

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXV.—No. 25

SUNDAY, JUNE 20, 1915

PRICE TWOPENCE

The only medicine for suffering, crime, and all other
evils of mankind, is wisdom.—T. H. HOXLEY.

Natural Morality.

JEAN-MARIE GUYAU was born on October 28, 1854. At the age of twenty his health broke down. For the rest of his short life—he died at thirty-three—he was more or less an invalid, residing on the shores of the Mediterranean. His first work was written at the early age of nineteen, and was "crowned" by the Academy of Moral and Political Science. It was a careful study of the Utilitarian moralists from Epicurus to the school of Bentham, and was afterwards expanded into two separate treatises. His pen was very active during the time allowed him to think and write. Amongst the several books he published were three which have been translated into English. The principal of these, Guyau's masterpiece, is the *Irreligion of the Future*. We reviewed it at considerable length, in the pages of *Progress*, on its first appearance in French. The English translation, which is ridiculously expensive, was published very long ago. *Education and Heredity*, translated by W. J. Greenstreet, was published in the "Contemporary Science Series" in 1891. Then came a translation of Guyau's chief ethical treatise by Gertrude Kapteyn. This remarkable writer is therefore accessible to English readers who wish to master his leading ideas.

Guyau was something more than a philosopher, in the ordinary meaning of the word. He wrote a little volume of verses that proved him to be a genuine poet. This aspect of his genius gives a delightful tone to his prose writings. The literary flavor of every page distinguishes him from the common run of writers on philosophy. He is never at a loss for appropriate and illuminating imagery. And the result is not only charming, but stimulating. Guyau's appeal is not merely to the intellect, which he does not undervalue, but to the whole mind, including the imagination, which gives wings to the intellect, and changes plodding into soaring.

Let us take an illustration, almost at haphazard. Guyau has been speaking of self-sacrifice as often the highest assertion of life, while apparently its negation. One moment of your life may be so intense and noble that all the rest may seem colorless and empty.

"There are hours in which the intensity of life is so great that, placed in balance with the whole possible series of years, those hours will turn the scale. One passes three days in climbing to a high summit of the Alps; one finds that the short moment passed on the white summit, in the great calm of the sky, is worth these three days of fatigue. There are also moments in life when we seem to be on the mountain-top—when we soar; compared with these moments everything else becomes indifferent."

Scores, perhaps hundreds of such similes, may be found in this little volume. Guyau reasons like a mathematician and writes like a poet.

But before we go further let us say a few words about the English translation. Here and there we have marked a bit of slipshod, but on the whole the

work is admirably well done. It might have been a little more idiomatic with advantage. Now and then the French phrase is transplanted rather than translated into English. But the author's meaning always seems adequately conveyed; and, after all, that is the point of greatest importance.

One-third of Guyau's book consists of an elaborate Introduction, in which he discusses the current metaphysics of morality. Optimism, he asserts, is really based upon religious ideas. God is looking after the affairs of the universe, and everything must be for the best. Even if they appear to be otherwise, there is the doctrine of immortality to supply the explanation. What is crooked now will be put straight hereafter, what is confused will be made orderly, what is dark will be made clear. Death brings the solution of all mysteries. Yes, says Guyau, but is it not a fact, after all, that God is little more than the hypothetical guarantee of this very immortality?

"In reality, humanity cares little enough about God; not one martyr would have sacrificed himself for that recluse of the skies. What was looked for in him was the power to make us immortal. Man has always been wanting to scale the heavens, and he cannot do it quite alone. He has invented God in order that God may stretch out a hand to him; next he attached himself in love to the divine Savior. But if to-morrow one were to say to the four hundred millions of Christians, 'There is no God; there is only a paradise, a man-Christ, a virgin mother, and saints,' they would very quickly be consoled."

The ethical vice of optimism is that it encourages supineness, content, and callousness. If everything is for the best, the passion for reform is both blasphemous and ridiculous. Pessimism is as false as optimism, for the persistence of life proves that it contains a balance of satisfaction. Nevertheless, the pessimist may well be more moral than the optimist. He rebels against the evils of life, and if he cannot hope to make it happy he may try to make it less miserable. The truth lies in the third hypothesis of the indifference of nature. Man gives her an aim, conceived from his own wishes. But she has no aim. She is infinite and inexhaustible. Nothing is fixed, all is fluid. Man is but one of her productions. The time was when he was not, and the time is coming when he will not be. She existed without him once, and she will exist without him again. It is useless to say "Conform to nature." We do not know what this nature is. What we are sure of is her indifference to man's aims and aspirations. Yet there is such a thing as natural morality, in the sense of an ethic based upon the laws and conditions of human life.

Guyau's sketch of this natural morality—without religious obligation or metaphysical sanction—is a fine performance. The reader may not find it convincing; he must find it suggestive. Guyau is a Utilitarian in the sense that he believes morality to be purely social in its origin and development. But he denies that human activity is exercised for the sake of happiness. "Life," he says, "unfolds and expresses itself in activity because it is life. In all creatures pleasure accompanies, much more than it provokes, the search after life. Before all we must live; enjoyment comes after." Life becomes moral by an inevitable necessity as it intensifies and expands. It has a power of fecundity as well as of self-preservation. This finds its first outlet in genera-

tion. Then follows a fecundity of intellect, of sensibility, of emotion, and of will; and all this is impossible except under the forms of sociability. Finally, ideas of ethical possibility arise, and these necessarily tend to realise themselves. They become psychological forces. "I ought, therefore I will," is a less potent formula than "I can, therefore I must." One is always impelled to fulfil the possibilities of one's nature.

Guyau is rigorously logical. Dismissing the idea of duty, he discovers its equivalent in the forces of life. Not only is the most intense and energetic man in the main the most sociable man, but human beings love risk as well as enjoyment; and this, we may remark in passing, is at the root of a great deal of gambling, which is too generally supposed to spring merely from a desire to obtain other people's money. There is a certain charm to strong natures in danger. It calls forth their energies and capacities. It makes them live intensely, and intense life is always a delight. Guyau observes that intrepidity and self-sacrifice, even in the face of the final risk of death, is "not a mere negation of self and of personal life; it is this life itself raised into sublimity." Everything, in short, which unites the individual to his species, and makes him subserve its interests, has its root in nature, and is susceptible of a rational explanation.

Dealing with the *penal* side of morality, Guyau remarks that punishment sprang originally from the useful animal instinct of self-defence, which took the form of attack upon aggression. A caress elicits a caress. A bite provokes a bite. Retaliation is at bottom a sound instinct. When a boy says, "He hit me first," he gives what for him is an excellent reason. But when intelligence comes to the aid of instinct, we learn that retaliation is a useless expenditure of force. We content ourselves with simple defence, and we even become capable of pitying the offender. Crime should therefore be dealt with in a social spirit. We should treat it as we now treat leprosy or insanity. "Charity for all men," Guyau says, "whatever may be their moral, intellectual, or physical worth, should be the final aim to be pursued even by public opinion." Humanity must not follow the bad example of Christianity, and set up a social doctrine of grace and election. God, if he exist, only damns himself in damning a sinner. From his height the outcasts should never be anything but unfortunates. The very heart of morality is pity or compassion. Higher than any Western prayer (we may add) is the great Eastern prayer: "O God, be merciful to the wicked. Thou hast already been merciful to the good."

G. W. FOOTE.

[Reprinted from an old number of the *Freethinker* and probably interesting to a new body of readers.]

Current Christianity.

ONE of the religious weeklies dealt recently with the reasons given by various people for the declining membership of the Churches. It had no explanation of its own to offer, but it pointed out that the reasons given neutralised each other. There is no denying the truth of this. One man says that the decline is due to a departure from the "old Gospel"; another puts it down to the preaching being old-fashioned and out of date. On the one hand, we hear there is too little of the social element in the preaching; on the other, that there is too much. Others talk vaguely about the general indifference to religion, or to the "Materialism" of the age; although, as the article referred to said, preachers in every age have been busy with exactly the same complaint. The only clear and certain thing is that people are drifting away from Christianity.

And in all this the vital point is quite overlooked. Beliefs—whether social or religious—if they are to possess the note of vitality, must spring from current life, and in some way or other receive confirmation

in daily experience. If we go back far enough, we find that of all beliefs, religious beliefs are the ones most firmly held. There is nothing that man then stands more in fear of than his gods; nothing he dreads more than their displeasure. He needs no priests to teach him religion; that is forced on him by the general environment—the function of the priest being that of interpreter of the will of the gods. Under such conditions, religious beliefs are not absurd; they are simply untrue. One no more laughs at a tribe of savages trembling before their gods than one laughs at a child's belief in Santa Claus or fairyland. Absurdity attaches itself to religion when it no longer has any support from the intellect. Then religious beliefs are not merely untrue; they are, in addition, ridiculous, and one laughs at them exactly as one would laugh at an adult who shared the child's belief in the reality of fairyland.

Earlier generations could be sincere about their religious beliefs because there was little or nothing in the intellectual environment with which they were in flagrant contradiction. Two or three centuries ago it was still possible for an educated and intelligent man to profess Christian beliefs without a number of dishonoring reservations and qualifications. If the actual facts in support of religion were not always so strong as they might be, still there was not at hand a mass of positive knowledge with which it was in positive antagonism. There was uncompromising bigotry, torture for heresy, and the sacrifice of much that might have made life better. But there was at least sincerity. Even the deadly blight of seventeenth century Puritanism possessed this quality. And one could hate the creed while still retaining one's respect for the man. Where opposite opinions are held with sincerity, both victor and vanquished are the better for their conflict.

But to-day Christianity is rapidly becoming an impossible creed for intellectual men and women with honest inclinations. I am, of course, referring to Christianity proper, and not to any of the refined ethico-sociological articles that do duty as such. There is not one of the orthodox Christian doctrines that can now stand serious examination, and all intelligent Christians know it. The whole of modern science is in direct contradiction to the cosmic theory upon which historic Christianity was based. Its heaven has vanished into infinite space, its hell earth has disappeared, its hell has ceased to terrify, and awakens nothing but disgust. If a Freethinker cites these things, he is told that they are not Christianity; he is insulting Christians and caricaturing their beliefs. Well, but they, with the belief in miracles and in prayer, were all part and parcel of orthodox Christianity; and if people do not believe them, by what moral right do they continue to call themselves Christians?

There is a constant complaint both in England and America that men of recognised ability and worth will not enter the ministry. How can one expect them to? Consider their position. A clergyman of position said the other day that in the present crisis the country stood sadly in need of prayer. I do not believe that things are so critical as that would imply; but whether or no, it is certain that prayers will not help. Whether all the clergy-men in this country pray or curse will not make the slightest difference to the course of the War. Men will, guns will, shells will, money will; but prayers will have as much influence as they would have on the course of an earthquake. Now, I do not say merely that the majority of the clergy ought to know this as well as I do; I say deliberately that the vast majority do know it, and know also that their exhortation to prayer is a piece of senseless mummery.

How does a clergyman excuse himself for saying prayers for this, or that, or the other? Prayer, he will tell you, is not offered up now in the belief that it will effect any alteration in the course of nature, but in the belief that it has an elevating influence on the mind. If one is in trouble, prayer soothes; if one

is in difficulty, prayer comforts—if we believe in it. So will a quack medicine cure—if one believes in it. There is much virtue in the "if." And what is all this but an elaborate self-deception? Would people ever have prayed unless they had believed that some alteration would be brought to pass in the order of things by their prayers? And how long will people keep on praying once they realise that it is no more than a kind of spiritual dram-drinking, and without any influence whatever on external nature? This is not honest conviction that one has to fight; it is a huge, informal conspiracy of humbug.

Current Christianity makes but a small appeal to conviction. Its main appeal is to self-interest. To one class its appeal is to conserve class interests, to keep the "lower classes" in order, to act as a curb on revolutionary tendencies. To the shop-keeping class it appeals as a business investment. It offers mediocrity the satisfaction of a position in life, such as could not be gained in any other direction with similar qualifications. And to yet another class it promises an alleviation of miseries, which it has played no small part in creating and perpetuating. Rich and poor are thus bribed into support; and behind all is the apathy and conservatism of large masses of people to whom everything established is treated as inevitable and immovable. It may be a matter of dispute whether we run our business on Christian lines, or our Christianity on business lines, but there is no doubt that a great deal of current Christianity was well summed up by Ruskin in the sentence, "If engineers could build a tunnel to hell, Christians would invest their money in it, and would stop building churches for fear of lowering the dividends."

So much of Christianity as is kept alive owes its existence very largely to these two sets of forces—self-interest on the one side, and indifference on the other. If only we had sincere and reasoned conviction to fight, the task would be easy, and the issue soon decided. And of the two classes, the greater danger is presented by the latter. It is the indifference to all the social issues involved in the fight against superstition that makes this class so great a danger. There is really no such thing as neutrality in what the *Times* calls the "War of Thought." Assistance may be active or passive, but everyone assists one side or the other. The man who is not fighting superstition is helping it. His very inactivity is so much in its favor. The great call is for everyone to decide in one way or another. Religious beliefs cannot be set on one side as of no consequence. Either they are of great value, and deserve far more support than they get, or they are a great danger, and the sooner they are swept on one side the better.

The present position of Christianity offers nothing new in the history of religion. In all probability it is a phase that has overtaken all religious systems and ended in convention. Religions commence in conviction and end in convention. It is not without significance that all religions have placed the golden age in the past. For the past is the golden age of the gods, as the future is the golden age of man. Religions belong to the past, they are rooted in the past—in past habits of life, old modes of thought, outworn conceptions of the universe. This is not alone the reason why religion places its golden age in the past, it is also the reason why all over the world religious systems cling to old modes of speech, of dress, and ideas. It is all an expression of the general law that seeks by every possible means to perpetuate old customs. It is all an expression of the general law that ideas, like organisms, must have a suitable environment if they are to live. That, in spite of all that is done, religious belief steadily weakens, is proof of the utter unsuitability of religious ideas to a really civilized environment.

The decay of religion is really an expression of social evolution. Universally, religion decays as civilization develops. This is not a phenomenon of modern times, or of one religion. It is characteristic of all times, and affects all creeds. The decay of religion is a fact, and an inevitable fact. Nothing can prevent it ultimately, although the rate of decay

may be hastened or retarded. Evolution proceeds consciously or unconsciously. Only it would be well for all Freethinkers to realise that the conscious direction of social forces may do in a few years what it may otherwise take generations to accomplish.

C. COHEN.

A New View of the War?

FOR supernaturalists the problem of the ages has been how to justify the ways of God with man, and it is no nearer solution to-day than it was four, six, or ten thousand years ago. Even the Bible declares that his ways are in the deep and past tracing out. There was a profound conviction that they were righteous, but nobody could show wherein their righteousness consisted. The author of the Book of Job tried his ingenious hand upon this old problem, and had to confess that it was altogether beyond him. They who are known as the men of God are obliged to admit that the question of Providence is an insoluble mystery. In a sermon, published in the *Christian Commonwealth* for June 9, the Rev. R. J. Campbell is humble enough to speak thus:—

"Probably those are right who say that in the last resort the problem of evil is insoluble; I have never yet met, and never expect to meet in this world, with a full and satisfactory explanation of the reason why sin and suffering are permitted in a Divinely ordered creation; but surely the words of my text [Isa. xlv. 7] might, without presumption or irreverence, be regarded as a finger-post pointing the way to a working faith on the subject. They are the explicit declaration that, apart from the will of God, we should never have known anything about the existence of evil under any of its aspects; he needed it or it would not be here."

Let us contrast that extract with the text upon which it is founded: "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things." Carefully note the contradiction. God is made to say, "I create evil," but Mr. Campbell improves upon that by saying, "No, he merely permits it, or only creates the conditions under which it becomes possible." Before proceeding any further, let us give another quotation from this sermon:—

"And what is it all for? Why has such a terrible experience had to become ours? Once again let me say that there is something here which, as all the sages of old have taught us, is unfathomable to human wisdom. I can but show you that which lies along the foreshore of the boundless ocean of the life divine and eternal."

Now the decks are cleared for action. The first noteworthy fact is that Mr. Campbell admits the insolubility of the problem of evil and suffering. This, he adds, has been taught by all the sages of old. If there be a God of infinite love and power, nothing can be more incontestable than that he "moves in a mysterious way his wonders to perform." His movements are so mysterious that they cannot be traced at all. The initial blunder, then, is to assume, without the slightest evidence, the existence of such an incomprehensible performer. What proof is there that any event whatsoever, or any state of things, is an expression of a supernatural will? Mr. Campbell confesses his inability to show his hearers anything but "that which lies along the foreshore of the boundless ocean of the life divine and eternal"; but we positively deny his ability to do even that. He does not know, nobody else knows, that there exists a boundless ocean of divine and eternal life, and in his total ignorance of such an existence it is sheer folly, it is even overweening conceit, on his part to imagine that he can show anybody anything which lies along the foreshore of such an imaginary ocean, because he has never seen anything himself. So far as the present discourse is concerned, he utterly fails to make the least revelation. What he gives us is Platonism pure and simple, or a metaphysical theory

insusceptible of verification. Let us look at it for a moment with the eye of reason.

We readily recognise the theoretical fascination of Platonism, as poetically stated by its author, but are by no means blind to its obvious inconsistencies. Mr. Campbell, ignoring the fountain-head of the theory, quotes from a modern book, the very title of which he has forgotten, but which he ventures to call *The Dual Pathway*. According to this work, two spirits, inhabiting a perfectly flawless heaven, conversed together concerning the nature of the life they were living there. Conscious of the limitations under which they labored, they both yearned for an indefinable something which was not then in their possession, save potentially. They had no idea whatever what it was, but they were restless under the urge of some unknown desire. In their ambitious uneasiness these two unique spirits elected to be born in the flesh on earth, and leave behind them the glories of the heavenly life. We much prefer Plato's own statement of the theory, which materially differs from this of the half-forgotten *Dual Pathway*; but the point of interest is that the two ambitious spirits became, by their own choice, incarnate on the earth, "and grew up remembering nothing of their former existence, and not recognising one another" (the italics are ours). They found themselves, poor things, "confined in bodies which hampered and repressed them at every turn, and at times developed desires and tendencies which warred successfully against their spiritual ideals." Unfortunately, one of them chose, or had thrust upon him, a body in which there lurked a congenital craving for strong drink, to which he, unhappily, became a wretched victim. The other had a somewhat better luck, though he, too, had to struggle against manifold temptation, and was able eventually to be of service to his fallen brother.

We fear that Plato would be heartily ashamed of such a miserable caricature of his pet philosophy, were he to know of it; but the outcome is practically the same whether we contemplate the hypothesis as delineated in the original picture or in this caricature. Man, as we know him, Mr. Campbell informs us, is a spiritual being, conscious of the conflict of opposing elements in his own soul, and subject to the assaults of sorrow and affliction from outside. In other words, dropping Platonism, man is a spirit encased in a material body, endowed with freedom of choice in thought and action, and, therefore, capable, by the free exercise of his own will, to set the will of his Maker at defiance. Now, then, Mr. Campbell's theory of man, half Platonic and half Biblical, comes to this, that "we can and do ally ourselves with evil in such a way as to throw ourselves into opposition to the will of God and mar his holy purposes. Then this oracle adds:—

"And he lets us do it, for to do any other would be to reduce us to automata, and to do away with the educative value of the struggle with unideal conditions to which we find ourselves exposed.....The point of importance is that God is himself the originator of the conditions under which the misuse of the power he delegates is possible."

Now, strangely enough, this curiously self-contradictory doctrine of man has been invented in defence of the moral character of God. As a whole, it is not found in the Bible, nor in the orthodox Church of any age, but is an illogical mixture of Platonic Paganism and Christian Arminianism. That it relieves God of all responsibility for the evil, sorrow, and suffering in the world is the veriest of delusions. Take the War as an example. Mr. Campbell regards the War as an evil, for which man, setting himself up in rebellion against God, is responsible; but this is a fatal fallacy, because God, being responsible for man, must logically and ethically be held responsible for all man's doings. Consequently, he is directly accountable for the War. Mr. Campbell admits that he permits it, as he permits all other evils, and that he is the originator of the conditions under which it has come to pass; "he needed it or it would not be here." It is one of the many ugly ways by which God fulfils himself in creation. Like all other forms

of chastening, war for the present seemeth not to be joyous but grievous, nevertheless afterward it will yield the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them who are being exercised thereby. How comforting a doctrine, especially when we bear in mind that up to the end of May the British casualties alone amounted to the grand total of 258,069, upwards of 50,000 of whom were killed. Fancy anyone out of a lunatic asylum saying that a God of justice and truth needed to inflict such a horribly bloody baptism upon his wayward children, or he would not be doing it!

No, the ways of God with man are not justifiable on any terms whatever. That is why the War is manufacturing Atheists at such a high rate. According to the Bishop of London, the men at the Front are turning to God and the faith of their childhood; but another Bishop admits, with deep sorrow, that at home the War is turning multitudes away from God who formerly were on the Lord's side. Christendom, and a goodly slice of Heathendom, have become a hell hotter far than the one depicted by the priests of the Middle Ages, with the object, as are told, of bringing the people to the feet of the Prince of Peace. Such a state of things is wholly inexplicable on the assumption that Omnipotent Love occupies the throne of the Universe. Platonism breaks down, and Christianity is entirely discredited in the presence of this bloody contest. And yet the ministers of the Gospel of peace, apparently oblivious to all these, devote most of their Sunday sermons to a delirious glorification of the War. Dr. Hugh Black, of New York, who is drawing such enormous crowds to the City Temple on Sunday evenings, is described in the *British Weekly* as having "shown himself a great war preacher." Just think of it, an ambassador of the God of peace, excelling himself as an advocate of war. Time-serving is now the path that leads to popularity, while fidelity to the teaching of the Gospel Jesus is rewarded with persecution.

J. T. LLOYD.

A Jester's Grave.

"The witty and the tender Hood."—LANDOR.

"A most loyal, affectionate, and upright soul."—TRACKER.

"Le rire c'est le propre de l'homme."—RABELAIS.

"The humanities are eternal."—CHRISTOPHER NORTH.

AMID thousands of unloved and obscure graves in Kensal Green Cemetery, is one with the inscription "He sang the Song of the Shirt." This is the last resting place of Thomas Hood, who was buried there seventy years ago, and whose neglected grave has been restored recently through the disinterestedness of an admirer.

When Voltaire sat down to write a book on English Poetry, he dedicated his first chapter to "Difference of Taste in Nations." A critic of our day might well find it necessary to expatiate on the difference of taste in generations. Changes of taste are always taking place, and occasionally we are embarrassed by their recurrence. One morning we wake up and find the gods of our youthful idolatry treated with contempt, and sometimes consigned to the dustbin. This week, for instance, we noticed in a popular newspaper that Thomas Hood was no longer read. We put down the periodical in which this opinion was printed and thought of the *Martin* Corellis, the *Hall Caines*, and the *Guy Boothbys* who had dispossessed the kind-hearted jester, who was once acclaimed as one of the literary glories of England.

Thomas Hood was born in 1799, and his life of brave humor closed nearly forty-six years later. The larger part of it was a constant struggle against ill-health, which was, however, powerless to affect the gaiety of his disposition. "Here lies one who spent more blood and made more puns than any man living," was the epitaph he proposed, jestingly, for himself. But in that short life he won his way to the heart of the public, for he had a sure touch upon

the laughter and tears of humanity. The high-water mark of his praise is in the lines of one greater than himself, that "unsubduable old Roman," Walter Savage Landor:—

"Jealous, I own it, I was once—
That wickedness I here renounce.
I tried at wit—it would not do;
At tenderness—that failed me too;
Before me on each path there stood
The witty and the tender Hood."

Of Hood's earlier days but little is known. His father was a minor novelist, whose works are now forgotten, so that his distinguished son was born, as he expressed it, "with ink in his blood." Hood was sent as a lad into a counting-house in the City, was withdrawn through illness, and after some idle years to the purer air of Scotland, was apprenticed to an engraver. His literary career began in 1821, when he became assistant editor of the *London Magazine*, which brought him into contact with a brilliant band of writers, amongst whom were Charles Lamb, Hazlitt, De Quincey, and Barry Cornwall. Like John Hamilton Reynolds, whose sister he married, Hood fell under the influence of Keats. His earlier poems were published in the *London Magazine* up to 1825, and afterwards in the various Annuals, "Forget-
Me-Not," "Keepsakes," which were then popular.

Hood's first appearance in motley was in 1826, when he published the first series of *Whims and Oddities*. The critics took offence at his puns, for his style was novel. His book was full of witty word play, and it is easy to conceive, as Hood said in his address to the second edition, "How gentlemen with one idea were perplexed with a double meaning." However, the public, like *Oliver Twist*, asked for more, and the book reached a fourth edition. "Come what may," said Hood, "this little book will now leave four imprints behind it—and a horse could do so more."

Hood then threw off his motley, donned his singing robes, and issued "The Plea of the Midsummer Parades." This was destined to prove his only volume of serious verse, for he had a reputation as a jester, and the public declined to listen to him in any other capacity. Hood had his living to make, and he turned with a sigh and once more put on the cap and bells.

The famous series of "Comic Annuals" lasted for about ten years. They delighted and inspired everyone like an ozoned breeze fresh from the ocean. In spite of great provocation, Hood seldom or never wrote a bitter word, though that he could wield the lash is amply indicated in his "Ode to Rae Wilson." This man was a Scotch Presbyterian, the writer of the most contentious books of travel, and in one of his volumes he attacked Hood on the ground of his flippant allusions to the Bible. Hood turned and rent him in the ode, and his unique power of using wit to serious purpose never found happier expression:—

"Well!—be the graceless lineaments contest!
I do enjoy this bounteous, beauteous earth:
And dote upon a jest
No solemn sanctimonious face I pull,
Nor think I'm pious when I'm only bilious—
Nor study in my sanctum supercilious
To frame a Sabbath Bill or forge a Bull.
I pray for grace—repent each sinful act—
Ferne, but underneath the rose, my bible:
And love my neighbor far too well, in fact,
To call and twit him with a godly tract
My heart ferments not with the bigot's leaven,
All creeds I view with toleration thorough,
And have a horror of regarding heaven
As anybody's rotten borough."

The last two lines have become a familiar quotation. "A man may cry 'Church! Church!' at every word, With no more piety than other people— A daw's not reckoned a religious bird Because it keeps a-cawing from a steeple." Smile as he might, Hood had much to contend against. Family troubles, chronic ill-health, and the eternal want of pence" harassed him to the point of endurance. Like many literary men, he was unbusinesslike, and the failure of a firm in which he

was involved brought him to the verge of ruin. He refused, however, to become bankrupt, and retired to the Continent for economy. Unfortunately, the climate was against him, and too soon came—

"The blind fury with the abhorred shears
And slit the thin-spun life."

Overwork, anxiety, and ill-health had broken a weak constitution, and heart disease declared itself. Hood was in harness almost to the end. Like Heine on his mattress grave, he jested about his disease. "The doctor declares that anatomically my heart is lower hung than usual—but what of that? The more need to keep it up!" His illness made him woefully thin, and when his wife was applying a poultice to him he said, "My dear! There's plenty of mustard but precious little meat."

He died courageously as he had lived, and his career was one of the minor tragedies of literature. His popularity as a humorist prevented him from following his truest as well as his highest faculty—that of a poet.

The bulk of his work is simply excellent journalism, but his puns were perfect:—

"The parson told the sexton
And the sexton tolled the bell."

Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg is as readable as Byron's *Don Juan*, and will always merit attention by its astonishing display of high spirits and fertility of invention:—

"Poor Peggy hawks nosegays from street to street
Till—think of that, who find life so sweet!—
She hates the smell of the roses."

Hood possessed the qualities of a real poet. When he laid aside his puns and pranks, and put off his cap and bells, and sang from his heart, all English-speaking men and women listened with tears and wonder. Lyrics such as *The Song of the Shirt*, *The Bridge of Sighs*, *Eugene Aram*, and the song beginning, "I remember, I remember, the house where I was born," are assured of immortality. His finest poems have found their way into every anthology and every heart. What depth and tenderness there is in his *Bridge of Sighs*, telling of the death of a prostitute:—

"Alas for the rarity
Of Christian charity
Under the sun!
Oh, it was pitiful!
Near a whole city full,
Home she had none."

One recalls Thackeray's touching tribute to Hood, "A most loyal, affectionate, and upright soul." The kind eyes were often filled with tears, and when the cap and bells were thrown aside, Ariel turned Prospero, and showed in the transformation how antic and irresponsible a spirit Ariel is. It is fitting that on the tomb of this most lovable of jesters should appear the inscription, "He Sang the Song of the Shirt."

MIMNERMUS.

The Fourth Gospel.

THE LOGOS.

IN the days of Papias and his friend John the Presbyter (A.D. 130—150) there arose certain heretical teachers who, sad to relate, led many of the orthodox Christians astray by teaching that the Old Testament god, Yahweh, was neither the creator of the Universe, as stated in Genesis, nor the "father" of Jesus Christ; but that the real creator and father of Jesus was another god—one greater than Yahweh. This heretical doctrine was first taught by Cerinthus and Cerdo (A.D. 135) and later on by Marcion; though some writers place Cerinthus at the end of the first century. Against this pernicious doctrine John the Presbyter addressed the first paragraph of his Gospel—that "according to John"—which he had piously written himself, and presented to the church at Ephesus as the work of John the apostle. This

paragraph commences:—

"In the beginning was the *Logos*, and the *Logos* was with God, and the *Logos* was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made.....And the *Logos* became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father," etc. (John i. 1—3, 14).

The word *logos* in the Greek signifies literally a *word*, and is so translated in the foregoing passage; but it also denotes a saying, discourse, speech, reason, etc. The idea of Jesus being the *logos* or word of God was the result of reasoning on his alleged divinity, and was probably suggested by the account of the Creation in Genesis and by the statement in Proverbs viii. 22—31. In the latter paragraph "Wisdom" is represented as speaking as a person, and saying:—

"Yahweh possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, before ever the earth was.....When he established the heavens, I was there.....when he made firm the skies above.....when he marked out the foundations of the earth; then I was by him as a master workman," etc.

Next, it was called to mind that the Hebrew deity, in creating the world, merely spoke the word, and the thing immediately sprang into existence—"And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." Then it was argued that it was the words spoken that created the world; for if they had not been uttered, nothing would have been created. Again, when God, in Genesis said "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," it was said that the Almighty was speaking to his son Jesus, who was the *Logos* or Word, and that it was the latter who did all the work of creation. Thus we arrive at the first paragraph in the "Gospel of John." Had the writer, however, turned to Job xxxviii. he would have seen that it was not Jesus Christ to whom the Creator was believed to be speaking. In the latter chapter the Almighty says to that much persecuted patriarch:—

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?.....Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened? Or who laid the corner-stone thereof, when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?" (4—7).

In the Septuagint, which was used by the early Christians, the last sentence reads: "when the stars were made, and all my angels praised me with a loud voice." Thus, it was to his angels the Creator was supposed to be talking when he said, "Let us make man in our image"—the god and his angels being naturally conceived as man-shaped. Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) makes the following statements:—

"Now the *Logos* of God is his Son, as I have before said" (1 Apol. 63)—"God begat before all his creatures a Beginning, a certain Rational Power out of himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, then the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and *Logos*" (Dialogue 61).

It is scarcely necessary to say that Justin did not take his "Logos" from the Fourth Gospel: both he and the Presbyter John drew their absurd ideas from Philo, the Jewish Platonist (A.D. 30—50), or from the exponents of his school. The last-named philosopher in one of his works says:—

"For the *Logos* is the image of God by which the whole world was created."

In another place this so-called Jewish philosopher says:—

"Strive earnestly to be fashioned according to God's first begotten *Logos*, the eldest Angel, who is the Archangel bearing many names; for he is called the Beginning, and Name of God, and *Logos*, and the Man according to his image, and the Seer of Israel."

Both Justin and the pseudo-John had some acquaintance with Philo's ridiculous system of distortion, miscalled philosophy, which accounts for the perfect nonsense written by the first and for the "only begotten Son" and the "Logos" of the Fourth Gospel—the latter being esteemed by unthinking Christians "the inspired word of God."

THE CHRISTIAN DEITY.

The first followers of Jesus and the first preachers of the gospel to the Gentiles were Jews who worshiped the god of the Old Testament. The Gentile Christians converted by Paul and his colleagues, and all the early Gentile Churches became worshippers of the same Hebrew deity, and took over the Jewish scriptures, while holding, in accordance with the Pauline teaching, that circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were not binding upon them—both having been finally abolished by the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the Jews. Succeeding generations of Christians, that is to say, the entire orthodox Church, received the same Hebrew scriptures and worshiped the same Jewish deity—the scriptures being regarded as the inspired word of God, and the deity as the creator of the Universe and the "Father" of Jesus Christ. One of their main reasons for accepting the Hebrew scriptures was the belief that those writings were full of "prophecies" referring to their Lord and Savior, Jesus, and they read them almost solely for the purpose of discovering such passages. Later generations of Christians came to believe that the god of the Old Testament was the only real deity, and rejected all other gods as mythical. Hence, from the third century down to the present time, the Hebrew scriptures have been regarded by all Christians as the inspired word of God, the only difference between those writings and the Gospels being that the Old Testament relates to a more ancient and much longer period—the Jewish tribal god, Yahweh, being the deity referred to in both.

This simple historical fact I had thought was known to everyone: but two years ago, or more, I read an article in a weekly newspaper (which shall be nameless) in which the writer flatly denied it. This writer, after denouncing the god of the Old Testament as "an unspeakable monster," and so forth, then went on to say:—

"Imagine the effect of such words in a crowd. Sober, decent but not well informed Methodist hears what I say. He does not even guess what I mean. He thinks I am talking about God—his God.....He does not know that Jahweh is not his God."

The "decent but not well informed Methodist" would certainly think that the writer was referring to his God, and his opinion would be endorsed by the whole Christian Church. The writer of the article mentioned said by way of explanation:—

"There are two Gods in the Bible. One is Jahweh or Jehovah, and the other is 'Our Father which is in heaven.' Jehovah was the savage bogey of a barbarous tribe: the other was a poetical but illogical conception."

Here our "decent but not well informed" writer is in error—hopelessly so. There is but one God in the Bible, though he is named and addressed by various titles. These in the Hebrew Old Testament are: Yahweh (the proper name); El (mighty one); El Shaddai (God Almighty); Elah (god); Eloah (god); Elohim (gods, but applied to Yahweh); Adon (lord, sir, master); Adonai (my lord). In the Greek New Testament the titles are: Theos (god); Kyrios (lord); Pater (father). There is no J in Hebrew; consequently there is no Jahweh. "Jehovah" is a ridiculous mistranslation.

That the name "Yahweh" is not found in the New Testament is easily explained. Some time prior to the Christian era the Jews came to regard the name as too sacred to be pronounced; and so, when reading their scriptures in the Hebrew, instead of uttering the sacred name, they said "Adonai." For the same reason, in the Greek translation called the Septuagint, the name Yahweh was rendered Kyrios—the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew Adon. The Greek version of the Old Testament was used by the New Testament writers, as well as by the early Christian Church. Hence, wherever the god Yahweh is referred to in the New Testament, he is called either "the Lord," or "God," or "Father," as already stated. The following are examples:—

Matt. xxii. 37.—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

Acts iii. 13.—“The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob.....hath glorified his son Jesus,” etc.
 Matt. v. 48.—“Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”

In the first of the foregoing examples both “the Lord” and “God” are Yahweh (see Deut. vi. 5). In the second example the “God” who is stated to be the father of Jesus Christ is Yahweh (see Exod. iii. 6). In the third passage the “Father which is in heaven” is Yahweh (see Gen. xvii. 1; Lev. xix. 2). The title of “Father” was, in fact, copied from the Old Testament, as may be seen by the following extracts:—

1 Chron. xxix. 10, 11.—“Blessed be thou, O Lord, the God of Israel, our Father, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory.....thine is the kingdom, O Lord.”

1 Kings viii. 23, 30 —“O Lord, the God of Israel..... bear thou in heaven thy dwelling place; and when thou hearest, forgive us.”

The first quotation is from a prayer by David; the second from a prayer by Solomon. The words italicised have been utilised by the primitive Gospel writer in making up the “Lord’s Prayer.” In both passages the word translated “Lord” is the Hebrew Yahweh. Moreover, the journalist who has stated that there are “two Gods in the Bible” does not appear to know that the New Testament hangs on the Old. If the latter, with its deity, were thrown overboard, then the four Gospels, deprived of the support they receive from the Old Testament, would soon follow. The Christian clergy know this perfectly well, and for that reason unite to defend attacks upon the older Hebrew scriptures.

As to the atrocities ascribed to Yahweh in the Old Testament, all rational critics know that these are due solely to the Hebrew writers themselves, who quite naturally attributed to their god the barbarous methods employed in their own times. They have represented him as commanding all the brutalities of savage warfare which victorious nations in a semi-barbaric age inflicted on conquered peoples. The writer of the article to which I have referred must have known that the Old Testament god Yahweh was a purely imaginary being. Why, then, such violent aspersions? The only conclusion to be drawn from the atrocities in the Jewish scriptures is that in ancient times the Jews, as a people, were quite as barbarous as any of the surrounding nations. Their tribal deity stands for nothing.

ABRACADABRA.

Acid Drops.

We have received a very courteous letter from the Bishop of Lincoln, from which we take the following:—

“I thank you (if it was your kind thought) for sending me your pamphlet on *Bible and Beer*? I am a Christian Bishop, and an English citizen, and I am an ardent advocate of local veto by the will of the people. But I agree with you in one point, viz.: that a Bible literalist finds little sanction for teetotalism in Scripture. But I believe in progressive morality. I have no mind to argue with you, nor have the time for controversy; but as you have done me the courtesy of sending me your tract, I thought you might possibly care to see the tract of a Christian man who agrees and a democratic prohibitionist.—Believe me, dear Sir, yours faithfully, EDWARD LINCOLN.”

We appreciate the tone of the Bishop’s letter, but he is mistaken in thinking the pamphlet came from us. It was probably taken by some reader of the *Freethinker* who desired the Bishop to see the subject treated from a Freethought point of view.

We observe the Bishop’s candid admission that a Bible literalist finds little sanction for teetotalism in the Scripture. “Literalist” means here one who takes the Bible to mean exactly what it says, and anyone who does that is compelled to give up belief in the Bible as a teacher of teetotalism. And if that is once admitted, everything is admitted. We believe with the Bishop of Lincoln, in progressive morality; but that is only another way of saying that we cannot regard the life of to-day by the teachings of two or three thousand years ago. The truth is, of course, that modern teetotalism finds no sanction whatever in the Bible, and

there is—as Mr. Foote’s pamphlet shows—much in it in praise of strong drink. The Bishop would probably agree with us that the question of teetotalism is essentially a modern one. Our quarrel is, however, with those who seek to found everything that commends itself to the modern mind upon a volume which, in spite of all that may be said on its behalf, carries on its face indisputable evidence of the primitive state of society in which it originated.

The clergy are always bewailing that they have no hold on the working classes. A recent meeting of the National Council of Public Morals, which includes representatives of the Government and fancy religions, was held at the residence of the Duchess of Marlborough. Among the subjects discussed was the morality of soldiers, but the one person who was absent was Thomas Atkins.

The Censorship has provoked caustic comment from journalists. One of the smartest is that in *The Journal of the Institute of Journalists*, which says “under a certain bulletin of the Press Bureau, a journalist would be liable to prosecution for republishing the Sermon on the Mount, since it certainly contained arguments in favor of the making of peace!” A decided hit!

Amongst other funds that have been started is “A National Revival of Family Prayers” Fund, with offices at Russell-square, W.C. One would have thought that the proper way to work this Society would have been to simply pray for what is wanted. But to ask for subscriptions in order to get people to pray is likely enough to make some curse.

Field-Marshal Lord Grenfell says he is convinced that our soldiers are religious at heart. They utter ejaculatory prayers on the battlefield. We are quite willing to credit the latter part of this statement. “Oh, Christ!” is, we believe, quite common when a shell bursts near a body of men. Sometimes it is “Jesus Christ,” and at other times “Good God,” or “My God,” but these ejaculatory prayers are common, and, as Lord Grenfell says, shows how deeply religious our soldiers are. And not only our soldiers, but the home population also. For you need only tread on a man’s toe to bring one of these ejaculatory prayers to the surface. Even the common “Gawd blimey” is a rough and ready illustration of the Englishman’s indestructible belief in the overruling providence of a Heavenly Father.

The Archbishop of Canterbury does not feel sure that there is more ungodliness and infidelity now than at any other time. He thinks we see less religion around us because “there is an increased shyness of utterance about our faith to-day compared with other days.” We congratulate His Grace on finding a new argument wherewith to “buck up” the faithful. We confess that we had quite failed to observe the “shyness” of the average Christian.

If the Bishop of London keeps on as he is doing we feel inclined to devote a column to him with some such heading as “The Bishop Day by Day.” His latest is to tell a congregation he thought “they should thank God that they were allowed to have a bit of danger” in the shape of Zeppelin bombs. We imagine if a Zeppelin were about the Bishop would “duck” pretty lively.

The Leeds City Council has decided to allow boating on Sundays in Roundhay Park, and also to permit donkey-riding. The proposal was strongly—although unsuccessfully—opposed by some of the councillors, who thought the pastimes would keep the youth of the city from Sunday-schools. Perhaps their constituents will, in due course, remind them that their duty is to look after the welfare of the city, not to act as a recruiting agent for the chapels.

The *Church Times* for June 4 rides an absurdly high horse. The last of its Summary Notes is an arrogant protest against a joint service recently held in the parish church of Tonbridge, in commemoration of the anniversary of the late Queen Victoria’s birthday. In this service, the principal parts were taken by a Baptist minister and a Congregational minister, the honor of preaching the sermon falling to the lot of the former. According to our very ably conducted contemporary, the object of such services is “so to accustom people to these occasional fraternisings that, in course of time, they may come to believe that there is no essential difference between a priest and a Dissenting preacher, between the Church and the separated sects.” We beg to inform the *Church Times* that its protest is at once insolent and ludicrous, and that the overbearing, haughty attitude underlying it is largely responsible for the popular indiffer-

ence to the Christian religion. Is not the editor aware that the Anglican Church is itself one of the "separated sects"? Will he tell us what is the "essential difference" between an Anglican clergyman and a Nonconformist minister? Are they not both looked upon as interlopers, and their orders declared invalid, by the Church of Rome? These ecclesiastical rivalries are all very laughable, and prove conclusively that all religious bodies, Rome included, sail under utterly false colors, claiming to be Divine institutions, temples of the Holy Ghost, while, in reality, they are but ingeniously constituted, and more or less cleverly managed, and exceedingly fallible human organisations, without a single trace of divinity about them at all.

Although people are getting more religious, as the clergy constantly assure us, there are little rifts within the lute. The Church Congress is not likely to be held as at first arranged. For this relief much thanks!

"Conscription will lead the way to the higher life," says the Dean of Exeter. If the conscript were killed it might land him in heaven—or the other place. Eh, Mr. Dean?

According to Dean Henson, in a recent sermon at the Temple Church, Christianity is self-condemned as a colossal failure. It comes "so badly out of the European crisis that its services to the highest interests of mankind may well be challenged." We are in complete agreement with Dr. Henson, and have been making precisely the same statement for many years. Our contention is that Christianity has failed simply because it is not true. Will the Dean of Durham be consistent enough to subscribe this also? On what other ground can he reasonably account for the failure? Surely, had Christianity been true, it would have been a glorious success, and there would have been no European crisis.

It is but fair to Dr. Henson, however, to say that he was speaking of "ecclesiastical" Christianity; but does he really think that there is any other? If so, will he be good enough to tell us where it is to be found? We venture to affirm that there has never been any other Christianity than that which the Church advocates; but the versions of it are as numerous as the sects, each one of which claims to be a Divine institution. The situation would be extremely amusing were it not so tragic. Some see only the comedy, and laugh; some the tragedy, and weep; whilst a few realise that comedy and tragedy intermingle in it in about equal quantities, and make it their aim to discredit and annihilate so mischievous a religion.

"God must be patient," says Father Bernard Vaughan, or "he would sweep us all off the earth and set this planet on fire." We quite fail to see what on earth, or in heaven, he need be patient about. The world is his job, not man's. He made it, and said it was very good; and if he now finds that it is not as good as he would have liked it to be, it is as good as he left it—on the whole, perhaps better. Really, it is man who is patient—to an almost asinine degree. God has only to put up with the fruits of his own creation, but man has to be content with it, also with a God who is believed to possess the power to put things straight—and does nothing.

The *Evening News* writes of "God's patience, whilst Father Bernard Vaughan marvels that he doesn't set the world on fire." The yellow pressman ought to be satisfied, Europe is pretty well alight.

Speaking in the House of Commons on the pooling of salaries by the Cabinet, Mr. Pringle, M.P., said the Government "had adopted one of the precepts of the early Christians." He hoped that they might emulate their example in another direction, and that it might be said of them, "By this ye may know that they love one another." Of course, there is always the risk that politicians might emulate another early Christian, and sell one another for pieces of silver.

The new play, "Marie Odile," has aroused some outcry in certain religious circles, principally on account of the chief character, a nun named after the patron-saint of Alsace, having a baby at a convent. Apparently, without the baby all would be well. "Thou shalt not be found out" is still the greatest commandment—for Christians.

June 13 was Hospital Sunday in London, and the *Times* reminded its readers that "contributions given in Church are a mode of expressing thanks to God for blessings vouchsafed to us." Apparently the *Times* thinks it is not enough to give

to a hospital collection for the sake of relieving human suffering, but it considers that in the *Church* the dominant motive should be to make the contribution "a mode of expressing thanks to God for blessings vouchsafed to us." On this point Colonel Ingersoll's views are an enlightening commentary.

"Nothing can be more absurd than the idea that we can do something to please, or displease, an infinite Being. If our thoughts and actions can lessen, or increase, the happiness of God, then, to that extent, God is the slave and victim of man.....Ministers say they teach charity. This is natural. They live on alms. All beggars teach that others should give."

The Rev. T. Rhondda Williams is convinced that the War is a terrible crime against God and humanity; but he maintains that when the horrors of it are fully faced, the ministers of religion "can still turn to the sorrowing hearts of Europe with a message of special consolation." No matter what the circumstances may be, the men of God always put forth that claim. Mr. Williams, however, being a New Theologian, touches that message with the hue of originality, thus:—

"Even the very worst that happens does not really touch the spirit, does not defeat the soul of man, or turn back the purposes of God."

The reverend gentleman has no right to make such a statement, because spirit and soul are purely imaginary entities, concerning which no knowledge is possible. So far as we know, when a man dies, the whole of him dies; and Mr. Williams has absolutely no evidence to the contrary, not even "a hint, a whisper, breathing low."

Mr. Williams cannot endure the "thought of the spirits of the slain falling victims to the destroyer; but if it be a fact that they do, how on earth can he help it? We affirm that from the religious point of view, "this world is quite enough of an enigma, at best," nay, more, "a demonstrated absurdity"; but how the belief that death does not end all can minister comfort to anybody is beyond our comprehension. On the assumption that there is a second life, there is nothing to show that it is an improvement upon the first; and most certainly it would not establish the rationality of the order of this world. Mr. Williams is a sentimentalist, pure and simple, a dreamer of irrational dreams.

The Moderator of the Welsh Calvinistic Body has made a wonderful discovery, namely, that the British people hate the Germans and love sin. He characterised it as both sad and suggestive. Is hating the Germans a sin? The same exalted personage is profoundly ashamed of Parliament, which is a sentiment shared by many non-religious people.

Religion does not appear to have a soothing effect anywhere. The Governor of Ceylon reports that on Buddha's birthday (May 28), Moslem shops in Kandy were looted by Buddhists, and there were numerous deaths. The military had to be used to quiet the rival religionists, several rioters being killed. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The resignation of Mr. William Jennings Bryan has provoked some caustic criticism of a very pious politician. The *Pittsburgh Gazette* says, "he was always possessed of a yellow streak; he has now developed a white liver in the hour of his chief's gravest trial."

We wonder what the Australians will think of the Rev. F. C. Spurr, who lately returned from the Antipodes after an unsuccessful attempt to stamp out Freethought. This gentleman told the Yorkshire Congregational Missionary Society that "the Australian blood tended to run thin and lose its virile British characteristics, and there ought to be a steady country perpetually a stream of good, pure, strong British blood, and from our Churches too, to replenish the blood that went thin, and to ensure under the Southern Cross a succession of great and godly men." Of course, all this means is: (1) Mr. Spurr was a failure in Australia; (2) Australia, like every other country, is steadily forsaking Christianity; and (3) That whenever church people leave here and get into a new environment, the artificial ideas that kept them attached to the Churches are broken, and new ones seldom create new ones. So much for man's "instinctive religion."

Mr. Israel Zangwill's play, "The Next Religion," was the subject of a debate at a Wesleyan Church at Southend-on-Sea. Is this to be regarded as part of the Wesleyan Forward Movement?

The *Daily Sketch* informs its readers that "the Irish never forget their religion." And, it may be added, religious people never forget to express themselves in an Irish way.

NOTICE.

The business of the "FREETHINKER" and of THE PIONEER PRESS, formerly of 2 Newcastle-st., has been transferred to 61 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

To Correspondents.

PAYMENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1915.—Received from March 15: Previously acknowledged, £51 9s. 7d. Received since: J. G. Finlay, £1; H. H., 2s. 6d.; H. B., 2s.; M. R. A. A., 2s.; A. and A. Shiel, £1; W. Feltrup, £5; R. S. P., 10s.; Bath Working Man and Wife, 5s.; B. Bowles, 5s.; J. Pendlebury (second subscription), £2; S. V. Brock, £3; F. Akroyd, 10s.; W. Cronaok, 5s.; A. Little, 3s.; S. E. Noakes, 5s.; J. F. Rowe, 10s. 6d. *Per Miss Vance.*—W. D. Cookes, £5.

Z. BAGGOTT, writing to Mr. Foote and enclosing a subscription towards the President's Honorarium Fund, says, "If I were only to be allowed one paper a week, my choice would be the *Freethinker*." Not only have I you to thank, but the whole of those who contribute to its columns. The marvel to me is that you all so willingly work for so small a pittance; but it shows how your hearts are fired for "the greatest of all causes."

A. C. GOODFELLOW.—Received. Many thanks.
MR. A. SHIEL.—There is no cause for alarm, only occasion for a little care and forethought. We are pleased to have your appreciation of this paper—after thirty years' experience—on which gives the right healthy tone to the situation. Mr. Foote, as you will see, is making satisfactory progress.

W. CRONACK.—When one does one's best, there is no need what- ever to regret one's inability to do more. And many helpers—of the right sort—make any burden bearable.

A. J. KING.—MSS. received. Will appear shortly.

A. G. E.—Received too late for insertion in this week's issue.

S. V. BROCK.—We should be only too pleased to see the Honorarium Fund subscribed and closed, as you suggest, within a brief period. But this is really in the hands of the subscribers. We should be glad to have the best of intentions, some people are dilatory in forwarding their subscriptions, and this causes the Fund to remain open longer than would otherwise be necessary. Per- haps your suggestion of fixing a time limit may encourage others to be more prompt.

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED, office is at 62 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY'S office is at 62 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

When the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the secretary, Miss E. M. Vance, giving as long notice as possible.

Communications for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

Notices must reach 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Shop Manager of the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C., and not to the Editor.

The *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office to any part of the world, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months 2s. 8d.

Personal.

I AM not shocked, but pained, at the news of the death of my old friend, Mr. J. W. De Caux, of Great Yarmouth. He was of a great age, and had long been ailing. I wrote him a friendly, even a brotherly letter, a short time ago, believing it would comfort him on what, I feared, was his last bed. As he did not reply himself, but someone wrote for him, I concluded that my fears were justified. He died on Friday night (or Saturday morning, as a local paper calls it), and I have lost one of the most brave and honorable friends I ever had, while the world has lost a clear-minded and dauntless Humanitarian. For he was the oldest magistrate on the Great Yarmouth Bench, and, while not unjust to his fellow-magis- trates, he was always a friend to the poor and if they could not get that, they went to him for comfort and vindication. He was once a member of the Town Council and the leader of Radical poli- tics in the district, but he left politics on account of what he considered its hopeless corruption, he dropped into the position of a relatively poor man,

but he retained every honest man's respect. His latter years were mostly spent in promoting Free- thought as he understood it, that is to say according to the *Freethinker*, which he considered in every way the finest paper in England, or rather the English- speaking world. It is well, not only to mention this, but to give it emphasis, as it is not the part of his career which is likely to be paraded in the newspaper obituaries. I am glad to see it remarked in the *Eastern Evening News* that "he would never take an oath, but always affirmed." These are the facts that mark men out from the ruck of their fellows. He did not belong to the common herd. There is something in "blood" after all. He came of an Huguenot family—men who defied tyranny in France and found safety in more liberal-minded England. He had the blood of these men in him, he never disgraced or betrayed it; he did it honor all his life.

* * *

My friend De Caux is dead, but I see that another, though less intimate friend, Mr. Herbert Burrows has just celebrated his seventieth year, with a pros- pect of being called upon to celebrate many more. Interviewed by a representative of *Reynolds*, he stated some interesting facts in his career, but they are mostly well known. I wish to say a few words about what is likely to escape the attention of the common-garden journalists. Mr. Burrows has been known to me ever since my prosecutions for "blas- phemy" in 1882-3-4, and I have always found him an unhesitating friend of Freedom of Thought. The test comes, finally, in relation to religious matters. It is there that you find whether a man really loves liberty; he risks something in defending her. He draws his sword with a certain passion and deter- mination when he sees her insulted—much more when attacked. Something of this must have been in George Meredith's mind when he spoke of the cause that was championed in this journal as "the best of causes." Mr. Burrows stood to lose a public appoint- ment, but he always delivered his full and honest opinion on the Blasphemy Laws, and became a member of nearly, if not quite, every committee established for their abolition. He was a member of the committee formed by Mr. Sharman when I was in prison, and he took the chair for me at the last lecture I delivered at the Queen's (Minor) Hall against the Blasphemy prosecutions which were dis- gracing a Liberal Government before it found out a still more popular and profitable policy. The chair- man's speech on that occasion was worthy of the applause it received. Mr. Burrows is still, I believe, a member of one of the most important committees in England—I mean the Executive Committee of the Secular Education League. I have belonged to it myself ever since its formation, and I know what I am talking about when I say that there is no more faithful Secular Educationalist than he is amongst the members. I could write more in this vein, but I have said enough to show what *might* be added to the *Reynolds'* panegyric of one whom I venture to call an old friend.

* * *

Another old friend of mine, unhappily just deceased, was the late Mr. Hans Lien Braekstad, to whom the age of seventy was fatal. He had done a great deal to familiarise Englishmen with Scandinavian litera- ture, and about a year before his death he retired from the post of Norwegian Consul in London. I see nothing in the newspapers about his Freethought, of course! of course! of course! and more of courses if you like. I became intimate with Braekstad about the time of my prosecution. He helped me in every way he could. I had officiated at his wife's funeral, and I was glad to know that it was her wish that I should do so. This seemed to bring me nearer to Braekstad than other circumstances could do. Years afterwards, when we were less intimate, and Braekstad associated more with the "respectable" Freethinkers, he still took the secretaryship of Holyoake's "Liberty of Bequest" Bill Committee, but nothing ever came of that Bill, as I told Holyoake,

and I turned my own attention to another way of breaking down the financial penalisation of Free-thinkers under the Blasphemy Laws. Braekstad was a clever man, and a lover of Freethought, but there was nothing of the heroic in him, for the causes he helped, with the one exception of Freethought, were never in danger. Still, I rather liked him as a friend; but it was as a Freethinker, not as a politician, that he first won my respect.

* * *

Some people wonder that my nervous breakdown has entailed such a long illness. It is the way of these things, that is how you recognise them. I met a friend the other day whom I had lost sight of. He expressed surprise at finding I had made so much progress in recovery. A somewhat similar breakdown had cost him a full seven months' illness. I noticed, too, a report that a consultation of medical specialists had been held upon Mr. Keir Hardie, who must imperatively retire for at least six months from all work, if he is to take his place again in public life. How about a poor Freethought President and Editor after that? I think I have as much right to consideration as Mr. Keir Hardie. I wish him well, but I wish myself well, too, and the best way, perhaps, of making this evident is to call the attention of many of my readers, who have overlooked it, to the President's Honorarium Fund. It is more than ever required; I hope it is not less than ever deserved.

G. W. FOOTE.

Science and the Bible.—III.

(Continued from p. 380.)

"In this nineteenth century, as at the dawn of modern physical science, the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew is the incubus of the philosopher and the opprobrium of the orthodox. Who shall number the patient and earnest seekers after truth, from the days of Galileo until now, whose lives have been embittered and their good name blasted by the mistaken zeal of Bibliolators? Who shall count the host of weaker men whose sense of truth has been destroyed in the effort to harmonise impossibilities—whose life has been wasted in the attempt to force the generous new wine of Science into the old bottles of Judaism, compelled by the outcry of the same strong party? It is true that if philosophers have suffered, their cause has been amply avenged. Extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science as the strangled snakes besides that of Hercules, and history records that whenever Science and Orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain. But orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget; and though at present bewildered and afraid to move, it is willing as ever to insist that the first chapter of Genesis contains the beginning and the end of sound science, and to visit with such petty thunderbolts as its half-paralysed hands can hurl, those who refuse to degrade Nature to the level of primitive Judaism."—PROFESSOR T. H. HUXLEY, *Lay Sermons* (1874), p. 277.

THE writers of the Creation story in the Book of Genesis wrote of things as they appeared. The sun appeared to move, and the earth appeared to be firm, flat, and stationary; therefore it was so. They did not know that the sun first draws the water up in the form of vapor before it can come down in the form of rain. Therefore they thought there must be a great store of water up above the sky, from which the rain came; consequently, the sky must be solid, or it would not hold the water up. It followed, therefore, that there must be windows in this solid—or "firmament," as they called it—which could be opened to let out the water as it was required; for at the Flood, we read, "the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights" (Gen. vii. 11-12).

While the "firmament" formed a blue vault, or ceiling, over us, the other side formed the floor of heaven, where God and the angels lived; the water evidently being kept in reservoirs. Jacob, in his dream at Padanaram, saw "a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it" (Gen. xxviii. 12)—evidently through one of

the windows. And after the Deluge, the people attempted to build the Tower of Babel, to reach heaven, so that when the next flood came they could walk up into heaven out of the way. The Lord, however—who does not seem to have been aware that the thing would collapse by its own weight when it had reached a certain height—nipped the scheme in the bud by confusing their language, which the Jews thought, in their vanity, that there was only one at that time—namely, Hebrew. In this way they accounted for the origin of the different languages. But we know now that Hebrew, compared with some of the ancient languages, is comparatively modern. The Babylonian script, which we read on the baked clay tablets in our museums to-day, was written thousands of years before Hebrew existed, and even before the Jews existed as a nation. The Accadian language was more ancient still, and the Babylonian priests and scribes translated Accadian as our scholars translate Greek and Latin; and even in that remote age Accadian was a dead language, only understood by the learned.

During the long night of the Dark Ages, which were also the Ages of Faith, which lasted from the overthrow of the magnificent Roman Empire and the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the State until the revival of science in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the first chapters of Genesis were held to contain the ultimate truth on the matters of which they treat; and when science began to revive—through the introduction into Europe, from Arabian sources, of the speculations of the ancient Greeks—it was these ideas, taken from the Bible, that formed a formidable barrier to human progress.

When Galileo, by means of his telescope, furnished the proof of the motion of the earth, previously discovered by Copernicus, he was promptly imprisoned and made to recant a doctrine so diametrically opposed to the statements in the Bible. The work of Copernicus on the Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies was condemned and placed on the Index of prohibited books, where it remained for two hundred years. Copernicus was beyond the reach of the Church, he having died immediately after receiving the first copy of his work from the printer.

Newton put the capstone on the labors of Copernicus and Galileo by his demonstration that the earth was controlled, in its orbit round the sun, by the purely natural force of gravitation; thus doing away, once for all, with any necessity for a supernatural explanation. Fortunately, by this time, the power of the Roman Church in Europe had been shattered by the Reformation; and, as Draper remarks,—

"Though its effect had not been the securing of complete liberty of thought, it had weakened many of the old ecclesiastical bonds. In the reformed countries there was no power to express a condemnation of Newton's works, and among the clergy there was a disposition to give themselves any concern about the matter. At first the attention of the Protestant world was engrossed by the movements of his great enemy, Catholic, and when that source of disquietude ceased and the inevitable partitions of the Reformation and that attention was fastened upon the rival and antagonistic Churches. The Lutheran, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, had something more urgent on hand than Newton's mathematical demonstrations. So, uncondemned, and indeed unobserved, in this contest of fighting sects, Newton's grand theory solidly established itself. Its philosophical significance was indeed more momentous than the dogmas that these persons were quarreling about."*

That is how the astronomers eventually triumphed in geology. When the strata of the earth began to be studied, two theories arose to account for the facts observed. One was known as "Catastrophism," and the other as "Uniformitarianism," or Evolution. The "Catastrophists" professed to be able to trace in the strata of the earth a succession of epochs, or revolutions, of which Noah's Flood was the last.

* J. W. Draper, *The Conflict Between Religion and Science* (1876), pp. 237-238.

that during each of these revolutions, or catastrophes, all life was destroyed, and afterwards re-stocked with other species of plants and animals.

The "Uniformitarians," on the other hand, held that Nature did nothing by leaps and bounds; that plants and animals did not suddenly die out, and new species suddenly appear. They held that the processes of Nature were slow and uniform requiring untold ages to accomplish her results; and that the same causes which we see at work to-day were at work in the unfathomable past. Hutton, a Scotch philosopher, a man of genius and one of the great pioneers of Evolution, upheld the theory of "Uniformitarianism" as opposed to the "Catastrophism" of the Saxon Professor Werner.

The "Uniformitarians" utterly failed to find general acceptance for their views. Even down to the beginning of the last century, evolutionary ideas were almost universally discredited. As Professor Judd remarks:—

"The causes of the neglect and opprobrium which befall all evolutionary ideas are not difficult to discover. The old Greek philosophers saw no more reason to doubt the possibility of creation by evolution than by direct mechanical means. But, on the revival of learning in Europe, evolution was at once confronted by the cosmogonies of Jewish and Arabian writers, which were incorporated in sacred books; and not only were the ideas of the sudden making and destruction of the world and all things in it regarded as revealed truth, but the periods of time necessary for evolution could not be admitted by those who believed the beginning of the world to have been recent, and its end imminent. Thus 'Catastrophic' ideas came to be regarded as orthodox, and evolutionary ones as utterly irreligious and damnable."*

Moreover, says the same writer,—

"Not only did Hutton, unlike the writers of other theories of the earth, omit any statement that his views were based on the Scriptures, but, carried away by the beauty of the system of continuity which he advocated, he wrote enthusiastically, 'the result of this physical inquiry is that we find no vestige of a beginning—no prospect of an end'" (p. 25).

This was in flat contradiction to the account given in Genesis; therefore his system was "looked upon with aversion and horror as subversive of religion and morality."

"The three great leaders—the enthusiastic Buckland, the eloquent Sedgwick, and the indefatigable Conybeare—were clergymen, as were also Whewell and Henslow, and they were all honestly, if mistakenly, convinced that the Huttonian teaching was opposed to the Scriptures and inimical to religion and morality."†

We give a sample of what the new science had to contend against. It is by the Rev. Henry Cole, the author of a book entitled *Popular Geology Subversive of Divine Revelation*, and two pamphlets on the same subject. He declares:—

"Certainly, of all the lately discovered or extended sciences, which the enemy of God and man has thus pushed to his destroying ends, no one has been found so appropriate to his purposes, nor has been so insidiously and industriously driven forward to the accomplishment of his aims, as the popular 'new science' of geology.

"To enumerate all the infernal artillery which the subtle enemy of God and man has put into the hands of his vassals, to aim at this everlasting monument of revealed truth, would require his own unspent breath and unwearied tongue. Suffice it to say, that sophisticated geologists have been allured, by his implacable subtleties, to enlist themselves in the service of his infernal policy."

He warns these agents of Satan that in future—

"No geologist who may read these pages will henceforth remain ignorant of his war against Omnipotence and everlasting Truth. And we again sacredly defy all the combined ability of sophisticated geologists, to the end of time, to prove either Scriptural positions false, or their geological positions true."

declaring that "if the Word of God does not satisfy them, no scientific hypothesis will"; that people

who deny the Bible are "not worthy with whom to argue on any subject which involves its sanction. Let such be turned out of the field of sacred argument, as they have often nobly been turned from a court of justice, as not worthy of being heard."

The same reverend gentleman also observes:—

"I cannot describe the gratitude of spirit and union with the holy Luther which I found, when in turning to his Exposition of the Book of Genesis, I found that his faith and understanding respecting some particulars of the creation-work (in addition to his fixed faith regarding the main point at issue) exactly and sweetly accorded with my own."

When, after much searching, I at last found a copy of "the holy Luther's" *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of the Book of Genesis*, I was not much surprised to find that it had been translated by the Rev. Henry Cole.

The distinguished geologist, Sir Charles Lyell, says that during the latter half of the seventeenth century—

"The theologians who now entered the field in Italy, Germany, France, and England were innumerable, and henceforward they who refused to subscribe to the position that all marine organic remains were proofs of the Mosaic deluge were exposed to the imputation of disbelieving the whole of the sacred writings."

And he further declares:—

"More than a hundred years having been lost in writing down the dogma that organised fossils were mere sports of nature, an additional period of a century and a half was now destined to be consumed in exploding the hypothesis that organised fossils had all been buried in the solid strata of Noah's flood. Never did a theoretical fallacy in any branch of science interfere more seriously with accurate observation and the systematic classification of facts.....In short, a sketch of the progress of geology from the close of the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century is the history of a constant and violent struggle of new opinions against doctrines sanctioned by the implicit faith of many generations and supposed to rest on Scriptural authority."*

(To be continued.) W. MANN.

The Genesis of Art.—II.

(Concluded from p. 374.)

NOW to the rude mind of the primitive savage, contends Della Seta, there is nothing better available as a means for materialising his desires than an image made in the likeness of the plant, animal, or natural phenomenon which is to be influenced in the interest of the tribe or clan. Armed with this image of the organic or inorganic entity he desires to mollify, or spur on to beneficent action, the savage is provided with an instrument of immense utility. The economic problem is ever with us, even in these civilised times. And the ways and means of obtaining the necessities of life were of the supremest moment to the most primitive of human kind. What more important than to cast one's spells successfully over the animals so essential to the cravings of the stomach? According to the animistic theory man was able, by figuring the creatures he was longing to possess, to wield a potent power over them. Or in default of this, he must persuade or compel the gods who rule over the animals to drive them to him. Living savages afford proof of this:—

"Some peoples therefore draw figures of fish upon the sand of the shore, or carve figures of wild animals upon the trunks of trees in the place where they are going to hunt, while others take with them into the field images of the gods of hunting and fishing, to induce them at an opportune moment to send them a good supply."

But the economic aspect of existence, although of extreme concern, does not constitute the sum total either of savage or semi-civilised life. And if we may judge from the present state of Europe, few of us are much more than semi-civilised. After he has obtained food through his magic arts, the savage must pay

* Sir Charles Lyell, *Principles of Geology* (eleventh edition), vol. i., p. 57.

* J. W. Judd, *The Coming of Evolution* (1911), pp. 21-22.
 † Judd, *The Coming of Evolution*, pp. 27-28.
 ‡ Cited by J. P. Smith, *Scripture and Geology* (1839), pp. 173-4.

some attention to the diseases, both of body and mind, which afflict him. As various anthropologists have shown, savages mould figures to represent diseased persons, and these figures are subjected to remedial treatment, so that the patients may benefit through means of sympathetic magic. Other uncivilised peoples of a more combative or subtle character will make a likeness of the demons responsible for human maladies and coerce them into better conduct. Or they will endeavor to outwit the baleful spirits by preparing images of the beneficent spirits, who then drive the sinister disease-generating goblins away.

Magical formulæ designed to overpower the demons of disease are by no means uncommon even among the superstitious in Western Europe. Among savages and barbarians such practices are ubiquitous. Shamanism, that world-wide mode of medical treatment, is built on magic. And although the witch-doctors are not too foolish to employ laxatives and herbal remedies for human ailments, they more often utilise images for curative purposes:—

"From the woman who is pregnant or in labor and the new-born child who cries too loudly, through all the varieties of disease, slight or serious, which affect humanity, even to epilepsy and madness, plastic art may be called on for help."

Magic incantations are also utilised for the purpose of disarming and defeating social enemies and foreign foes. Like Susan Nonsuch in Hardy's *Return of the Native*, who made a waxen image of the detested Eustachia Vye, which she stabbed spitefully with pins, so that her hated enemy should suffer and die, so does the noble savage most conscientiously elaborate a rude image of his public or private foe and inflict on the figure all the injury he would delight in wreaking on his living enemy. The savage will stab, burn, or carve to fragments the effigy of his adversary, who is certain, in consequence, to endure the pangs of suffering and death. At a far higher stage of evolution, we pray to the war gods—and even the Prince of Peace may become a war god when required—to help us to vanquish the foreign nation we are anxious to overpower. And they, true to the old savage instinct, cry out, "Gott strafe England." Thus we witness savage philosophy in full working order among the most up-to-date disciples of Kultur.

Della Seta very cogently argues that the once universal belief in another state of existence after death is responsible for several forms of early art. The future state is almost invariably pictured as a continuation, in a somewhat different sphere, of the life previously led. And savages unhesitatingly assume that the foemen who attacked them on earth will continue to molest them in the spirit world. Magical means must therefore be provided to enable the departed to withstand the malevolence of their enemies. Moreover, the dead "must eat, drink, and sleep, and the survivors must help them in this, as in their turn they hope and expect the same help from those who survive them." All things essential to the spirit land are therefore represented by images, many of which are buried in the graves.

Like modern uncivilised peoples, early man appears to have employed perishable materials when fabricating his funerary furniture. We are therefore dependent for our direct knowledge of prehistoric art upon the discovery of those art products which were elaborated on bone and stone, or in the form of pottery. Various remarkable examples of ancient carving and engraving have come down to us from the reindeer period. Wonderful figures of the mammoth, horse, bison, stag, reindeer, and fish were executed by some gifted prehistoric race on the horns and bones of the reindeer. Few representations of fish have, so far, been discovered, but many paintings of animals have come to light in the caves inhabited by these early savages. In one of the Spanish caves of this prehistoric period a stone lamp was discovered, ornamented with a splendid representation of an ibex.

Now the caves whose walls were so lavishly painted are profoundly dark, even in full daylight. This is a

most astonishing discovery. As Salomon Reinach remarks in his beautiful book, *Apollo*:—

"These paintings, consisting sometimes of over a hundred animals, could only have been executed, and were only visible by artificial light. Why did the authors take the trouble to execute them? Was it only to please the eye of the reindeer hunter, who, retiring to his cavern at nightfall, he made his evening meal on the spoils of the chase, by the dim light of smoking lamps filled with oil from the fat of deer?"

Carving, painting, and engraving were therefore in evidence even in this remote age. The ancient artists were at first credited with a restrained aesthetic passion, but Reinach, Della Seta, and others now champion the view that these marvelous achievements were the outcome of the powerful stimulus provided by the savage philosophy of sympathetic magic. "Civilised man," says Reinach, "makes hyperbolic use of the expression, 'the magic of art.' The primitives actually believed in it." It is indeed surprising that if those artists were inspired by æsthetic emotion, that they should have so seldom figured the human form. It is far more probable that the animals portrayed—all of them useful as provender—were drawn on implements and represented on walls in the fixed faith that by increasing the number of images, they thereby impelled the animals themselves to increase and multiply in ever greater abundance. That this is no mere speculation is proved by the survival of the same custom among contemporary hunting and fishing peoples of arrested civilisation.

It has long been realised that the children of the more developed human stocks retain many of the features which characterised their adult ancestors of far departed days. Della Seta discerns in the instinctive desires of the young European child various blurred, but still recognisable, relics of earlier human life. Just as primitive man mimicked what he was most anxious to obtain, so the modern child delights in drawing those particular things which make the most potent appeal to his fancy. Unless the young are constrained to figure the stereotyped models so dear to the heart of the average drawing-master, their natural bent reveals itself in their crude creations of those living forms which awaken their untutored interest:—

"It not only causes the little artists to prefer certain figures to certain others, but is responsible for the exaggerated proportions of certain parts of these figures. This explains why the figure of a soldier is one of the favorite subjects of a small boy, while that of a lady in full dress is preferred by his little sister; and also why in the former figure the sword and plume are exaggerated out of all proportion, while the buttons and the pipe are not forgotten, and why in the second figure the feathers in the hat are exaggerated, and the parasol and parasol are not forgotten."

Mechanical toys, however cleverly constructed, seldom retain their novelty with children for any length of time. They really prefer an old, or even battered, doll or animal toy to a much more costly contrivance. Della Seta argues from this that the child looks upon its toy as something over which it wishes to exercise its powers. The popular plaything of the civilised child serves the purpose which the image and the native offering supplied to his uncivilised forbears. The imaginative child, living in a twilight world of fancy. Such toys as these are made to minister to their owner's capricious desires. But with the automatic toy, the child's exercise of authority is strictly limited. The mechanism works in its own way and in no other. The mechanical instrument retains its independence of its possessor, whereas the ordinary plaything remains a constant obedient slave.

Boys of a certain age affect to disdain the toys and games to which mere girls or "kids" continue to attach importance. Quite big girls excite the envy of their brothers through their fondness for dolls. In other words, they require a longer time to free themselves from the bonds of magic. This is thought to, in some measure, explain the submission of women to the authority of the priest.

That there is a considerable amount of truth in the foregoing contentions may be readily granted. There is a certain sense of mystery in all sentient things, which we all more or less feel. Thousands of people will stop in a crowded thoroughfare to gaze at a monkey. Mobs of children show the intensest interest in animal life by congregating in front of a naturalist's shop window. The eagerness with which the average child gazes on the exhibits in the Zoological Gardens far transcends that of the ordinary unscientific adult. And, unquestionably, the ownership of an animal's image is the most appreciated substitute for the possession of the animal itself. And there can be little doubt that this, in company with the dimly awakened maternal instinct in the female child, has materially assisted in fashioning the playthings most acceptable to the young. But so far as the automatic toy is concerned, the uniformity of its action gradually makes it appear as tame, that it soon becomes as dreary and monotonous as the ticking of a clock. Again, the interest in animals, even by children of a larger growth, is usually far keener than that aroused by mechanical contrivances. This appears to point to a period when the living and moving organism exercised a strong fascination over human animals of all ages.

Our prehistoric ancestors' firm faith in the efficacy of magic can scarcely have influenced the evolution of architecture to any great extent. The uses to which primitive dwelling-places were put were severely utilitarian. The structural arrangements of the early edifice were determined by the laws that condition stability and the power to resist wind, cold, and rain. The shaping of man's tools and vessels was likewise governed by the purposes they were designed to serve. In the case of funerary monuments, the religious motive had greater play, and in the decorations of dwellings, the magic fancy also exercised its sway.

In the realm of letters, again man's magical delusions strongly asserted themselves. The masterpieces of ancient and modern literature have been evolved from the prayers, invocations, and hymns which were chanted by the people and handed down, generation after generation, from memory. In music and dancing the same magic element obtained. Both were originally intended to mimic the sounds and movements of surrounding Nature. And each of these arts appears, if we may judge from the customs of contemporary savage and barbarous races, to have been utilised to further the well-being of the community, or to arrest or nullify the sinister activities of the spirits.

In plastic and pictorial art the foregoing considerations are reinforced both by what happened in ancient Greece, as well as in later European times. In the most glorious period of ancient Greek art, when the gods were represented in majestic shapes of stone, when human genius—

“First mimicked and then mocked,
With lovely limbs more lovely than its own,
The human form, till marble grew divine;”
the uncultured masses still placed their rude votive offerings in the popular sanctuaries to secure the protective powers of the gods of health and prosperity. Della Seta writes:—

“And during the whole period of the development of Christian art, while sculptors and painters with most perfect mastery of form perpetuated pious legends, the faithful believers paid their most devout worship to the rough images held by tradition to be miraculous, because to these images was attributed a magic power the others did not possess.”

T. F. PALMER.

The “Wooden” God.

A private letter written practically from the battle front, and describing in palpating words—words that would bleed if they could be cut open—the sufferings of the soldiers in the trenches and under a fire that robs hell of its horrors, the writer remarks that such scenes as he had witnessed, and

such cries as he had heard, would cause even “a wooden god to weep.”

What a splendid chance the world's religions have, each to prove that its own god is not wooden! We read in the Bible that Elijah gave a practical demonstration to the heathen to show that while their gods were asleep, his own was wide-awake. The priests of Baal met around an altar with Elijah and cried their lungs out, shouting at their god to prove his ability to save. But there was no response. Elijah prayed for fire, and immediately the flames descended as water a-down a hill, and licked up the offering on the altar. Ah, that's the kind of God to own! But why do not the sects of to-day give their gods an opportunity for a public demonstration of their interest in human affairs? Instead of the god who answers by fire, let the test be the god who can make his warm tears fall like the gentle rain from heaven upon bleeding fields and hearts with healing effect. O, ye gods! which of you has the gift of tears?

Of course, it is of no use to weep, if that is all a god can do; but a god that can see all that is going on in Europe—in Galacia, Eastern Prussia, Poland, Belgium, Serbia, as well as in wayward and unhappy Mexico and massacred Armenia, and hear the murmur of anguish from a million tortured souls the world over and not care, must have a stone or wood for a heart!

“Our Father which art in heaven”—Indeed! Have we, then, a father in heaven? And is he blind? Is he deaf? Is he asleep? Is he away from his universe on some foreign business? Has he fallen into the hands of robbers, who have tied him hand and foot, so that he cannot act? Clergymen! explain the silence of “our father in heaven”! Is it a wooden father we have up there, in the skies?

I am going to quote again Buchanan's wonderful lines, which will be found in one of our publications called *Pearls, Brave Thoughts from Brave Minds* (page 56). I wish somebody would set to music this poetic gem. I would like to hear it played on every instrument,—the piano, the violin, the harp, the flute! I would like to hear it sung on the concert stage by artists, in the school by children, in the home and the fields, by everybody! I would give a fortune, if I had one, to hear the whole world humming Buchanan's challenge to the gods:—

“If I were a God like you, and you were a man like me,
And in the dark you prayed and wept, and I could hear and see—
The sorrow of your broken heart would darken all my day,
And never peace or pride were mine till it was smiled away,—
I'd clear my heaven above your head till all was bright and blue,
If you were a man like me, and I were a God like you.”

—The Rationalist (Chicago). M. M. MANGASARIAN.

Obituary.

On Saturday, June 12, a gathering of Secularists from all parts of London, including a large number of the officials of the National Secular Society, assembled at the Golders Green Crematorium to say farewell to that highly esteemed and sturdy old apostle of Secularism, James Rowney, whose death was recorded in these columns last week. In accordance with the last wishes of the deceased, a Secular Burial Service was read, most impressively, by Mr. J. T. Lloyd. Born in Ireland and educated in Scotland, James Rowney became in turn a Presbyterian, a Baptist Sunday-school teacher, and finally, through diligent study of the Bible, for the last forty years of his life a confirmed Atheist. By his energy and ability, he at one time became the owner of a highly successful business and a comparatively wealthy man; but his advocacy of Freethought, in and out of season, subjected him to the usual persecution, and through the dishonesty of Christian clients, he suffered ruinous financial losses. For many years he was probably the best-known figure in all the London parks, where, in spite of increasing years, he lectured as a free-lance, both winter and summer. He was a man of wide reading and sound argument, and, though tenacious in his opposition, was never discourteous to his opponents. In his last hours of consciousness he reaffirmed his belief in the principles of Secularism which he had so nobly and ungrudgingly upheld. He gave of his best to the cause of Freethought, which was the richer by his advocacy and will be the poorer by his loss.—E. M. VANCE.

Another of the old guard has fallen in the person of Mr. John Hocking, of 122 Belsize-road, Kilburn, who died on Monday, June 7, in the sixty-first year of his age. Mr. Hocking joined the N. S. S. in the year 1885, and for many years did much to promote the interests of Freethought by open-air speaking in Kilburn and by debates at his own house. He was held in high esteem by all who knew him as a man of sterling character and high aims. He was buried on June 10 in the West Hampstead Cemetery, and a Secular Service was conducted at the graveside. We tender our profound sympathy to his mourning relatives.—J. T. L.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

Notices of Lectures, etc., must reach us by first post on Tuesday and be marked "Lecture Notice" if not sent on postcard.

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 3.15 and 6.15, E. Burke, Lectures.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 6, Miss Kough, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (corner of Ridley-road): 7.30, F. Schaller, "A Plea for Atheism."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Finsbury Park): 11.15, W. Davidson, a Lecture. Parliament Hill: 3.15, A. D. Howell-Smith, B.A., "The Truth About the Soul." Regent's Park: 3.15, L. B. Gallagher, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford, E.): 7, A. D. Howell-Smith, B.A., a Lecture.



LATEST N. S. S. BADGE.—A single Pansy flower, size as shown; artistic and neat design in enamel and silver; permanent in color; has been the means of making many pleasant introductions. Brooch, Stud fastening, or Scarf-pin, post free in Great Britain, 9d. each. Exceptional value. Only limited number in stock.—From Miss E. M. VANCE, General

Secretary, N. S. S., 62 Farringdon-street, London, E.C. N.B.—Note compulsory slight advance in prices.

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. Christianity a Stupendous Failure, J. T. Lloyd; 2. Bible and Teetotalism, J. M. Wheeler; 3. Principles of Secularism, C. Watts; 4. Where Are Your Hospitals? R. Ingersoll. 5. Because the Bible Tells Me So, W. P. Ball; 6. Why Be Good? by G. W. Foote. The Parson's Creed. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 6d. per hundred, post free 7d. Special rates for larger quantities. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—Miss E. M. VANCE, N. S. S. Secretary, 62 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

THE LATE CHARLES BRADLAUGH, M.P.

A Statuette Bust,

Modelled by Burvill in 1881. An excellent likeness of the great Freethinker. Highly approved of by his daughter and intimate colleagues. Size, 6 1/2 ins. by 8 3/4 ins. by 4 1/2 ins.

Plaster (Ivory Finish) ... 3/- Extra by post (British Isles): One Bust, 1/-; two, 1/6.

THE PIONEER PRESS 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.; or, Miss E. M. VANCE, Secretary, N. S. S. All Profits to be devoted to the N. S. S. Benevolent Fund.

America's Freethought Newspaper.

THE TRUTH SEEKER.

FOUNDED BY D. M. BENNETT, 1873. CONTINUED BY E. M. MACDONALD, 1883-1908. G. E. MACDONALD ... EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS. L. K. WASHBURN ...

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. Single subscription in advance ... Two new subscribers ... One subscription two years in advance ... To all foreign countries, except Mexico, 50 cents per annum extra. Subscriptions for any length of time under a year, at the rate of 25 cents per month, may be begun at any time. Freethinkers everywhere are invited to send for specimen copies which are free.

THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY, Publishers, Dealers in Freethought Books, 62 Vesey Street, New York, U.S.A.

Determinism or Free Will?

By C. COHEN.

Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.

A clear and able exposition of the subject in the only adequate light—the light of evolution.

CONTENTS.

I. The Question Stated.—II. "Freedom" and "Will."—III. Consciousness, Deliberation, and Choice.—IV. Some Alleged Consequences of Determinism.—V. Professor James on "The Dilemma of Determinism."—VI. The Nature and Implications of Responsibility.—VII. Determinism and Character.—VIII. Problem in Determinism.—IX. Environment.

PRICE ONE SHILLING NET (POSTAGE 2d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY (LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office—62 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Chairman of Board of Directors—MR. G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary—MISS E. M. VANCE.

This Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this world is the proper end of all thought and action. To promote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Education. To promote the complete secularisation of the State, etc., etc. And to do all such lawful things as are conducive to such objects. Also to have, hold, receive, and retain any sums of money paid, given, devised, or bequeathed by any person, and to employ the same for any of the purposes of the Society.

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up and the assets were insufficient to cover liabilities—a most unlikely contingency.

Members pay an entrance fee of ten shillings, and a subsequent yearly subscription of five shillings.

The Society has a considerable number of members, but a much larger number is desirable, and it is hoped that some will be gained amongst those who read this announcement. All who join it participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest, or in any way whatever.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, consisting of not less than five and not more than twelve members, one-third of whom retire (by ballot) each year,

but are capable of re-election. An Annual General Meeting of members must be held in London, to receive the Report, and elect new Directors, and transact any other business that may arise.

Being a duly registered body, the Secular Society, Limited, can receive donations and bequests with absolute security. Those who are in a position to do so are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favor in their wills. On this point there need not be the slightest apprehension. It is quite impossible to set aside such bequests. The Society have no option but to pay them over in the ordinary course of administration. No objection of any kind has been raised in connection with any of the wills by which the Society has already been benefited.

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Balfour, 1 Rood-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

A Form of Bequest.—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—"I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £1,000, to be free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy."

Friends of the Society who have remembered it in their wills or who intend to do so, should formally notify the Secretary of the fact, or send a private intimation to the Chairman, who, if (if desired) treat it as strictly confidential. This is not necessary, but it is advisable, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid, and their contents have to be established by competent testimony.

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary: Miss E. M. VANCA, 62 Farringdon-st., London, E.C.

Principles and Objects.

Secularism teaches that conduct should be based on reason and knowledge. It knows nothing of divine guidance or interference; it excludes supernatural hopes and fears; it regards happiness as man's proper aim, and utility as his moral guide.

Secularism affirms that Progress is only possible through Liberty, which is at once a right and a duty; and therefore seeks to remove every barrier to the fullest equal freedom of thought, action, and speech.

Secularism declares that theology is condemned by reason as superstitious, and by experience as mischievous, and regards it as the historic enemy of Progress.

Secularism accordingly seeks to dispel superstition; to spread education; to disestablish religion; to rationalise authority; to promote peace; to dignify labor; to extend material well-being; and to realise the self-government of the people.

Membership.

Every person is eligible as a member on signing the following declaration:—
"I desire to join the National Secular Society, and I pledge myself, if admitted as a member, to co-operate in promoting its objects."

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

Dated this..... day of..... 190.....

This Declaration should be transmitted to the Secretary with a subscription.

Subscription.—Beyond a minimum of Two Shillings per year, every member is left to fix his own subscription according to his means and interest in the cause

Immediate Practical Objects.

The Legitimation of Bequests to Secular or other Free-thought Societies, for the maintenance and propagation of the same.
The expression of opinions on matters of religion, on the same basis as apply to Christian or Theistic churches or congregations.

The Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws, in order that the same may be canvassed as freely as other subjects, without fear of fine or imprisonment.

The Disestablishment and Disendowment of the State Churches in England, Scotland, and Wales.

The Abolition of all Religious Teaching and Bible Reading in Schools, or other educational establishments supported by the State.

The Opening of all endowed educational institutions to the children and youth of all classes alike.

The Abrogation of all laws interfering with the free use of Sunday for the purpose of culture and recreation; and the opening of State and Municipal Museums, Libraries, and Art Galleries.

The Reform of the Marriage Laws, especially to secure equal justice for husband and wife, and a reasonable liberty of facility of divorce.

The Equalisation of the legal status of men and women, so that all rights may be independent of sexual distinctions.

The Protection of children from all forms of violence, and from the greed of those who would make a profit out of their premature labor.

The Abolition of all hereditary distinctions and privileges, and the substitution of a spirit antagonistic to justice and human improvement.

The Improvement of daily life for the masses of the people, especially in towns and cities, where insanitary and incommodious dwellings, and the want of open spaces, cause physical weakness and disease, and the deterioration of family life.

The Promotion of the right and duty of Labor to organise itself for its moral and economical advancement, and of its legal protection in such combinations.

The Substitution of the idea of Reform for that of Punishment in the treatment of criminals, so that goals may not be places of physical, intellectual, or even of mere detention, for those who are afflicted with anti-social tendencies.

An Extension of the moral law to animals, so as to secure humane treatment and legal protection against cruelty.

The Promotion of Peace between nations, and the substitution of Arbitration for War in the settlement of international disputes.

FREETHOUGHT PUBLICATIONS.

LIBERTY AND NECESSITY. An argument against Free Will and in favor of Moral Causation. By David Hume. 32 pages, price 2d., postage 1d.

THE MORTALITY OF THE SOUL. By David Hume. With an Introduction by G. W. Foote. 16 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

AN ESSAY ON SUICIDE. By David Hume. With an Historical and Critical Introduction by G. W. Foote. price 1d., postage 1/2d.

FROM CHRISTIAN PULPIT TO SECULAR PLATFORM. By J. T. Lloyd. A History of his Mental Development. 60 pages, price 1d., postage 1d.

THE MARTYRDOM OF HYPATIA. By M. M. Mangasarian (Chicago). 16 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

THE WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS. By Lord Bacon. A beautiful and suggestive composition. 86 pages, reduced from 1s. to 3d., postage 1d.

A REFUTATION OF DEISM. By Percy Bysshe Shelley. With an Introduction by G. W. Foote. 32 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY. By Percy Bysshe Shelley. 16 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? By Col. R. G. Ingersoll. 24 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

BIBLE STUDIES AND PHALIC WORSHIP. By J. M. Wheeler. 136 pages, price 1s. 6d., postage 2d.

UTILITARIANISM. By Jeremy Bentham. An Important Work. 32 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

THE MISTAKES OF MOSES. By Col. R. G. Ingersoll. Only Complete Edition. Beautifully printed on fine paper. 136 pages. Reduced to 6d., postage 2 1/2d.

THE ESSENCE OF RELIGION. By Ludwig Feuerbach. "All theology is anthropology." Büchner said that "no one has demonstrated and explained the purely human origin of the idea of God better than Ludwig Feuerbach." 78 pages, price 6d., postage 1d.

THE CODE OF NATURE. By Denis Diderot. Powerful and eloquent. 16 pages, price 1d., postage 1/2d.

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF FREETHINKERS— Of All Ages and Nations. By Joseph Mazzini Wheeler, 355 pages, price (reduced from 7s. 6d.) 3s., postage 4d.

A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN LIBERTY. By Anthony Collins. With Preface and Annotations by G. W. Foote and Biographical Introduction by J. M. Wheeler. One of the strongest defences of Determinism ever written. Cloth, 1s.; paper, 6d., post 1d.

DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT. By Col. R. G. Ingersoll. 64 pages, price 2d., postage 1d.

ROME OR REASON? A Reply to Cardinal Manning. By Col. R. G. Ingersoll. 48 pages, price 1d., postage 1d.

THE GODS. An Oration by Col. R. G. Ingersoll. 48 pages, price 2d., postage 1d.

PAMPHLETS BY C. COHEN.

AN OUTLINE OF EVOLUTIONARY ETHICS. Price 6d., postage 1d.

SOCIALISM, ATHEISM, AND CHRISTIANITY. Price 1d., postage 1/2d.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ETHICS. Price 1d., postage 1/2d.

PAIN AND PROVIDENCE. Price 1d., postage 1/2d.

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT.

By G. W. FOOTE.

FIRST SERIES.

Fifty-One Articles and Essays on a Variety of Freethought Topics.
302 pp., Cloth, 2s. 6d., postage 3d.

SECOND SERIES.

Fifty-Eight Essays and Articles on a further variety of Freethought topics.
302 pp., Cloth, 2s. 6d., postage 3d.

These two volumes contain much of the Author's best and raciest writings.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

PIONEER PAMPHLETS.

Now being issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.

No. I.—BIBLE AND BEER. By G. W. Foote.

FORTY PAGES—ONE PENNY.

Postage: single copy, ½d.; 6 copies, 1½d.; 18 copies, 3d.; 26 copies 4d. (parcel post).

No. II.—DEITY AND DESIGN. By C. Cohen.

(A Reply to Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace.)

THIRTY-TWO PAGES—ONE PENNY.

Postage: Single copy, ½d.; 6 copies, 1½d.; 18 copies, 2½d.; 26 copies, 4d. (parcel post).

No. III.—MISTAKES OF MOSES. By Colonel Ingersoll.

THIRTY-TWO PAGES—ONE PENNY.

Postage: Single copy, ½d.; 6 copies, 1½d.; 18 copies 2½d.; 26 copies, 4d. parcel post).

Special Terms for Quantities for Free Distribution or to Advanced Societies.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

FOR FREETHINKERS AND ENQUIRING CHRISTIANS.

BY

G. W. FOOTE and W. P. BALL.

Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.

Paper, 6d., net. Cloth, 1s., net., postage 2d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed and Published by the PIONEER PRESS, 61 Farringdon-street, London, E.C.