

Duplicated as a manuscript
All rights reserved
Copyright C.K. Bliss, 1963
2 Vicar Street, Coogee,
Sydney Australia

"Providing the means for the publication
of Bliss' work "is, in my opinion, per-
forming an important service to mankind."

Bertrand Russell (1)



13.

S C H O L A R L Y L U N A C Y

and

THE MOST IMPORTANT ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL DISCOVERY EVER MADE.

by

C. K. B l i s s
Author and Inventor of
Semantography (Blissymbolics)(2)

S E C O N D P A R T

In the first part we have discussed

- (1) the theory of the eminent psychiatrist Dr. Brock Chisholm (3), who thinks that human warfare is due to a mental perversion, a brain disease, an epidemic which can be cured by medical means. He blamed the theologians for having inflicted this mental perversion on the minds of men;
- (2) the failure of philosophy, as deplored by Professor Reiser (5), who also attacked the theologians, but the scientists and philosophers too, because they have failed to give mankind a simple world philosophy by which humanity could live united, instead of divided;
- (3) the curse of scientists and philosophers for using highfalutin highbrow language which is too high for humble humanity, even too high for university students;
- (4) the revolt against the university scholars begun 300 years ago. It was defeated by the autocratic forces in the universities. The highbrows still stalk the faculties, making a comfortable living by making themselves not understood, and then punishing their students for it;
- (5) my experiences in the concentration camp of Buchenwald where I could compare the brutality and bestiality of animal brutes and beasts caged in a zoo, with the brutality and bestiality of humans against humans;
- (6) the fact that all plant eating animals adhere strictly to the ethical law

"Thou shalt not kill!" - even when they are starving. The fact, which no zoologist told us, that animals of the same species - even killer animals - don't kill their own kind, even when starving. In terrible contrast, man kills and eats his fellowman in an open boat, or in a religious ceremony. In human warfare men kill their fellowmen in masses and are even proud of it;

(7) the researches of Professor Ashley Montagu (7), who proved that the rare instances of animal cannibalism happen only when the animal's normal reasoning is upset by shock, fear, panic, often induced by the sudden loss of freedom and confinement in too small cages;

(8) the sensational pronouncement of Montagu that "Among the same species of animals the highest ethics is supreme law." Man is the only creature on this planet which kills its own kind. Man is therefore ethically the lowliest creature on earth.

Now read on.

J E S U S A N D T H E W O L V E S

I am not going to hit you with any religious blabla. I am not a believing Believer, least of all am I a believing Atheist, who believes (believe he must) that he believes nothing. I despise the priests and rabbis, as only Chisholm taught me how to despise them, because they are at the "bottom" of that bottomless pit, called our glorious Judeo-Christian Society where men kill their fellowmen. This doesn't mean that the other orthodox religions are less despicable. They too have in their "holy scriptures" upheld the doctrine that it is good and righteous to go out and kill other people in battle. They too must stand condemned.

In my youth I loved the great poet Heinrich Heine (1797 - 1856). He too had to flee from the German police. I loved to recite his poems, and among them - "Der Wettstreit" - "The Debating Duel". If I remember rightly, the scene is Spain in the reign of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castil. To entertain his queen, the king had arranged a debating duel between a monk and a rabbi. The loser must renounce his religion and be converted to the religion of the winner.

Day after day the battle raged in front of the whole court. And day after day the fellow monks were holding in readiness the baptismal water, and the fellow rabbis were grinding ceaselessly their circumcision knives. Until the king turned to his queen and asked of her opinion as to who should be declared winner. Said the queen sweetly:

"Mir scheint es will mich gar beduenken,
Dass der Rabbi und der Moench,
Dass sie alle Beide stinken."

"It seems to me, or so I think,
that both the rabbi and the monk,
they altogether stink."

My cousin Mr. Karl Bittman of Sydney, he too a laughing philosopher in his own right, gave me some time ago a clipping from a Vienna newspaper which contained an

article under a title of four words only. These four words are in themselves the harshest condemnation of all the rabbis, priests, imams, and other professionals of all religions, including all the orthodox scholars in all the orthodox universities. These four words are:

TIERE KENNEN KEINEN BRUDERMORD
ANIMALS DON'T KNOW BROTHERMURDER

There is a reason why this article appeared in a Vienna newspaper. The article was written by a co-worker of one of the most remarkable naturalists of our age, Dr. Konrad Z. Lorenz, who lived for many years in Altenberg, a village near Vienna. There Lorenz conducted his observations of animals, birds and fishes. He saw what almost all the zoologists couldn't see. When I remonstrated with them, when I asked them that there must be a book by a zoologist who has seen what I am now trying to see, they could only point to Dr. Lorenz' book "King Solomon's Ring".(8) This book was a bestseller for many months, and yet, it failed to make any impression as to its true meaning. Why? Because Lorenz didn't know of Chisholm, and Chisholm didn't know of Lorenz, and no one combined both findings, no one among the hundreds of thousands of concentration camp prisoners of Buchenwald who was ever led to the comparison of animal and human brutality and bestiality. I had at first no inclination to delve into zoology of all things. I was working on a new interlinguistic tool for common understanding among the peoples of this earth. I faced an impasse when I arrived at the words and meanings which cause strife and bloodshed among people. It was then that I found Chisholm's lectures, and then I remembered my thoughts in Buchenwald. This led me to the comparison of ethics in animals and humans, and in the end to the most important anthropological and archeological discovery ever made. Of this we shall hear in the last chapters.

Lorenz' book tells of amazing observations. He observed for many years the feathered friends which came to his house. He observed them in their natural way of life, in freedom. They were not in cages!!! He ringed them with coloured rings, and then observed his friends, appropriately called - Leftgreen and Rightred, Greenred and Bluegold, etc. I quote now from my book "In Search of a logical God" (9) where I condensed some chapters of Lorenz' book:

"Some birds," said Lorenz, "as the jackdaws, marry for life. More amazing still, they become engaged before they mature. Jackdaws become betrothed in the first year of their life, marry in the second, and remain faithfully married for up to 30 and 40 years. The male bridegroom will bring his fiancée delicacies. He will search for a nesting cavity and then impress his bride with it. When the eggs are ready for brooding, the father will take turns with the mother. When mama sits on the eggs, papa will feed her. In turn, mama will clean papa's headfeathers which he cannot reach with his own bill.

And Lorenz adds:

"This loving help, can be observed with all social animals."

And, mind you, "social animals" are lions, tigers, wolves and other ferocious "beasts".

In another chapter, Lorenz shows how Love, Reason and Conscience works even in a tiny fish, the cichlid. When the babies swim around all day, it is papa's task to gather them together in his mouth, and then to bed them down in the nest for the night. One evening, he had already gathered in his mouth all his offsprings, when suddenly a juicy morsel came floating down tantalizingly. What should he do? If he snaps it off, he may injure his babies in his mouth. For seconds the little fish strained his brain, and then came upon the only logical solution. He opened his mouth, let all his babies out, and then enjoyed his bite of food. After that, off he went after his babies to get them into bed.

And here are some excerpts from Lorenz' observation of fights between animals of the same species. He too said that animals of the same species don't kill each other. And then almost against his will, and very reluctantly, he brings a saying of Jesus into it. I shall now quote the passages in Lorenz' book "King Solomon's Ring", and my commentary in my book "In Search of a Logical God." Lorenz describes the fight of two male wolves. The older has overpowered the younger and weaker. And the younger suddenly gives in, and offers his neck to his victor.

"Every second you expect violence and wait with bated breath the moment when the winner's teeth will rip the jugular vein of the loser. But your fears are groundless, for it will not happen. In this particular situation, the victor will definitely not close on his less fortunate rival. You can see that he would like to, but he just cannot. A dog or a wolf that offers its neck to its adversary in this way will never be bitten seriously."

Why not? I commented. Why does the victor not kill? Is an ethical power of mercy operating in the dumb animal? We don't know, said Lorenz, and he continues:

"Wherein consists the essence of all the gestures of submission by which a bird or animal of a social species can appeal to the inhibitions of its superior? We have seen in the wolf, that the defeated animal actually facilitates his own destruction by offering to the victor those very parts of his body which he was most anxious to shield as long as the battle was raging. All submissive attitudes with which we are so familiar, in social animals, are based on the same principle: The supplicant always offers to his adversary the most vulnerable part of his body, or, to be more exact, that part against which every killing attack is inevitably directed! In most birds, this area is the base of the skull."

If a turkey-cock has had more than his share of the wild and grotesque wrestling match in which these birds indulge, he lays himself with outstretched neck upon the ground. Whereupon the victor behaves exactly as a wolf or dog in the same situation, that is to say, he evidently wants to peck and kick at the prostrated enemy, but simply cannot. He would if he could, but he can't."

Why not? I asked. What else is this natural inhibition but a natural manifestation of mercy? Or is it only, as modern biologists say, a "purely mechanical reflex"? We shall deal with the linguistic deception in the word "mechanical" later on.

Continues Lorenz:

"Whatever may be the reason that prevent the dominant individual from injuring the submissive one, whether he is prevented from doing so by a simple and purely mechanical reflex process, or by a highly philosophical moral standard, is immaterial to the practical issue, The essential behaviour of the submissive as well as of the dominant partner remains the same: the humble creature suddenly seems to lose his objections to being injured, and removes all obstacles from the path of the killer, and it would seem that the very removal of these outer obstacles raises an insurmountable inner obstruction in the central nervous system of the aggressor."

"And what is a human appeal for mercy after all? Is it so very different from what we have just described? The Homeric warrior who wishes to yield and plead mercy, discards helmet and shield, falls on his knees and inclines his head, a set of actions which should make it easier for the enemy to kill, but in reality, hinders him from doing so."

"Homer's heroes were certainly not as soft-hearted as the wolves. The poet cites numerous instances where the supplicant was slaughtered with or without compunction. The Norse heroic sagas bring us many examples of similar failures of the submissive gesture, and it was not till the era of the knight-errantry that it was no longer considered "sporting" to kill a man who begged for mercy. The Christian knight is the first who, for reasons of traditional and religious morals, is as chivalrous as is the wolf from the depth of his natural impulses and inhibitions. What a strange paradox?"

"I think it is a truly magnificent thing that one wolf finds himself unable to bite the proffered neck of the other, but still more so that the other relies upon him for this amazing restraint. Mankind can learn a lesson from this, from the animal which Dante calls "la bestia senza pace" (the beast without peace). I at least have extracted from it a new and deeper understanding of a wonderful and often misunderstood saying from the Gospel which hitherto had only awakened in me feelings of strong opposition: "And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other" (St. Luke, VI.26). A wolf has enlightened me: not so that your enemy may strike you again do you turn the other cheek towards him, but to make him unable to do it."

Alas, I cry, Christ preached in vain. His formula works with wolves, but not with men. Indeed, some of the massacres where no mercy was shown to men, women, and children were massacres in the name of Christ. In our time, no mercy is shown in new religions: nationalism, nazism, socialism, communism, and other isms. No mercy is shown even by the highest in the lands, the supreme judges, the President of the United States and other countries. Our gracious Queen would like to show mercy, but she can't. Her most obedient servant the Prime Minister executes her power (against her will) and gives the signal for the execution amidst the roar of the rabble, the roar of the reporters, the

roar of the rotating presses - although it has been proved time and again that capital punishment is no deterrent whatever. And our wise men in the churches and synagogues have set a precedent of utter mercilessness. They ask us to worship a God whose mercilessness is beyond imagination. Unless we repent and repay (in hard cash, but shares and properties also accepted), HE will let us burn in hell forever and ever, Amen!

No mercy by God, no mercy by men, but mercy by animals. Within them a natural power of love, compassion and conscience operates. Now we learn that a natural ethics operates too, which makes them abhor the killing of one of their brothers. And now we have been told by Lorenz that even a natural power of mercy operates, much more than in men. The animals have no words for all these high ethical values. Hence they cannot lie like human hypocrites. Animals have the moral principles built into their "mechanism". They can only act upon them. And they do it admirably.

Whenever I tell all this to people, they look at me blankly. It makes sense what I say, but why has no teacher and professor of zoology and biology told us this? They are the experts. They must know. Why were they silent? Why are they still silent after Ashley Montagu and Konrad Lorenz?

FIVE EXPERT EXCUSES FOR THE EXALTED EXPERTS

Why have our experts in the schools and the universities not told us:

- (1) that animals of the same species, even killer animals, do not kill their own kind?
- (2) that man, among all creatures, is the only creature which kills its own kind?

They have five excuses. The first excuse is the excuse of the specialist. There are specialists in birds, specialists in fish, specialists in insects, and there are special specialists in special birds, special fish, and special insects. Professor Reiser pointed out, that a specialist is an expert who knows more and more about less and less, until he knows almost everything about almost nothing. Hence he must lose sight of the unifying laws which govern all living beings.

The second excuse is the specialisation in different faculties. Zoologists study animals, anthropologists study men, theologians study ethics. No one dares to intrude into the domain of his colleagues, of which he feels ignorant. And if a black sheep among the professors dares to make comparisons and come to conclusions involving different fields of study, he is soon told to keep to his last, as any cobbler should. Hence the specialists in the special faculties failed to see what was before their very eyes.

The third excuse is a mental deficiency common with learned and laymen. Everyone has his cherished pet theories about everything. It is very upsetting to hear that these theories are all wrong. With professional scholars it

is worse. They make a living by their theories. To tell them that all their teaching is false, is a threat to their seats and their salaries. Hence they ignore evidence which demolish their theories, and they use every trick of language to denounce the new theory and defend their old one.

The fourth excuse is truly terrifying. It is the excuse of the lackey who must do as his master tells him to do - or else. From the beginning of man's history, court historians have falsified the history of their rulers, who paid for their upkeep. They have glorified the murderous massacres of their kings and emperors, and their colleagues in the schools and the churches have taught their pupils and people to love, adore and obey the monsters on the throne. And they are still at it, the historians and the teachers and preachers in the new absolute kingdoms of communism, falangism, arabism, and other isms. The lackeys do it, because if they don't, they may lose their lives. In the democratic countries they may lose their livelihood, when they tell their pupils to despise the corrupt demagogues voted into government by corrupt methods.

Imagine the truly terrifying aspect if the people of all countries would be made aware of what I am trying to tell here: that man is the lowliest beast among all creatures, that animals don't kill their own brothers, that only men kill their fellowmen when they are led into battle by their misleaders in the governments, schools and churches. Hell would break loose, a hell of questions raised by all the people who would say:

"We feel like the animals do! We have no desire to kill our fellowmen! We don't want to kill and be killed by our own Kind! What devilish device, what gross falsehood is used by our teachers and preachers, by our leaders and misleaders to make us do the most horrible thing which no animal does?"

The answer to this hell-raising question is: language, articulate and abstract language. And Chisholm told us which words are the most dangerous ones for making us killers, and he showed us too that the professionals of all religions have built up their business on these very words. But before we hear in detail of Chisholm's theory we must accumulate more facts, until we begin to unlearn what we learned from our teachers and preachers.

Animals have a language too, cries of love or rage, cries of fear or pain, cries of danger or defiance. But animals have no abstract, abstruse and absurd language. Hence animals cannot be exhorted by ambiguous and lying words to go out and kill their own brothers, because (so they are told) their brothers are bad and evil Catholics or Protestants, bad and evil Jews or Negroes, Germans or Frenchmen, Capitalists or Communists, etc., etc.

THE LANGUAGE EXCUSE OF BIOLOGISTS

The fifth excuse of zoologists, biologists, anthropologists, moralists and militarists is, that they are victims of their colleagues, the linguists. The teachers and professors of languages have failed to teach children and students a simple semantics by which they could recognize vague, ambiguous and lying

words. In fact, our language teachers are lie teachers. They are not at all concerned with truth. We may say or write any lie or any nonsense, provided we say and write it in "correct" pronunciation, spelling and grammar (no matter how illogical and irregular). We may write of "spiritual materialism" and "materialistic spiritualism", and may get a good mark for an essay on such nonsense. We may combine far-fetched ambiguous and vague words to new and even more far-fetched and more ambiguous and vague meanings. We may write "spiritual sabotage" or "socialistic sabotage" and our language teachers would be pleased with our spelling and grammar - though men accused of such vague "sabotages" have been put to death. But our teachers would be horrified, and would not tolerate a "socialistic sabotage", not on their lives!

And their good pupils, the biologists have followed their teachers and have combined two words. By this combination they have created a mental muddle of disastrous proportions. They call the search for food in the animal kingdom "biological warfare". By this new meaning, they even mean those animals which live on plants. Don't they wage war on plants, deprive them of their fruits and foliage?

The answer is no! Plants are the most ethical of living creatures. They unite by male and female love. They have children. They live by chemical food and water. But plants are creatures on a higher level of ethical co-operation. Plant creatures live and grow and have children for a higher purpose: to feed other creatures. And they don't die when their fruit and foliage is eaten. On the contrary. Plants go on producing wholesome food year after year, and grow stronger and healthier year after year doing this wonderful service, making sweet cherries, apples, pears, peaches, and many other fruits by the millions of tons.

So much for the lie in the "biological warfare" on plant creatures.

Now let's look at the killer animals. Here we can speak of "biological warfare". And this includes human beings who are killers too. They wage war on animals. But they also wage war on humans, their fellowmen. It was then simple for the biologists, the scientists, the moralists and the militarists to cry that "human warfare" against humans is nothing but part of "biological warfare". A German who kills a Jew, does the same act as a wolf which kills a sheep. It's all biological warfare, it's all natural, and you can't go against nature. Hence, the teachers and preachers declared: War was, War is, and War may ever be with the human race, Amen! Even God approved in the Bible of the slaying of people because they pray unto other gods. "Because I am the Lord and thou shalt have no other gods before me!" And the Bible is the word of God, and the word is God, and God is the word, according to that lying linguist who translated falsely St. John from the original text in Greek. The Greek text starts with the words: "In the beginning was Logos" Logos was for the Greek the "ultimate reality", the "prime mover" of all things in the heavens and on earth. Logos did not mean a Greek god (theos) one of that Olympic bunch of fallible and frolicking drunkards and damsels. Hence, the first sentence in St. John should read "In the beginning was God", this is what we understand under God, and what the Greek too meant by Logos. In later centuries logos sank in meaning to mean first logical reasoning, then word only. And this was the meaning which that translating idiot took to write "In the beginning was the word...and the word was God".

It can't be! The word is often falsehood; falsehood in meaning, falsehood in translation, falsehood in interpretation. Therefore the Bible cannot be the word of God. How merciless of God to tell Abraham to kill his only beloved son. And how stupid of Abraham to prepare for the killing. He should have told God to go to HIS own creation - the Devil. That's where HE belongs in his wrath and vengeance. And that's where all the professional servants of HIM belong too, all of them who told their flock to despise, and even to kill the evil people who pray to other gods, obey other kings, and adhere to other customs.

And so the children of Israel, and after them the children of Christ, went out and massacred without mercy, men, women, and children, made slaves of the others, and took the "promised" land away from them in Palestine in ancient times, and in Peru or Pennsylvania or elsewhere in modern times. And when all the dastardly deeds were done, they assembled under the leadership of their priest and gave praise and thanks to God and his only beloved Son, Hallelujah and Hosannah!

How false their teachings! And how false the teachings of the biologists. Human warfare is NOT biological warfare. Untold trillions of animals are not killers at all. And those who kill, do it because their parents have taught them to do so. Besides, a wolf kills a sheep only when it is hungry. But Germans killed Frenchmen, Russians, Poles, Jews and others, NOT because they were hungry. Hungry wolves will never kill their fellow-wolves, even when starving. But Germans have killed Fellow-Germans, Russians have killed Fellow-Russians, Frenchmen have killed Fellow-Frenchmen in civil wars fought among themselves. The cause was usually an abstract concept, expressed in abstract words about religion, language, politics, and a host of other isms, brought forth by a host of rabble rousers who wanted above all things - THEY above all things, as rulers of all people. And their lackeys in the schools and the churches have faithfully supported the spoilers of peace, because of the spoils which came their way and their pockets.

No, N o, N O! Human warfare is NOT biological warfare. Human warfare is an entirely different phenomenon. The decisive difference can be stated as follows:

Biological warfare is the hunt for food from other species

Human warfare is the hunt for destruction of the same species

The difference is tremendous. And what makes it so horrible is, that the soldiers sent out to kill, have no desire to kill and be killed. The devilish device which turns their minds into monsters is language, used deliberately to make them killers against the natural ethics which operates within them, as it operates in all animals.

And language is used by the priests of a new creed, the creed of man, anthropos. Their crime is the more damnable, because it is based not on religious fairy tales but on scientific reasoning and research. I am speaking of:-

THE "RACE" OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Professor Ashley Montagu, the rebel anthropologist, published some years ago his sensational evidence that man is ethically lower than the animals. What have zoologists said to it? Nothing. They usually smile at outsiders who venture into their field. What have anthropologists done about it? After all, the study of man is their business. Why is man ethically lower than the animals? There must be a cause! If the cause can be found and eliminated, then - incredible hope - human warfare could perhaps be eliminated. What an exciting and promising field of research!

But Montagu's colleagues did nothing. They ignored him. We have heard of the excuses of the experts who are confronted with a new theory, a new evidence. How easy to refute everything with words. Words are the most versatile of scoundrels, used by the users to keep up their theories, which keeps them in clover.

But words are worse. Sometimes they turn against their masters and turn their minds. And the words used by the anthropologists have befuddled their minds. The result was, and still is: catastrophe on a world-wide scale.

The teachers of words, the linguists maintain that usually different words mean different things. Just ask them the difference between freedom and liberty, brotherhood and fraternity, foreword and preface, etc., etc., and watch them going into a lather explaining the difference, however so subtle. But there is none. Freedom, brotherhood, and foreword are the Teutonic words for their Romance counterparts liberty, fraternity and preface. Only the linguists create artificial differences in meaning, no matter how trivial.

What is the difference between a man from Mayfair and one from Whitechapel? What is the difference between a Londoner and a Glaswegian? A triviality in speech. What is the difference between a Londoner and a Parisian, a Hottentot and a Kaffir, a German and a Jew? Again trivialities. We can take a bright boy from a backward Kaffir tribe, and bring him up in a Western university town, and he may become a renowned scholar, a successful engineer, a good doctor, a well-educated, well-behaved citizen.

The differences between different human tribes are slight; a different dialect, a different taboo, a different skin colour, a different shape of the nose or the buttocks - trivialities. But for the anthropologists these differences are most important. They mean a professorship, salary, security and some jolly good time with natives on a sunny South Sea island. There they measure their skulls, record their singsong, fairy tales and taboos, and then come back with sensational theories of superior and inferior races. They deliberately fail to see the unifying laws which unite all humanity. Instead, they divide and subdivide humanity into races and sub-races. And because of this, they have made their greatest blunder in following the biologists's theories.

The biologists say that man - through evolution - evolved from the animals. And evolution goes on - right now. And believe it or not, some anthropologists had the temerity to proclaim that the division into Englishmen and Scotsmen,

Welsh and Irish, Frenchmen and Spaniards, Kaffirs and Hottentots, Germans and Jews is simply the continuation of evolution of homo sapiens into different "species" of man. Hence human warfare is biological warfare after all.

This catastrophic theory is the scientific basis for race riots, human warfare and genocide (the extermination of whole groups of people). This disastrous and fallacious theory has been preached by German Nazi anthropologists, and practised by their pupils Hitler and his henchmen. It seems obvious that a Pole is not a German, and a German is not a Jew. Hence a German Jew or Jewish German must be some sort of bad racial interbreeding. What this world needs are purely bred Germans - and into the gaschambers with Jews, Gypsies, Poles and other inferior races.

I remember my horror when I was led into the anthropological workshop of Dachau concentration camp. They took various pictures of me. They made plaster masks of others. The walls were covered with such pictures and masks with descriptions of the various races among the German people - good races from the North, and bad races from the Mediterranean - good only to be exterminated.

In Nuremberg we hanged Hitler's henchmen. We should have charged also the scientific instigators of those mass crimes - the anthropologists of all nations. They should be brought before an international court and the criminal falsehood of their race theories exposed and exploded. Their theory of superior and inferior races createshavoc in all countries where a slight difference in speech, in skin colour, in beliefs, lead to animosity, abuse, then to race riots and civil wars.

In desperation, Ashley Montagu, the black sheep of anthropologists, wrote a desperate book (10). Knowing that his colleagues might not even bother to read it, he put his desperate cry right into the title. It reads:

"RACE - MAN'S MOST DANGEROUS MYTH"

But he remained a crier in the wilderness of professorial theories. They won't admit that they have taught false and most dangerous theories all the time.

And so we see that the lunacy of the biologists has led to a super lunacy of the anthropologists. They have provided the scientific basis and "explanation" for the continuous mass killings between the different "species" of man, Germans against Frenchmen, Christians against Moslems, Egyptian Arabs against Yemen Arabs, red Russians against white Russians, redder Russians against whiter Americans, and so on, and so on with all the other "species" of man who are locked for thousands of years in deadly combat on the battlefields of mankind, thanks to the teachers and preachers of mankind.

But a more dangerous situation has arisen. Each "species" in trying to win against the other "species" has perfected deadlier weapons with quicker and deadlier firepower. But for the generals it isn't quick enough. "Give us more fire power!" they cry in desperation. Their explosives chemists and weapon technologists work overtime. Machine guns and quick-firing howitzers,

multibarrel rockets and missiles, carpet bombings and saturation bombings - all kill much too slow, too slow, too slow!

And so the gods of science have been called in, the men who contemplate the outermost of space and the innermost of atoms - the physicists. And they have perfected the atomic bomb, and the hydrogen bomb, and work is going on on the cobalt bomb and the neutron bomb. And they are telling mankind that hundreds of millions of men, women and children will die in a flash, will be incinerated in a blaze of light, "Brighter Than A Thousand Suns", as the title of one glorifying book goes. Already the havoc created by these super lunatics is catastrophic. Millions of parents and their children have become nervous wrecks. They go to bed never sure whether they will be still alive in the morning. What's the use of bringing up children, of trying to be God-fearing and honest, when the very next minute an idiot in Washington or Moscow may press a button by mistake or misunderstanding and everything will be gon , just everything.

The only people who draw the logical conclusion from all this, are our young boys and girls, the hope and the future of mankind. What's the use? they cry, tomorrow we may all be dead. Let's have some fun before we die. And so they have some fun, harmless fun with music beats and beatniks, and harmful fun with beating and killing harmless people for the sheer thrill of the kill.

Very well then, let's have a hard look at the men who make the atomic bombs. Let me show you that they are not only lunatics, but liars too. I am a research chemist. Let me prove to you that their most important atomic device is not the reactor, not the moderator, not the generator, not the detonator - but the exaggerator.

And let me prove to you that there is more ethics in the atoms which build one single living cell, than there is in all the churches of Christendom, of Judadom, of Buddhadom, of Shintodom, of Islamdom, and all the other doms which thrive on the religion of fear and doom.

For proving that there is ethics in atoms, I shall call upon one of the most celebrated medical biologists of our age, a Nobel prize winner, but alas - he too a crier in the wilderness like the other criers Reiser and Chisholm, Montagu and Lorenz. His name is Alexis Carell.

END OF SECOND PART (to be continued)