Extremist "Liberation" in Sex by David Holbrook.

Tom Stacey, £2.80.

David Holbrook has written a lively polemic which would have made an excellent pamphlet. Unfortunately, by expanding it to the length of a book he has had to deck it out with lengthy and somewhat tedious quotations by obscure foreign writers who share his views, and thus the polemic has lost much of its punch. This is a pity, as what he has to say seems to me to be largely true: "There has never before been a situation in which most people as a major part of their culture set out to watch others copulating, raping, and masturbating with such regularity and obsessiveness." Even if it is not 'most' people, but simply a 'large minority' of people, why should this be? Mr. Holbrook does not really discuss this rather important question. My guess is, that it has something to do with the repetitive, boring, mechanical and therefore dehumanising work that so many have to endure. When it is at an end, all they are fit for is the dehumanising entertainment of commercial 'porn' and its associated violence and brutality. If this is the correct explanation, then the only cure is a pretty long-term one—a fundamental restructuring of our social and educational systems.

Though I would agree with much of Mr. Holbrook's diagnosis, he seems to me to be oddly gullible. He believes, for instance, that "Denmark has the highest rates of all European countries for crimes of violence." Higher than Greece or Spain, where "crimes of violence" of a hideous nature are the preserve of the ruling juntas? Indeed, Denmark and Sweden set conundrums to which Mr. Holbrook does not really address himself. The commercial pornography industry is more highly developed in those two countries than in most others; yet these are in virtually all other respects among the most civilised countries in the world. The Danes and the Swedes look after their old people, their prisoners, their unmarried mothers, and other underprivileged citizens, much better than any of their European neighbours, with the possible exception of the Dutch (who have a thriving 'porn' industry of their own). This is puzzling. Whether these two trends are causally related or simply accidentally associated is an intriguing question to which there is no answer.

Mr. Holbrook's favourite Aunt Sally is the 'liberals' who have sold the pass. He is right to point out that commercial pornography is based on sadism, and hatred and fear of women; but Women's Lib. cottoned on to this one some time back. If he ever glides up the escalator in Tottenham Court Road he may see stickers bearing the legend "This advertisement is an insult to women" plastered over the more suggestive and offensive of the tube advertisements. These have not been placed there by the Mothers' Union. The much abused 'liberals' do not in fact take the same view of 'porn' as Mr. Kenneth Tynan, and to imply that they do is to misrepresent the liberal position. At the time of writing, the Home Secretary has just announced stricter measures to control pornography, and

these will be welcomed by liberals, Liberationists, and all those who have some concern for the quality of life in our country today.

MADELEINE SIMMS

GENETICS AND EDUCATION by Arthur R. Jensen. Methuen, £3.50.

Professor Jensen's seminal article "How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement?" first appeared in the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1969. It met with an immediate, violent response. Militant students at Berkeley, California, where Jensen is professor of educational psychology, tried to disrupt his classes, chanting "Fight racism! Fire Jensen!". The article was greeted by a shrill chorus of abuse from the American academic establishment. Scorning, in many cases, even to read Jensen's article, or in others, to apply themselves to understanding it, American anthropologists, sociologists and social psychologists flocked to denounce their colleague. He was pilloried as a "chauvinist, biased racist", or as being "extremely naïve" in his interpretation of I.Q. tests, or even as committing errors setting out to "maximise differences between blacks and whites and [maximise] the possibility that such differences are attributable to hereditary factors". The perpetrator of this particular *ad hominem* attack on Jensen was at least forced to justify himself before the committee of professional ethics of the American Psychological Association, but otherwise in the Jensen affair academic integrity has taken a definite back seat.

As Professor Eysenck has commented, a book could be written about the techniques used to attack Jensen: denying what has not been asserted, asserting what has not been denied, cluttering up the argument with conclusions which are held to flow from Jensen's position, but which do not logically do so (like saying that Jensen is a segregationist). The whole history of the controversy is a damning exposure of the double standard operating amongst leftist social scientists: breaches of academic honesty or rigour are perfectly acceptable, so long as they serve the interests of the conventional leftist wisdom.

What, then, is the Jensenist heresy that has caused so much passionate argument, not to mention repeated threats of physical violence against Jensen and his supporters? The paradox is that most of what Jensen says is not heresy at all, but orthodoxy: among those geneticists and psychologists, that is, who really are experts in the field, who have mastered the mathematics, in short who know what they are talking about.

The central conclusion of that part of Jensen's paper dealing with race is surprisingly moderate:

It [is] a not unreasonable hypothesis that genetic factors are strongly implicated in the average negro-white intelligence difference. The preponderance of the evidence is . . . less consistent with a strictly environmental hypothesis than with a genetic hypothesis, which of course does not exclude the influence of environment or its interaction with genetic factors.

Far from Jensen having embarked on a holy war against the environmentalists—those who hold that differences in intelligence between various social classes and racial groups are attributable to their wildly different cultural and social backgrounds—he came to the problem, in a sense, by accident. His original field of research was in serial rote learning. This led him to a search for a so-called "culture-free" intelligence test and hence to an interest in the psychology of the culturally disadvantaged: negroes, Puerto Ricans, and poor whites. Research undertaken by

the United States Office of Education, among other bodies, has demonstrated that the various programmes of compensatory education designed to help disadvantaged children catch up with their middle-class peers had no permanent effect; in general, the subsequent school performance of the disadvantaged children did not significantly increase over that of other children in the same socio-economic groups who had not been helped. Surveying the accumulated evidence, Jensen maintains that equality of educational opportunity or even of environmental background will not generally lead to equality of performance. He suggests that the vogue for equalising education, for treating all children alike, is misconceived. It is no good trying to make disadvantaged children as academically bright as their more fortunate fellows if their whole background and heredity handicaps them from the start. And, arguably, it is cruel to attempt to do so. Jensen wants instead a "greater diversity of curricula, instructional methods, and educational goals and values that will make it possible for children ranging over a wider spectrum of abilities and proclivities genuinely to benefit from their years in school".

All this, to me at least, does not appear in the slightest objectionable, and indeed it places Jensen squarely in the humanist tradition in education. Why, then, all the uproar? Presumably because it is highly unfashionable to point out the extent to which intelligence is genetically determined. The estimate most commonly used by professional psychologists is that genetic factors account, on average, for 80 per cent of the differences in intelligence found to exist and environmental factors for 20 per cent. Performance in I.Q. tests is, in turn, one of the most reliable indicators of subsequent academic performance at school and university, and of occupational achievement. Some of the evidence quoted by Jensen against the extreme environmentalist position is devastating. For instance, one study of the I.Q. performance of American Indian children compared to negro children showed that the Indian children scored significantly higher on tests of verbal, non-verbal, reading and mathematical ability. Yet, on each of a dozen variables commonly put forward by environmentalists to "explain" the poor performance of negroes, such as lack of parental interest in the child's progress at school, or lack of cultural activity at home, and so on, the American Indian children actually scored *lower* than the corresponding negro sample of children.

To sum up, research on racial differences does not mean that one is a racist, or that if substantial, genetically-determined, differences are found to exist between social classes and racial groups any hope of improving the educational system must be abandoned. Nor do any conclusions follow about the desirability, or undesirability, of segregation, apartheid, or what have you. There is nonetheless a widespread feeling that science is playing with fire if it continues to investigate race. Jensen has more faith than I do that reason will prevail and that people will not jump to any number of illegitimate conclusions about the innate 'inferiority' of negroes and other minority groups from his research. Truly a hot pebble for well-meaning liberals to have to pick up.

PHILIP HINCHLIFF

HITLER by Alan Wykes. Pan/Ballantine, 50p.

One of my favourite bits of Orwell is that splendid scene in *Coming Up for Air* where the worried narrator, George Bowling, visits the retired schoolmaster Porteous and asks him what he thinks of Hitler.

Porteous is so surprised that he almost takes his pipe out of his mouth.

"Hitler? This German person? My dear fellow! I don't think of him."

There were plenty of such people in England in 1938, when Orwell wrote his novel. In 1932-4, when Hitler came to power, I was still at school, and though beginning to take an interest in European politics I remember that "this German person" seemed to most of us a clown rather than a menace. Even when the war loomed close, in 1937-9, a reaction as common as Porteous's, in more politically sophisticated circles, was summed up in the title of a book sponsored by the Left Book Club: *Hitler the Pawn*. He may well have been considered a pawn at first, by several elements in German life which thought to use him, but he was a pawn who moved quickly up the board and became a queen before any of his opponents were ready for him.

The book under review is part of the Pan/Ballantine Illustrated History of World War II and is good value at the modest price. Alan Wykes's *Hitler* is "War Leader Book No. 1" and therefore the stress is on the war period, not, however, to the detriment of what went before. Indeed, some of the most fascinating pages are on the origins of the Nazi Party and how it came to power. These pages will be of more interest to many readers than the war pages, because they explore relatively unknown ground.

One of Mr. Wykes's main points is that Hitler was infected in early manhood by syphilis and that this accounts for much of his maniacal behaviour in later life. "The Victim" is the somewhat ironical title to this part of the book. He apparently caught the disease in Vienna in 1910 from a Jewish whore named Hannah, so even Hitler's anti-semitism, which led eventually to the greatest crime of modern times, may have had partly a personal origin.

There was, however, as Mr. Wykes brings out, plenty of anti-Jewish feeling both in Austria and Germany in the years 1910-14, ready to be exploited after the national humiliation of 1918-20 by any demagogue who wanted an easy scapegoat. "By resisting the Jews I fight for the Lord" was an early Nazi slogan, pictured here, which reminds us of the part-Christian basis for the atrocities which so quickly followed.

R. C. CHURCHILL

MY LIFE AND TIMES by Henry Miller.
Pall Mall Press, £6.

I have always disagreed with those who think of *Ulysses* as a pretty good aphrodisiac. This contention is, I suppose, partly because of Joyce's alleged religious tensions, but whether or not this is the case with the Irish writer, it is certainly not true of that American 'pornographer' Henry Miller, who is no aphrodisiac at all. Certainly, *religious* tension does not exist for him.

In his more than 50 books, Miller has been championing a liberated and more enquiring society than he has got for his labours. Now, half a century after his first book *Clipped Wings* was published, comes this fine coffee-table account of the great little old man's philosophy.

It has saucy and informative illustration—black, sepia and coloured—to back up the racy, raving, randy Miller dialogue which flows from start to finish like a babbling brook overflowing into the Mississippi. This visual autobiography reveals, nostalgically, more than 70 years of Miller's astonishing life, hitherto not exposed. Also there are original outlines and MSS. of many of his works, as

well as pages from his Paris notebooks reproduced in facsimile. He has proved a caustic critic of our current complex society, not because he is in his 80s, for such men never grow old, but because in the writer we have a liberating influence, an iconoclast prepared to talk out his life as he looks back, without any regrets.

The photographs by Bradley Smith and others nicely create an unusual volume which serves to orchestrate the rumblings, mumblings, fumbings, but never grumbings, of a literary giant who, will surely go down to posterity as the author of, amongst others, *Tropic of Cancer*, *Tropic of Capricorn*, *The Colossus of Maroussi*, *Sexus*, *Plexus*, and *The Rosy Crucifixion*—especially *Tropic of Cancer*.

It has been said that every word Henry Miller has ever written is autobiographical. Let it be added now that if this is so, there is not a word of 'confession' in any such memoirs. If he exaggerates he rarely boasts—certainly when he does so it is only in the interest of his art.

It must be regretfully noted that there is a lurid dust-jacket for this important record; reminiscent of schoolboy smut at its worst. It makes an unworthy and quite unnecessary sandwich for so many profound, witty and appetising ingredients.

PETER COTES

IS PEACE INEVITABLE? Aggression, Evolution and Human Destiny edited by Santiago Genovés. Allen and Unwin, £2.50.

This is an admirably written, persuasive argument against the view that man possesses a "lethal aggressive instinct" that inevitably pushes him to make war. The evidence marshalled in support of the argument is not new but I have rarely seen it presented with such skill and eloquence. One by one the counter-arguments are demolished; the notion that war is an agent of man's evolutionary progress, that it is a necessary outcome of the struggle for existence, that it stimulates inventions and improvements in production, and so on.

For me, the best argument against the notion that war is instinctive in any sense is the great reluctance of ordinary people to take part in it. Once the first excitement has died down and it has become clear that the war will not be over by Christmas, people have to be dragged into war by means of conscription and their hatred for the enemy fanned by propaganda. The same thing is true of attempts to arouse racial antagonisms. The racialists and anti-immigrationists have to make periodic speeches to whip up the flagging interest. What Mr. Powell calls "sweeping the problem under the carpet" is really a boredom with the whole subject, a willingness to accept on friendly terms other people, whatever their colour.

Professor Genovés has done an important service in summarising so lucidly the case against war and racial hatred. He compels us to ask why, then, does war take place; and look for the social and cultural factors which condition its occurrence. Countries do not go to war against one another. They are involved in wars through the activities of small groups of politicians in governmental and ruling circles, representing often large economic and financial interests and endowed with low-level frustration tolerance. If peace is to be inevitable we shall have to select our leading politicians somewhat differently. Professor Genovés mentions the irrational causative factors of war. Supreme among them, surely, is the ease with which ambitious, thrusting unstable people can make their mark in politics.

REUBEN OSBORN

THE FREETHINKER, Vol. 92 (1972) edited by Nigel Sinnott. G. W. Foote, £2.50 (plus 25p postage).

The Atheists' Parish Magazine—to imagine a typical Muggeridge boomerang—continues in fact to serve a parish as extensive in history as in geography. This 92nd volume includes contributors from Shelley to Jack Lindsay, from Swinburne to Antony Flew, while the Letters to the Editor, if at first glance ranging only from David Holbrook on pornography to David Holbrook on pornography, at a closer examination reveal readers from all parts of the freethinking globe.

Where the Editor comes from is perhaps a matter for the Holy Office. I suspect myself that his tail in the cartoon in the 5 February number (p. 44) is strictly an *ex officio* appendage and that he is as respectable a person in private life as his predecessors from G. W. Foote and Chapman Cohen to Messrs. Tribe and McIlroy. Judging from his editorial performance over these 53 weekly numbers, the shoes of his predecessors appear to fit Mr. Sinnott like the proverbial cloven hoof.

Volume 92! It is an impressive achievement, looking back. It means that *The Freethinker* has not only survived *John Bull* and *G.K.'s Weekly* but is senior to the *New Statesman* and the *Church of England Newspaper* and only a few years junior to the *War Cry*. If it is still a younger, prodigal brother to the *Church Times* and *The Universe*, it expresses its awareness of these elders' currency by quoting them pretty often in its News and Notes feature. The thought strikes one that readers of *The Freethinker* may know of these rival journals' continued existence only by the extracts in these columns, which makes one wonder if Christian readers know of *The Freethinker's* continued existence only when the *Church Times*, *The Universe* or the *War Cry* happens to quote us.

It has been a rewarding experience to read through these 424 pages, which are recommended in their volume form to weekly or monthly freethinkers in need of permanent ammunition or who have spring-cleaning wives hard on periodicals left lying about. As an amateur student of the New Testament, I am particularly glad to have in more durable shape the articles on Jesus and Paul by such scholars as G. A. Wells, Philip Hinchliff, Robert Morrell and R. J. Condon. The centenary or other anniversary articles by Eric Glasgow and other writers are also worthy of this more permanent form. The reviewing in this volume, by F. A. Ridley and others, keeps up *The Freethinker's* high standard. And the Editor's eye has rightly been concerned as much with topical as with perennial issues. Ireland comes into both categories, as was emphasised by Lord Raglan, speaking "in another place" on 2 February 1972 and reported here on p. 57. "It is only when religion ceases to be the dominating factor," concluded Lord Raglan, "and Ireland begins to work towards being a modern civilised non-theocratic society, that the people will start to learn to live together."

R. C. CHURCHILL

THE FREETHINKER 1972 BOUND VOLUME

Edited by Nigel Sinnott

£2.50 plus 25p postage

G. W. FOOTE & Company

698 Holloway Road, London, N19 3NL

THEATRE

MISALLIANCE by Bernard Shaw. The Mermaid Theatre (in repertoire until 16 June).

I was glad to learn that Shaw's long-neglected play, *Misalliance*, was to be revived at the Mermaid Theatre. Like many of Shaw's lesser plays, *Misalliance* is idiosyncratic to a fault. It cries "Author! Author!" so loudly that it is wisest to see it in conjunction with the Mermaid's other offering, the pot-pourri *Cowardy Custard*. Both Shaw and Coward were shrewdly critical of the restrictive conventions, the idleness and the blinkered arrogance of the upper-middle classes. Both men adopted a deceptive air of caustic detachment, both were eminently quotable, but while Coward was essentially nostalgic, Shaw was something of a seer; there is even a snide reference to artificial insemination in *Misalliance*.

Alan Strachan's production of this cerebral romp is lucid and affectionate, helping us warm to the rather tiresome assortment of people Shaw wrote into it. Bill Fraser is delightful and credible as the underwear manufacturer, lamenting his superabundant vitality and his success in business. Anthony Sharp gives a fine performance as the world-weary retired colonist. Wistful yet urbane, his Lord Summerhayes is a sympathetic portrayal of an ageing man of action. Caroline Blakiston's Polish accent misfires, but she is forceful and alluring as the eccentric gymnast, and she is to be congratulated for not giving us an embryonic Saint Joan.

For me, though, the high spot of the evening was provided by John Tordoff's vengeful, tub-thumping clerk, highly amusing yet very sad, an unforgettable piece of human observation, and of theatre.

VERA LUSTIG

OPERA

DON GIOVANNI by W. A. Mozart. Royal Opera House, Covent Garden.

The opera, of course, is about Don Giovanni or Juan, the great seducer who is finally sent to Hell by the statue of an outraged father he has murdered. The main feature of this production was that the stage had long thin steel tubes hung all over it. Some people said it reminded them of an African kraal. It was certainly puzzling but one should keep an open mind. (Sadlers Wells in *The Rheingold* has girders all over the place.)

Wales was well represented on this production. Sir Geraint Evans as Leporello (Giovanni's comic servant) sang well, as usual, but acted rather heavily. He was equipped with a huge moustache which made him look like J. Stalin—was this prompted by the revolutionary sentiments in his opening aria?

I thought Miss Gwyneth Jones as Donna Anna (daughter of the outraged murdered father) gave the best performance. This attractive and appealing young lady put real fury into the aria 'Or sai chi l'onore' in which Anna stirs her lover to revenge against Giovanni. Stuart Burrows as Don Ottavio looked a bit elderly to be Anna's lover but he got the most applause.

The audience was certainly interested. But some people booed the producer, presumably for being too surrealistic. The producer seemed more shaken than Herr Wolfgang Wagner who last year at Bayreuth was booed for not being surrealistic enough!

I. S. LOW

LETTERS

Ancient Rome and the Barbarians

Having read Mr. Hinchliff's article (April) lamenting the sad fate of Quintilius Varus and his legions suffered at the hands of Arminius, may I be allowed to plead the case for the barbarians.

It is reasonable to assume that by A.D. 9 even the dimmest of tribes living along the Rhine had perceived that the immediate benefit Roman civilisation bestowed on the vanquished consisted of a journey to Rome to make up the tail-end of a triumphal procession. Once there, it was taken for granted that the barbarians, having seen the splendour of Imperial Rome, were loath to return to their native bogs, and suitable employment was found for them. They could either become auxiliaries to the legions and fight for the glory of the *Imperium Romanum*, or be torn to pieces in the arena, thus entertaining their "civilised" captors. Those with no taste for either career: well, there was always a great demand for able-bodied slaves. Meanwhile their former homelands, having been "pacified" by the military, were left to the tender mercies of a proconsul who would impose systems of bondage, tributes and punitive measures that were deeply resented by the free-born Germans. This "Vae Victis" attitude of the Roman conquerors made it possible for Arminius to unite a number of tribes in order to halt further Roman advances. They preferred to remain free barbarians rather than become civilised slaves.

Surely Mr. Hinchliff exaggerates a little when he attributes later historical events such as the Reformation and the Franco-German conflicts to the outcome of that battle in the Teutoburg Forest. Protestant detestation for Rome and all its works was reserved for the Catholic Church, not Roman culture; I hope the two are not regarded as being synonymous. Finally it pains me to have to remind the scholarly Mr. Hinchliff that a 350-year dose of *Pax Romana* did not deter the British from laying into the French for centuries, and with such gusto that subsequent German incursions seem amateurish in comparison.

S. D. KUEBART.

Docetism and Christian Origins

Not all of the heretics attacked by Irenaeus accepted the existence of the man Jesus. Professor Wells omits to mention the Docetae, to whom Jesus was never more than what would nowadays be called a subjective vision. Docetism was the earliest of the so-called heresies, appearing when "the blood of Christ was still fresh in Judaea" according to Jerome, a hostile witness and therefore not likely to have been exaggerating. There is no reliable evidence of a human Jesus being preached at that time or even shortly afterwards, as Professor Wells has demonstrated in his book.

In short, the Docetic view of Jesus was probably the original one, and not a heresy at all. Its relevance to the historicity question should be obvious.

R. J. CONDON.

Freedom to Believe

The letter from Robert Halstead (April *Freethinker*) outdoes Lewis Carroll's White Queen, who "believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast". Mr. Halstead says he used to be a freethinker but now believes (though he admits it is "difficult") in God and an afterlife—on the principle that "All men should be free to believe what they want to". What sort of freedom is that? Is the alcoholic free when his consumption of liquor is unlimited?

Certainly, all men and women should be free to believe whatever they have reason to conclude is true—indeed, that is what we mean by "freethought"—but that is very different from believing whatever they want to, which is to make themselves prisoners of delusion. Does Mr. Halstead also choose to believe in Santa Claus and fairies? Wishful thinking has its place in fantasy and poetry, but life is for real. And true freedom lies in knowing the difference. As Bertrand Russell said, "What is wanted is not the will to believe but the wish to find out."

BARBARA SMOKER.

"All men should be free to believe what they want to", declares Robert Halstead (letters, April). But surely, all men are 'free to believe' what they want to; yet all men who believe 'what they want to' are not 'free'!

BRYSHA CASSEL.

Social, Economic and Sexual Exploitation of Women

David Holbrook (letters, April), expresses a very one-sided view of the exploitation of women. I fail to see why a woman selling her body for, perhaps, a fairly substantial sum of money, should be regarded as more reprehensible or exploitive than a woman selling her labour power in a factory or canteen for a derisory wage! The sexual exploitation of women is an intrinsic part of their economic and social exploitation. (The trading of sex for economic maintenance is still an aspect of most marriages for instance.)

It is impossible for women to have real sexual freedom until they have economic equality with men. Among the greatest obstacles to the "inherent dignity and freedom of the body" which David Holbrook writes about, are the restrictions on birth control and abortion; fear of having an unwanted child deprives many women of sexual enjoyment.

Without economic and social changes in the position of women, the "good sexuality" which David Holbrook and everyone else thinks is desirable, will remain a chimera. PATRICIA KNIGHT.

Do We Read Less Than We Used To ?

"What makes I. S. Low suppose that grown-ups in this country don't read a book a week?" asks Brigid Brophy in the April issue. Answer: as a lecturer in a polytechnic I am very much aware of the difficulties both staff and students have in getting through their reading.

In her letter in the January issue Miss Brophy writes, "From public libraries alone . . . there is now one borrowing a month per man, woman or baby in the population". In her April letter she writes, ". . . the figure of 13 borrowings a year per head of population takes no account of the babies in the population." She says one thing one moment and the opposite the next! The babies "cannot be expected to read books", says Miss Brophy solemnly (just fancy that!) although in her January letter she implied they did!

Miss Brophy says the number of books borrowed from public libraries increases annually. This is probably because of the rise in population. And as a Marxist friend of mine says, what sort of books? And if people have lots of time to read, why have some libraries lengthened the reading time for each book to one month when previously it was two weeks?

Miss Brophy also says that school and university libraries spend twice as much "on printed matter" as public libraries. Perhaps, but as a polytechnic lecturer I doubt very much if they "account for nearly twice as much reading" as the public libraries. (No wonder Miss Brophy says "the number of loans from such libraries is not available".)

So, "the British home market sells £78 million worth of books a year". Has Miss Brophy not noticed the very high price of books? She says less than a fifth of the £78 million figure represents sales to public libraries. "Less than a fifth" is a bit vague, but presumably the figure is more than a sixth or Miss Brophy would have said so. In both her January and April letters, Brigid Brophy makes a clear distinction between public libraries on the one hand and school and university libraries on the other. And she says that school and university libraries spend twice as much as public ones. So the school libraries must spend two sixths of the total and therefore libraries account for three sixths or half of that £78 million—and if you remember the price increase this does not suggest the public buy so very much more than they did about ten years ago. If in reply Miss Brophy says that by "public libraries" she meant school and university libraries as well, this will be one more example of her saying one thing one moment and the opposite the next!

My point is: writers should have consideration for the difficulties of readers by being as concise as possible and not using a thousand words where ten would do equally well. I. S. Low.

In reply to I. S. Low's 'passing' assertion (16 December) that people nowadays have less and less time to read, Brigid Brophy (January) claimed that people are in fact making more and more more time to read. Mr. Low has yet to give us any basis for his assertion.

Miss Brophy (April) would seem to be basing her claim on the fact of an annual increase in the number of borrowings from public libraries; thus, she would seem still to be assuming that the number of books borrowed elsewhere and bought (and even stolen) has not been decreasing! Moreover, as regards the British

home market selling £78 million worth of books a year, would not a general increase in the price of books mean less books sold?

On the question of the comparative time people are making to read, is it not possible that people are reading quicker and quicker and books that are read are shorter and shorter? Also, is it not possible that while *some* people are making more and more time to read, *others* are making less and less—not necessarily in the same degree?

CHARLES BYASS.

The Mechanism of the Universe

Twenty years ago I came to the conclusion that current physical theory had become a religion instead of a science. I have subsequently sought—and found—a logical explanation of the universe in terms of mass, motion and elasticity only, one which also accounts for those phenomena which conventional theory fails to explain.

In presenting my theory to the public I feel that conventional physicists would find it more acceptable if it included a more detailed mathematical supplement. I am therefore looking for a mathematical physics heretic with whom to collaborate.

R. LESLIE KENT, M.I.Mech.E.

8 Grove Road, Isleworth, Middlesex.

Clydeside Humanist Exhibition

Glasgow Humanist Society is intending to mount a small exhibition on the impact of humanism on the Glasgow and Clydebank area over the last 100 years.

We would welcome from your readers reminiscences of meetings, campaigns, and especially, local humanist characters, who were active in public life, in the arts, crafts or sciences, in the Glasgow and Clydebank area.

If you readers can loan us photographs, press-cuttings, advertisements or posters about campaigns with humanist objectives, for example, relaxation of Sabbatarian practices (old election literature might include something of this kind) we will be most grateful. All material loaned would be copied and returned.

Would anyone who can help with this project, please contact me at 6 Glassford Street, Milngavie, Glasgow G62 8DS (telephone 041-956 1566).

ANNA McLAREN (Mrs.), *Hon. Secretary*,

Glasgow Humanist Society.

Information on Joseph McCabe ?

I am a great admirer of the late Joseph McCabe, and would like to correspond with anyone who knew him well and has books of his to sell me. McCabe had four children who may still be living today: can anyone give me their addresses? I also need photographs of Joseph McCabe for their work I am doing on the great historian and rationalist. All mail will be answered.

B. LANDRY.

Box 391, Stanton, California 90680, U.S.A.

Herr H. Stacher-Loos, Baumgartenweg 28, 4123 Muttenz, Switzerland, is middle-aged, multilingual, and fond of travelling. He would like to correspond with freethinkers, humanists and rationalists of similar (or younger) age in any part of the world, but especially in the Far East.

DEATH OF A FRIEND

The Battle lost, the Peace is won,
 And gentle rest and silence triumph now:
 For Life must end at setting of the sun,
 And transient seas observe their ebb and flow.
 Yet though the day must fade before the night,
 Courage and love endure and there is light.

S.W.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

National Secular Society. Details of membership and inquiries regarding bequests and secular funeral services may be obtained from the General Secretary, 698 Holloway Road, London, N19 3NL (telephone: 01-272 1266). Cheques, etc., should be made payable to the N.S.S.

Freethought books and pamphlets (new). Send for list to G. W. Foote & Company, 698 Holloway Road, London, N19 3NL.

Ashurstwood Abbey Secular Humanism Centre (founded by Jean Straker), between East Grinstead and Forest Row, Sussex. Telephone: Forest Row 2589. Meeting every Sunday, 3 p.m.

Humanist Counselling Service, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London W8 5PG; telephone 01-937 2341 (for confidential advice on your personal problems—whatever they are).

EVENTS

Brighton and Hove Humanist Group, Imperial Centre Hotel, First Avenue, Hove. Sunday, 3 June, 5.30 p.m.: WALTER BROUGHTON, "The Presentation of Humanism."

Freethought History and Bibliography Society, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London W8. Thursday, 14 June, 7.30 p.m.: WILLIAM MCILROY, "The Influence of Rationalism on the Irish Rebellion of 1798."

Havering and District Humanist Society. Saturday, 19 May: social evening c/o Ken and Francis Clifford (telephone: Romford 46700).

London Young Humanists, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London W8. Sunday, 20 May, 7.30 p.m.: BARBARA SMOKER, "Radical Alternatives to Prison."

South Place Ethical Society, Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London WC1. *Sunday Morning Meetings*, 11 a.m. 20 May: RONALD MASON, "Tolstoy and Social Values"; 3 June: RALPH RUDDOCK, "The Making and Breaking of the Self"; 10 June: HARRY G. KNIGHT, "A Psychologist's Search for God"; 17 June: JOY MCASKILL, "Darwinism and Secularism in the Later Nineteenth Century." *Humanist Forum*, Sunday, 3 p.m.: 10 June: PETER REDDAWAY, "Religion in the Soviet Union." *Tuesday Discussions*, 7 p.m. 22 May: PATRICIA HEWITT, "The Old and the Lonely"; 29 May: TIM ELLIOT and LYNNE HARNE, "State Benefits and the Claimants' Union. (No meeting on 27 May; no Tuesday discussions in June.)

Welwyn Garden City Humanist Group. Sunday, 10 June: a ramble. (Details from J. van Someren, telephone: Welwyn G.C. 25901.)

Worthing Humanist Group, Burlington Hotel, Marine Parade. Sunday, 20 May, 5.30 p.m.: Annual General Meeting.

TWO NEW N.S.S. PAMPHLETS

BROADCASTING BRAINWASHING CONDITIONING

by **David Tribe**

25p plus 4p postage

THE LONGFORD THREAT TO FREEDOM

by **Brigid Brophy**

Foreword: BARBARA SMOKER

10p plus 3p postage

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

698 Holloway Road, London, N19 3NL

PUBLICATIONS

TITLE	AUTHOR	Price	Post
The Origins of Christianity	G. A. Wells	20p	3p
The Case Against Church Schools	Patricia Knight	20p	4p
Broadcasting Brainwashing Conditioning	David Tribe	25p	4p
An Introduction to Secular Humanism	Kit Mouat	45p	3p
The Longford Threat to Freedom	Brigid Brophy	10p	3p
Nucleoethics: Ethics in Modern Society	David Tribe	£2.95	9p
Rebel Pity	Eddie & Win Roux	45p	7p
Club Life and Socialism in Mid-Victorian London	Stan Shipley	60p	9p
Boys and Sex	W. B. Pomeroy	25p	7p
Girls and Sex	W. B. Pomeroy	25p	7p
Life, Death and Immortality	P. B. Shelley and others	10p	3p
The Freethinker 1972 Bound Volume	Edited by Nigel Sinnott	£2.50	25p
Religion and Ethics in Schools	David Tribe	7½p	3p
Religious Education in State Schools	Brigid Brophy	12½p	3p
Ten Non Commandments	Ronald Fletcher	12½p	3p
The Cost of Church Schools	David Tribe	20p	3p
Humanism, Christianity and Sex	David Tribe	2½p	3p
Freethought and Humanism in Shakespeare	Phyllis Graham	2½p	3p
The Nun Who Lived Again	Marghanita Laski	10p	3p
The Secular Responsibility	Robin Odell and Tom Barfield	20p	4p
A Humanist Glossary	Chapman Cohen	3p	3p
Morality Without God	Margaret Knight	60p	9p
Humanist Anthology	Winwood Reade	60p	12p
The Martyrdom of Man	R. G. Ingersoll	5p	4p
Rome or Reason	Chapman Cohen	25p	10p
Materialism Restated	Chapman Cohen	5p	4p
Thomas Paine	David Tribe	3p	3p
Religion and Human Rights	A. C. Bouquet	50p	8p
Comparative Religion	Various	17½p	6½p
Objections to Christian Belief	Various	17½p	6½p
Objections to Humanism	Thomas Paine	35p	8p
Rights of Man	John Allegro	35p	8p
The Dead Sea Scrolls	David Tribe	£2.50	14p
100 Years of Freethought	Kit Mouat	52½p	11½p
What Humanism is About	Bertrand Russell	60p	8p
Impact of Science on Society	Bertrand Russell	35p	8p
Authority and the Individual	Bertrand Russell	30p	7p
Political Ideas	Bertrand Russell	60p	9p
The Conquest of Happiness	Bertrand Russell	45p	8p
Unpopular Essays	Bertrand Russell	60p	8p
Roads to Freedom	Bertrand Russell	65p	8p
Power	Bertrand Russell	37½p	7½p
Legitimacy versus Industrialism	Herbert Gottchalk	25p	7p
Bertrand Russell: A Life	G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball	65p	8p
The Bible Handbook	Adrian Pigott	20p	7p
The Vatican Versus Mankind	David Tribe	£4.00	25p
President Charles Bradlaugh MP	N.S.S.	20p	3p
Birth Control	Margaret Knight	3p	3p
Christianity: The Debit Account	Soren Hanson & Jesper Jensen	30p	6p
The Little Red Schoolbook	Joachim Kahl	35p	7p
The Misery of Christianity	G. H. Taylor	10p	3p
A Chronology of British Secularism	Chapman Cohen	3p	3p
Did Jesus Christ Exist?	Historicus	5p	4p
Did Jesus Ever Live?	Hector Hawton	60p	10p
Controversy	Louise Rose	30p	7p
Faith Healing	Bertrand Russell	60p	9p
Education and the Social Order	Richard Carlile, Agitator	25p	8p
Richard Carlile, Agitator	Guy A. Aldred	25p	8p

● Please make cheques, postal orders, etc., payable to G. W. Foote & Company.

● The above list is a selection of publications available. Please send for complete list.

G. W. FOOTE & Company

698 HOLLOWAY ROAD, LONDON N19 3NL

Tel. 01-272 1266