

The FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

EDITED BY CHAPMAN COHEN ■ EDITOR · 1881-1915 · G. W. FOOTE

VOL. XXXVII.—No. 2

SUNDAY JANUARY 14, 1917

PRICE TWOPENCE

CONTENTS.

	Page.
<i>A Challenge to the Churches.—The Editor</i>	17
<i>Religion in West Wales.—J. T. Lloyd</i>	18
<i>"The War and Religion."—Minnermus</i>	19
<i>A Scientific and Sceptical Saint.—T. F. Palmer</i>	21
<i>Another New Hymn.—Arthur F. Thorn</i>	22
<i>Acid Drops</i>	23
<i>To Correspondents</i>	25
<i>Our Sustentation Fund</i>	25
<i>Sugar Plums</i>	25
<i>"Free Will."—Jerl. Nirra</i>	26
<i>"Christian Evidence."—W. A. V.</i>	27
<i>A Hasty Judgment.—Alan Tyndall</i>	28
<i>Letter to the Editor—Colonization and the Birth-Rate</i>	29
<i>Death of William Platt Ball</i>	29
<i>Notice of Meetings</i>	30
<i>Books and Pamphlets</i>	31

Views and Opinions.

A Challenge to the Churches.

We said last week that if there were an epidemic of truth-telling, and the clergy fell victims to its ravages, half the pulpits would be empty. A few days after we had written this, a Church newspaper, the *Challenge*, substantially endorsed the truth of what was said by publishing the following in its leading article:—

We challenge the Church to proclaim aloud the ascertained results and the prevailing tendencies alike of science and of Biblical criticism. Often the clergy do not speak for fear of shocking the laity, and the laity conceal their views from the clergy for fear of shocking them. There is a conspiracy of silence where silence means deception.

The editor is quite safe in issuing this challenge, for none of the clergy are likely to accept it. And this, we fancy, he knows as well as we do. For it is not the appointed and historic task of the clergy to either discover the truth or to proclaim it. Their function is to teach specific doctrines, to maintain them in face of all opposition, to keep from their congregations all knowledge likely to disturb their faith, and, if some knowledge cannot be kept from them, to harmonize it with established teaching, so that it becomes quite innocuous.

* * *

Reciprocal Hypocrisy.

Apart from this, there is no doubt whatever that the *Challenge* is proclaiming a vital truth of the religious situation. And the picture of the laity refraining from saying what they think about current religion for fear of shocking the poor clergy is not without piquancy. "Poor fellow," they say in effect of their parson, "we must humour him as far as we can. If he knew what we know about religion, he would be made quite miserable, and would have to leave the pulpit. So we must keep up the pretence that he is our guide and instructor. We must pity his weakness, and have compassion on his ignorance." And things go their way; the pulpit pretending for the sake of the pew, the pew pretending for the sake of the pulpit. Nor does the game stop at

the church doors; it extends to the outside world. What the *Challenge* pictures as the relation between the clergy and the laity exists also as between large sections of the laity itself. Smith professes to believe in Christianity so that he may not shock Jones. Jones says he is a Christian so that he may set a good example to Smith. The "upper classes" patronize religion so that the "common" people may be kept in order. The "common" people pretend to believe so that the "superior" classes may not be offended. Robinson won't allow his children to play in the garden on Sunday because it would shock his neighbour Jones; and Jones keeps his youngsters indoors for the sake of Robinson's feelings. Each plays the hypocrite for the moral improvement of the other. Half the world is engaged in inoculating the other half with insincerity, to encourage straightforwardness. What a revelation there would be if the world were stricken with honesty for only twenty-four hours!

* * *

Our Greatest Need.

The longer one lives, the more one reflects, the stronger becomes one's conviction that the world's greatest needs lie in the cultivation of clear thinking and of moral courage. Both are among the rarest qualities possessed by human beings. Clear thinking means ultimately a trained and informed thinking, and there are comparatively few whose intelligence is either one or the other. Of how many people can we say that they have earned the right to express an opinion on any subject whatever? Usually you will catch the echo of the last morning's or evening's paper, or of some inanity they have been accustomed to repeat from childhood. Of an independent and informed opinion not a trace. Look at the kind of reading provided for popular consumption, and you will see evidence to the same end. We were looking recently over a whole batch of illustrated newspapers, and it was enough to make one despair of human nature. A picture of Lady — watching soldiers play billiards, King — walking down the street, Lord — entering his motor car, and so on through an unending series of similar inanities. What kind of intelligence is it to which such things appeal? And yet such productions are circulated literally by the million! It may safely be said that among a people who did any real thinking there would be no demand for puerilities of this kind.

* * *

The Herd Mind.

But there is more in the hesitancy of people to speak out on matters of religion than is glimpsed by the *Challenge*. At the root of the matter lies a lack of moral courage. People are mentally gregarious to a frightful degree. They cannot think with comfort save in a crowd. Analyse the majority of the apologies put forward on behalf of a rationalized religion or a rationalized Christianity, and we must come to this conclusion. They talk glibly enough of "essential Christianity" and "pure religion," but what is meant by either phrase? Essential Christianity should mean Christianity untouched by modern thought, and that leads us straight in the demonism and crass supernaturalism of the New Testa-

ment and of the Apostolic period. And "pure religion," again, is religion as it exists with the primitive savage. Neither modern Christianity nor modern religion are "pure." They are highly impure—adulterated with the refinements and humanitarian impulses of a more civilized age. There is only one reason for this cant of a purified or a rationalized religion, and that is the fear of standing alone without a religion in a world where it is accepted as a badge of respectability.

* * *

The Dangers of Independent Thought.

The mass of people do not think clearly. But why should they? No one can say that thinking is encouraged or that the thinker is held in high honour. In our national economy the thinker receives the smallest consideration. In our State functions it is the Soldier and the Priest who figures, the Scientist and the Philosopher and the Man of Letters are left on one side. Under prevailing conditions we have no right to expect a real honesty of expression. In the mass mankind will always seek to get through life as comfortably as they can. And so long as independent thinking involves severe discomfort, so long will it remain a rarity. This is not so much the fault of the individual as it is the fault of society as a whole. In the very nature of the case the martyr—upon even the smallest scale—must be an exception. Exceptional virtues will only be practised by exceptional people; it is the commoner ones that will be exercised by humanity at large. And when society offers the same inducements to moral courage and independent thinking that it now offers to mental sluggishness and hypocrisy, it will have made the honest thinker a far commoner phenomenon than he is at present.

* * *

Christianity's Capital Crime.

We are the product of our tradition and training here as elsewhere. For over fifteen centuries the peoples of Europe have been under the influence of Christianity, and the one thing on which the Churches have agreed has been hatred of nonconformity, a desire to press all minds into one mould, a determination to suppress freedom of thought and speech. Generation after generation, heretics have been punished, the truth hidden, questions suppressed, critics damned. People have been made to feel that the one thing a Christian community cannot tolerate, and rarely forgives, is freedom of thought and plainness of speech. And this, as a matter of fact, is Christianity's capital crime against the race. Other offences have a more dramatic aspect. The myriads of people put to death in the name of the religion of peace and brotherhood, the lingering martyrdom of brave men and women in Christian prisons, may make more moving reading, but these things are as nothing compared with the influence of Christianity on race development. The constant elimination of a strong mental type, the preservation of a type unthinking, credulous, and sheepish, have combined to keep the race at a low level of development. Every generation is moulded by the beliefs, the customs, the institutions by which it is surrounded, and we have been moulded by ours. To rail against the individual is useless; it is the whole social tone that needs modification. Christianity has worked hard to create a race of moral cowards and mental hypocrites, and its efforts have been all but completely successful. It is something to the good to find a religious paper challenging the Churches to speak the truth, even though one is without hope of the challenge being accepted. And it is just possible that the challenge may be boldly offered because it is felt there is not the least danger of its being acted on.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Religion in West Wales.

II.

(Concluded from p. 3.)

It cannot be repeated too often that Christianity is a religion not for time but for eternity, and that its primary object is to set a man right, not with his fellow beings, but with God. To be saved signifies to be "delivered from the wrath to come," to become a citizen of heaven. Neither in the New Testament nor in the creeds of the Church do we find any allusion whatever to the re-organization of society. The ransomed of the Lord are but strangers and pilgrims on the earth, constantly looking for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. The Christian life is, therefore, a life devoted to the pursuit of heavenly ideals. The apostolic admonition is, "Seek the things that are above where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth" (Col. iii. 1, 2). This world is not a permissible object of love, and the saints are solemnly warned against being of it while passing through it to the next. In the "Seiet," as Caradoc Evans calls the meeting at which church members relate their experiences, the subjects talked about are God, Christ, salvation, and the glory that awaits the faithful in heaven; and the complaint oftenest heard is that the earth and its things prove too attractive, or that the Devil succeeds too well in drawing the mind away from spiritual realities. To be religious, then, means to occupy the mind with supernatural concerns, to attend church or chapel, to read the Bible and sing hymns, to pray, and to converse as frequently as possible about the unseen world and its denizens. In Wales, especially in the agricultural districts, religion is a source of unpeakable joy to those who possess it, owing chiefly to the sense of eternal safety which it affords them. All their sins are blotted out, and they can read their title clear to mansions in the skies.

Now, it is quite possible to be sincerely and profoundly religious without being morally upright and honourable. There are, alas, many people to whom religion is an emotional luxury of the most ardent kind. The Big Man is on their side; they are accepted in the Be'oved; they are free from condemnation; no matter what happens, hell's door is closed against them for ever, and heaven's ineffable bliss awaits them. They may do wrong on a large scale, but Christ has purchased full forgiveness for them, and all they have to do is to ask for it. Caradoc Evans tells us that Lias Carpenter was "a mighty man in Sion," his piety entitling him to sit in the Big Seat. Yet his being "full of the White Jesus bach" did not prevent him from going to Tycornel and deliberately robbing Ellen Pugh of her chastity.

Thereafter, Lias frequented Tycornel whither he arrived and quitted in darkness and away from the common track.

It came to be that Ellen said to him, "Boy bach ("bach" being a term of endearment) wed me you must."

"Speak will I to mam," answered Lias.

"Iss, do you in a haste."

"Indeed, speak will I. Fair day for now."

Ellen was troubled that Lias did not come any more to Tycornel, and she contrived that men and women should not discover her plight. She drew in her clothes, and as her size increased she eased them; her contrivings, did not withhold her state. Folk said to her, "Many handfuls of gravel have been thrown at your window. Whisper the name of the thrower" (*Capel Sion*, p. 123.)

Lias not only refused to marry her, but flatly denied that he was the father of the child. Ellen "pleaded in

the hearing of Lias's mother, Shanni: 'Woman bach without wickedness, make your son verify his pledge.' Old Shanni laughed in the girl's face and spoke rudely. 'Don't laugh, foolish Shanni,' Ellen retorted, 'Serious is affairs.'

Old Shanni tightened her lips and called to her Lias, who had kept himself close: "The strumpet of Tycornel says you are the father."

Lias opened his mouth, and a frothy spittle fell therefrom upon his beard. "Dear me," he said. "Bad lies you talk."

Ellen bare a child and she named him "Lias," and after she was recovered fury possessed her; she cried, as a peevish child cries, on the Tramping road, and in shop Rhys, and at the Gates of Sion that Lias Carpenter was the father of her infant (*Ibid*, p. 124).

Lias was terribly vexed, and he shammed innocence before the minister of Sion Chapel, "to whom he sacrificed a hen." Poor Ellen was ordered to attend the Seiet and to stand in the Big Seat, in the face of all the people. The wily men of the High Places showered questions on her, and lastly the Rev. Bern Davydd lifted his voice:—

"Name the man bach you tempted." Truly Ellen answered.

"Sparrow of a pig, no-no. A liar you are. Very religious is Lias. Is he not in the Big Seat?"

"He was bad with me," Ellen said. Bern Davydd interrupted her: "Shut your head, you bull. Your bastard is by old Satan. Congregation, here's a sin. Shaking and redding you are. Good that I am here, for am I not the Big Man's son?" (*Ibid*, pp. 125-6).

Having refused to listen to the woman's story, this man of God requested Lias Carpenter to state his case, which he did thus:—

"Dear people, shedding tears am I, and they are saltier than the weepings of Mishtress Lot. Evil was she, but very, very pious was Lot. Changed was she into a rock of salt; a rock bigger than the biggest in shop Rhys. Let out tears will I this minute." Lias wept. "Look you on the marks of the tears on my whiskers. So-ho, the wench says: 'Lias Carpenter was naughty with me.' No, dear me. Am I not full of the white Jesus bach? A carpenter was the Big Jesus. He made coffins. Iss, people bach, religious is the male that makes coffins" (*Ibid*, p. 126).

Lias was very religious, and he boldly stood in the Big Seat, lying in the face of the Big Man himself. He pretended to be on the friendliest terms possible with the Lord; but his saintliness was no barrier to his wrongdoing and lying.

Dan, a farm servant, "assumed that he was above all the religious men in Capel Sion, and in the Seiet he rose and exclaimed: 'Boys bach, a photograph of the Big Man am I.'" The minister laughed his claim to scorn, saying, "The fool is lame in the foot: old club is at the bottom of his leg, and light is the weight of his sense." Shan, his mother, adored him, and muttered: "Murmuring, dear congregation, is always the boy bach to the One in the sky. Large joy he makes of his religion." Bern Davydd scolded her: "Serious to goodness, off is your temper. Lunatic is Dan. Boys Capel Sion laugh provokingly at Dan Groesfordd. Know you all that I am the Big Man's photograph." Dan professed to be the Big Man's most highly valued servant, to whom he once said: "Dan bach, Jesus is on my right hand, and you are on my left hand." While he was preaching one day, a strange woman asked, "What does the boy bach say?" She was a rich widow, called Sali Blaenpant, her husband having gone to the palace of White Shirts.

"Dear me," said Dan. "Dear me. Abide do I with the Big Man. Not anything concerns me but him." Then sang Dan Groesfordd: "Sali Blaenpant, is not the Big Man the landlord of all the fields? Even the

land under the old potatoes he owns. Good he is to ones religious and bad to unbelievers. He did say to me: 'Dan bach, don't you now let an old razor touch the hairs of your face, because I will make you a photograph of the White Jesus bach'" (*Ibid*, p. 196).

Sali took him at his own valuation, saying, "The second Jesus is Dan Groesfordd." She wrote him a letter, in which she described him as "greater than all the rulers." She loved him with all her heart, and supplied him with plenty of money. The farm of ninety acres was her own property. On hearing this, Dan said:—

"Well and well, an old bother is a mortgage."

"Iss, boy bach. But there's no mortgage on Blaenpant."

"Happy you are in your offences," said Dan. "What will Blaenpant profit you in the Palace of White Shirts? Give did I all to the Big Man. Speechify religion will I now. This is what the Angel said to me the first night: 'Grand for you to preach preaches in a Capel.'"

"Wise was the Angel," said Sali.

"Poor am I in silver and gold," said Dan, "and rich in religion. How say you to a Capel Sink? White will be your Shirt."

Dan did not rest until he had swindled Sali out of her farm, which he sold for five hundred and fifty pounds. Besides, Sali gave birth to a boy of whom he was the father, but he declined to marry the mother. Afterwards—

Dan wept in the Seiet that women had caused him to meddle with them to his hurt, and he glorified God that his hand had been stayed from marrying Sali Blaenpant (*Ibid*, p. 207).

In all the stories told in *My People* and *Capel Sion* religious humbug plays a prominent part, vice finds even the clerical profession a useful medium through which to work, and covetousness thrives in the guise of giving to the Lord for the carrying on of his work in the world.

Mr. Evans' two books, *My People* and *Capel Sion*, are distinguished by two great qualities. In the first place, they represent the first successful attempt to give in English a literal translation of the popular idioms of the Welsh language. Of course, the success is only partial, because idioms are really untranslatable. "Big Man" does not by any means convey the Welsh idea of God contained in the term "Gwr Mawr," nor is "White Shirts" an equivalent of the Welsh "gynau gwynion"; but there are no English equivalents to such idiomatic Welsh expressions. On the whole, however, these volumes afford English readers an accurate idea of the idiomatic manner in which the Welsh people talk about religion. But their most characteristic feature is the accuracy with which they represent the influence of chapel religion upon the Welsh character. We do not know what Caradoc Evans' attitude to supernatural religion is, but it is incontrovertible that the Welsh people do things in the name of God which, as members of society, they would never dream of doing. Like Joshua of old, they hold the Supreme Being responsible for their evil deeds. The sooner they get rid of Christianity the better it will be for the land of song.

J. T. LLOYD.

"The War and Religion."

We were all brothers, because we had one work, and one hope, and one All-Father.—*Henry Kingsley*.

THE European War has disturbed the Churches. Already the theological literature of the War comprises a library, and there is every prospect that before Armageddon has died down, the load of books and pamphlets it has occasioned will be as prodigious as itself. The large majority are ephemeral, mere dust and bluff

driven on the breath of the storm; but some have a passing interest.

Anyone who reads the utterances of the clergy, and their apologists, in periodical literature will perceive that they are conscious of the reproach which this present War implies. It had been the clerical boast that the Christian religion had civilized Europe, and none, except the Kaiser and his obsequious Lutheran pastors, have the courage to claim that such a war is in harmony with the principles and ideals of the Christian religion. The clergy of all denominations have preached brotherhood and peace for centuries, and this present War means that the big stick of brute force has been thrust suddenly into the mechanism of religion. The wheels cease turning, and the familiar hymn-tunes die into a silence, broken by the clangour of guns, the groans of the dying, and the noise of falling thrones. Not only religion, but philosophy, literature, science, and art, are suddenly arrested. At one terrible stroke we are back in the times of barbarism and savagery, and millions of dead men are shovelled under crimson soil. The pre-war conditions were the fruit of centuries of evolution, centuries of moral and intellectual advance; a labour not of yesterday, but very many yesteryears of European civilization. Humanity has been hoodwinked, and just too late the clergy discover the state of affairs, and apologize for them.

One of the most remarkable of these orthodox deliverances is a pamphlet, entitled *The War and Religion*, printed as a supplement to the *Athenæum*, a paper that has concerned itself with weighty and serious matters for over eighty years. For this reason we give it prominence. That the writer's pen is pointed with pious bias is natural enough; his bias does not, however, degenerate into the gross unfairness and hysterical emotionalism that usually distinguishes soulful utterances on religion. Here are his comments on the boasted revival of religion:—

The revival of interest in religion has not so far issued in a revival of positive religious faith. The first broad effect of the War has been to stimulate criticism of the Churches and to raise doubts as to the truth of Christianity itself. "The failure of the Churches," "the failure of Christianity," are phrases in constant use at the present time. Surely professing Christians ought to have done more. They ought to have been able to prevent this War. A widespread popular sentiment harps on the degradation of Europe in coming to this pass after two thousand years of Christianity. The responsibility of the failure is laid at the doors of the Churches. In some quarters this means despair of organized Christianity. The complicity of the Churches with the existing social order precludes any hope for their future. The Church is indeed the captive city of God, and not a few doubt the possibility of her recovery.

Nor is this all, for the writer carries his argument further:—

The critical processes initiated by the War is by no means confined to dissatisfaction with the Churches. Observers at the Front report that soldiers feel themselves to be in the grip of an evil fate whose very existence contradicts the Christian's faith in a God of love. The problem of evil is accentuated. How can God be good when he permits such a catastrophe to overtake mankind and inflict untold suffering on the innocent? The fundamental article of the Christian creed is thus called in question, and relegated to the land of dreams.

The effect of the War, he admits, is felt by the Churches, like all other institutions:—

The churches are understaffed. There is a prospect of a shortage of ministers as of doctors. The churches at home are often hard put to it to keep things going. Sunday-school work, especially on the boys' side, suffers

from lack of workers. Indeed, all the activities of the churches are crippled not only by enlistment, but also by perpetual overtime and the strain of daily business. The problem of finance is an additional embarrassment in many instances.

Equally plain-spoken are his remarks on the usual pulpit-talk concerning the "supreme sacrifice" of the troops:—

Eagerly, and sometimes perhaps too easily, the sacrifice of the soldier has been associated with the Cross of Christ, usually along the line of the passage, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." But this does not really carry thought beyond Thermopylæ.

The writer is not on such firm ground in his remarks on Protestant theology:—

The Protestant used to be content with heaven and hell, but he now finds he needs something like purgatory, and there are some signs of a return to the use of prayers for the dead. The cause of such a change is simple. No one is willing to believe that a man who dies for his country is eternally lost. Yet it is not easy to believe that soldiers pass at once into heaven in virtue of their self-sacrifice. Such a belief seems more Mohammedan than Christian, and there is some doubt whether all soldiers pass from earth in a state of salvation. Consequently, it seems that the conception of that other world needs to be completed by the restoration of the idea of purgatory.

This extraordinary conclusion, together with an insistence on the value of the purely Secularistic work of the Young Men's Christian Association, and kindred organizations, appears to be all of value in his apologetics. The young soldiers of Europe, who have died in millions, are the very flower of our civilization, and to the orthodox mind their fate only suggests the necessity of "the restoration of the idea of purgatory." Not a word of pity for the destruction of brains which might have carried on the intellectual traditions of ages; not a tear for the killing of men who might have enlarged the boundaries of knowledge, or have discovered easements for human pain, and solutions for social danger. These splendid youths were destroyed, apparently, to quicken our senses for the rehabilitation of a church dogma.

O, most impotent conclusion! If this is all a Christian apologist can get from his creed, small wonder that it has failed, and failed utterly. So long as men's theological conceptions remain radically unchanged, so long as no new Humanism flames into being with a passionate sense of brotherhood, and a new scale of human values, so long will men seek peace in vain. Christianity is a great illusion, and the clergy fail invariably to get to grips with vital affairs. In this nightmare of civilization the comforting theory that purgatory should be restored is uttered to eager ears. The War has produced horrors and evil enough, but there is a silver lining to the blackest of clouds if this European outbreak but shows clearly and unmistakably that Christianity is but a superstition, and that the Gospel of Christ is of the things that perish. The failure of Christianity is too complete to be glossed over by the glamour of false sentiment and false heroics. Christians are so immersed in their own dogmas that they cannot see that Brute Force has usurped the seat of Reason. We, whose fathers built up in generations of suffering and toil, this fair fabric of Western civilization, can no longer rely on an outworn superstition. Let the clergy leave the peoples of Europe free to work out their Secular salvation, without the fears and trembling of a foolish faith. Humanity has outgrown the dogmas of Oriental creeds, and civilized man is better than the deities of decadent superstitions.

MIMNERMUS.

A Scientific and Sceptical Saint.

THE biography of Lord Avebury, better known as St. Lubbock, the creator of the August Bank Holiday, is distinctly readable and informative. Considering Lubbock's standing in business and in social circles, the reticence of his biographer, Mr. Horace G. Hutchinson, concerning his subject's religious beliefs need awaken no surprise. Extremely reticent himself, Lubbock did, however, on one occasion, when delivering the Huxley Lecture, avow himself "a reverent Agnostic"; a position he shared, he said, with many of his scientific and philosophical friends. As these included Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and Herbert Spencer, this declaration of his own Agnosticism is worthy of note. No discerning reader of Lubbock's more important scientific works, such as *Prehistoric Times*, *The Origin of Civilization*, and other evolutionary writings, not to mention his *Marriage, Totemism, and Religion*, published as late as 1911, could possibly have entertained the slightest doubt as to what his religious views really were.

After showing that Lubbock was a good fighter on the side of science in its conflict with clericalism, Mr. Hutchinson states, quite truly, that Sir John outwardly conformed to the religious demands of the day, although several of his very intimate friends were determined antagonists of any spiritual explanation of the universe. Nevertheless, the following passage may perhaps be regarded as a sop to Cerberus, as Mr. Hutchinson appears by no means orthodox in his own theological beliefs. When Darwin died, scientific Materialism was supreme; but, we are told,—

In the midst of that extreme materialism we find Sir John, though many of his best friends were among the extremists, surprisingly moderate in his attitude. He was ever reticent as to his mental outlook on the great mysteries, but I believe he had arrived at the conclusion.....that there was some room, after all, among the atoms for the spirits; that the human intellect did rightly and according to the intention of its Maker in reading as accurately as may be the story which Lyell found in the rocks, and Wallace and Darwin in the whole life history of the globe; but that besides these records there was, as man's special gift, through his evolutionary development, that religious sense or intuition, or whatever term you choose to give it, which was of other stuff than to be subject to the test of human reason. That I believe to have been his attitude, though I do not claim to have heard him explicit in regard to it (vol. i., pp. 186, 187).

Of ancient lineage, the pedigree of his family extending back to the fifteenth century in the county of Norfolk, Sir John Lubbock was the eldest son of Sir John William Lubbock, third baronet, banker, astronomer, author, among other works, of the *Theory of Probabilities*, and Treasurer to the Royal Society. The son first saw the light in London, where he was born in April, 1834, and the boy's natural bent was shown at the age of eight, when, at the coronation of Queen Victoria, he watched with interest "a large insect under a glass." When the child was only four years' old, his mother, who seems to have been an exceptional woman, noted in her diary: "His great delight is in Insects. Butterflies, Caterpillars, or Beetles, are great treasures, and he is watching a large Spider outside my window most anxiously."

That pioneer of photography, Daguerre, forwarded the first of his newly invented appliances that crossed the Channel to the elder Lubbock, and the boy was present when the first picture recorded by the sun was taken in our Isles.

Like most born sceptics, young Lubbock early displayed a propensity for putting inconvenient questions

concerning religion. "We were talking," testifies Lady Lubbock,—

about resisting the Devil, and what that meant, and John said, "Mama, do you think it's right in us to hate the Devil? I don't. I thought we ought to hate no one?" I said, "Very true, my dear; but the Devil is the personification of Sin, and we must hate sin." "True, mama; but the Devil was once an Angel; so I think we ought to wish that he may some day grow good again, instead of hating him."

Sound sense and excellent ethics neatly combined by a small boy!

From a private school at Abingdon Abbey he proceeded to Eton, where he remained until, at the early age of fourteen, his "educational" days ended, and he entered into the busy banking world. Lubbock was thus one of those numerous instances of men destined to obtain world-wide celebrity in the realm of mental achievement who were without that university training which many still imagine to be indispensable to the complete culture of the intellect. In 1849 he joined the banking firm of Lubbock, Forster & Co., as it then was. This step was decided upon owing to the declining health of his father's two partners, in addition to the circumstance that there were several brothers and sisters to be provided for.

When Lubbock was seven years old, as he himself records,—

My father came home one evening in 1841, quite excited, and said he had a great piece of news for me. He made us guess what it was, and I suggested that he was going to give me a pony. "Oh," he said, "it is much better than that. Mr. Darwin is coming to live at Down."

Quite naturally, the boy's countenance fell, and little could he suspect the potent part that the immortal evolutionist was to play in shaping the current of his maturer thoughts.

Despite the demands of the bank, in which young Lubbock practically occupied the position of a partner, in his seventeenth year he delivered his maiden address. This lecture was given, he narrates,—

at Down on the wireworm, and was well attended by the villagers. Now I began to realize how right my father was in saying that Mr. Darwin's coming to live at Down was an immense advantage to me. He induced my father to give me a microscope, he let me do drawings for some of his books, and I greatly enjoyed my walks and talks with him. My first scientific original work was on some of his collections, and appeared in the *Natural History Magazine* for January, 1853. In 1849 I was elected a member of the Royal Institution, and in 1853 I attended my first meeting of the British Association. In 1854 I was introduced to Sir C. Lyell and Sir Joseph Hooker, in 1855 to Kingsley, Prestwich, and Sir John Evans, and joined the Geological Society. In 1856 I met George Busk, Huxley, and Tyndall, and the following year was elected a member of the Royal Society. It would be impossible for me to express how much of my real education I owe to the advice, the sympathy, and the example of these kind friends.

What a group of eminent men for a lad to number among his guides, philosophers, and friends.

Residing at High Elms, a beautiful place in Kent, it was necessary to travel daily by road and rail to the City and back; and the facility with which he studied books in crowded trains in later life, becoming, indeed, in such circumstances, unconscious of his fellow-passengers, indicates that he acquired this habit in his youth. He also possessed a wonderful aptitude for moving easily from one theme to another. In mentioning this, Mr. Hutchinson remarks that—

it was always a surprise to me to note how instantly, and without any apparent effort, he could switch off his mind,

as it were, from the discussion of some intricate point of finance—say the involved fortunes of the Peruvian bondholders—and discuss such a problem of biology as parthenogenesis.

Having turned twenty or so, Lubbock elaborated a scheme, which he submitted to the London Bankers, for the purpose of economizing time and money. Up to the time of the eighteen-fifties, metropolitan bankers accepted for collection from their customers cheques drawn on provincial banks and sent them by post to the country banks on which they were drawn. These banks then authorized payment, frequently less a commission. Lubbock now suggested that the London Bankers "should hold a 'clearing' and present to one another all the cheques on the Country Banks for which each London Banker was agent, and that Country Banks should send up all such cheques to London to be dealt with in the same way." Many of the City Bankers shook their heads over this novel proposal, but they were wise enough to consider it, and even to adopt it, and it has been in operation ever since.

In 1859 *The Origin of Species* startled the world, and Lubbock eagerly embraced the new gospel. And, at the famous gathering of the British Association at Oxford in 1860, when Bishop Wilberforce's ignorance and arrogance were so scathingly rebuked by Huxley, the young convert instanced the testimony so strikingly afforded by embryology in favour of evolution.

There is a capital story relating to Mrs. Lowe, the wife of Robert Lowe, of Match Tax renown. Busk and Lowe were staying at High Elms, and,—

on Saturday evening Mrs. Lowe was between young Lubbock and Mr. Busk (President of the College of Surgeons), and the conversation turned on the great book. Mrs. Lowe asked Mr. Busk "just to explain" why one germ should develop into a man and another into a kangaroo. He suggested that she should read the book, and she took it upstairs. Next day she sat in the drawing-room with it, and finished it about 4.30, shutting it up with a clap, and saying; "Well, I don't see much in your Mr. Darwin after all; if I had had his facts I should have come to the same conclusion myself."

Yet people still linger in the world who fail to grasp the simple truth which this sharp lady seized nearly sixty years ago. What a difference it *would* make if the general public only understood the facts!

In 1860 appeared the once execrated *Essays and Reviews*, and the uproar this publication occasioned appears extraordinary in the days of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. But in the far-off 'sixties the sacerdotal and lay obscurantists who so furiously assailed the volume, and those who contributed to it, made themselves the objects of scorn and amusement to intellectual England.

The writers, among whom were scholars so distinguished as Dr. Jowett and Mark Pattison, had dared to state in the most temperate terms the truth in relation to theology, as revealed by modern science and criticism. Yet they were denounced with unmitigated bitterness, and the palpable earnestness and sincerity of several of the leading orthodox religionists in their stern antagonism to the truth, proved most painfully how utterly unaware they were of the fully demonstrated scientific discoveries of their time. Men of letters and of science were not merely amused and amazed by the display of clerical ignorance, but became alarmed at the sinister spirit of persecution manifested by the men of God. A committee was therefore formed, of which Spottiswoode and Lubbock became secretaries, and an address was despatched to Dr. Temple, whose essay occupied the place of honour in the offending volume, in which the contributors were warmly thanked for their valued services to honesty and truth. This

address was signed by many of the leading writers and thinkers of the period, the signatures including those of Darwin and Lyell, Graham the great chemist, Airy the celebrated astronomer and mathematician, and Bentham the eminent botanist.

T. F. PALMER.

(To be continued.)

Another New Hymn.

Dedicated to the "National Mission."

LET the gladsome joy-bells ring,
Let the little children sing,
Christ is here!
Let the Guardians raise their voice,
Let the Government rejoice,
Let all sinners take their choice.

Christ is here!

Let the Army raise a cheer.
Let the Rank and File adhere
To the truth that Christ is here,
Oh, so near!

Let the nations fight it out,
Put the enemy to rout,
Christian soldiers have no doubt,
Christ is here!

See, the Saviour lifts his hand,
And the soldiers take their stand.
Christ their own!

See the heroes of the War,
Wiping blood from many a sore,
Wondering what their guns are for,
At his throne!

Let the buglers sound "retreat,"
While they lie at Jesu's feet,
Peace at last!

See the clergy standing by,
Meet their God with flashing eye,
Never having told a lie,
Safe at last!

Let the gladsome joy-bells ring,
Let the little children sing,
Christ is here!

Let the soldiers raise their voice,
Let civilians, too, rejoice,
Let all sinners take their choice,
Christ is here!

ARTHUR F. THORN.

WHY VOLTAIRE FOUGHT CHRISTIANITY.

Men spoke to Voltaire of the mild beams of Christian charity, and where they pointed he saw only the yellow glare of the stake; they talked of the gentle solace of Christian faith, and he heard only the shrieks of the thousands and tens of thousands whom faithful Christian persecutors had racked, strangled, gibbeted, burnt, broken on the wheel. Through the stream of innocent blood which Christians, for the honour of their belief, had spilt in every quarter of the known world, the blood of Jews, Moors, Indians, and all the vast holocausts of heretical sects, and people in eastern and western Europe, he saw only dismal tracts of intellectual darkness, and heard only the humming of the doctors, as they served forth to congregations of poor men hungering for spiritual sustenance the draff of theological superstition.—*Lord Morley*.

MISSIONARIES.

The missionaries who teach and insist on clothing amongst races accustomed to nudity by heredity are responsible for three evils; firstly, the appearances of lung diseases amongst them; secondly, the spread of vermin amongst them; and thirdly, the disappearance from amongst them of inherent and natural modesty.—*J. Theodore Bent*, "Nineteenth Century," November, 1894.

Acid Drops.

Dr. Gilbert Murray, in his address as President of the Teachers' Union, said that "a great hindrance to educational reform is the venomous religious difficulty. The *Church Times* quite agrees with the epithet "venomous," but says the solution is perfectly simple. "Nothing more is needed than the mutual recognition of each other's rights. We all pay the Education Rate, and are all equally entitled to the benefits for which we all alike pay. It has been proved over and over again that Church people will not submit to being deprived of their rights." This is very specious. We agree that so long as religion is included in State Education, something is to be said on behalf of the *Church Times'* case. But the whole question really turns upon whether religious instruction should remain a part of the school curriculum. And it is quite clear that it cannot so remain without inflicting injustice on some people, and doing injury to the cause of education.

It is not only Christians who pay an Education Rate. Non-Christians of all kinds pay also. And if justice demands that teachers shall instruct children in the religion of their parents, will the *Church Times* hold that teachers should also be appointed to instruct children in Mohammedanism, and Buddhism, and Judaism, and Positivism, and Atheism? If not, what becomes of *their* rights? Of course, the *Church Times* has in mind Christians only, and how they can be satisfied. Or, if the various creeds—Christian and non-Christian—were allowed to be taught, what effect would that have upon the children generally? A State Education teaching all religions must refrain from expressing an opinion in favour of any, and the religious lessons would be reduced to a "you—pay—your—money—and—you—take—your—choice" kind of an affair. There is only one way out. Let the State leave religion alone. No one is then defrauded of any "right." Everybody gets what they pay for, and all they pay for. They pay for education, and that the children receive. Anything a parent wishes above that he must provide himself in his own way, and at his own expense.

Now we may sleep in comfort. Not alone have we the great Lloyd-George at the head of affairs—with Mr. Bottomley and *his* God supporting, but a correspondent of the *British Weekly* says that as Mr. Lloyd-George has been "very faithful to the Little Bethel," so he may rest assured that he has behind him the support of the "men of God" of his native land, who are "praying that he may prevail." It is quite evident, therefore, that a triumphant peace is at hand.

The *Daily News* claims that John Wesley was the inventor of Watch Night services. Surely pious men and maidens met off in the stilly night before Wesley's time.

Articles of luxury have been prohibited in Russia, says a daily newspaper. This should cause a slump in ikons and sacred images, and cause Biblical language among the dealers.

A new book bears the arresting title, *Much Ado About Peter*. We wonder if it refers to the loquacious apostle who made a cock crow with his terminological inexactitudes?

In their New Year Letters, the Bishops of Chelmsford and Bristol deal with the War and National Service. Neither of the bishops suggest the conscription of able-bodied clergymen of military age.

Farmers are not the only ones who benefit by the high price of corn. It will also benefit the Church; though whether that will compensate for the increased cost of bread is doubtful. But a tithe rent charge of £70 value before the War is now £83. Whereat the hearts of the parsons rejoice.

"Thank God that the War has come!" says Pastor Phillipps, of Berlin. We do not question the sincerity of the

preacher; it is merely a sample of the kind of idiocy that flourishes in the pulpit.

Is it not time, by the way, that our newspapers left off treating expressions of this kind, when made by Germans, from the Kaiser downwards, as proofs of hypocrisy? They are nothing of the kind. If the history of man proves anything at all, it proves that intense and sincere religious conviction is perfectly consonant with the most stupid and the most villainous of sentiments. It will be remembered that the notorious Charles Peace hurried away from a prayer-meeting to commit a burglary; and if there is one thing certain about the Kaiser, for instance, it is the sincerity of his religious convictions. And before the War there was not a Christian in England who doubted it.

The *Weekly Dispatch* is responsible for a story that a child-dancer was refused admission to appear at a Christmas entertainment at the Y.M.C.A., Tottenham Court Road, on account of the scantiness of her clothing. We should like to know the precise association between Christianity and calisthenics.

From the *Globe* of January 3:—

We have no wish to be hypercritical, but it is the plain fact that the Anglican clergy know less about their work on its intellectual side than the members of any other learned profession, and that the majority of them are entirely oblivious of what has been accomplished in other spheres of thought. We say it with deep regret, but no thoughtful man who forces himself to listen to the average sermon will deny it—least of all the best among the clergy themselves. The people are no longer ignorant, and if the Church is to regain her influence over the masses, her clergy must be educated to deal honestly and competently with the tremendous problems presented by the Higher Criticism and by Science in general. That is not the case at present.

It is only what we have said over and over again, but we are pleased to have it repeated elsewhere.

According to the Bishop of Lichfield, Christianity is *the* religion of progress. We do not wish to retort, "Look at the War," although that retort is obvious, and quite justifiable. But when and where is it that Christianity has made progress? It inherited Greek and Roman culture. What became of that culture under Christian control? Surely the rule of the monk was a sorry exchange for the intellectual dominance of the Greek and Latin thinkers, and the rule of the Church a poor substitute for that of the Roman State. Look at the Dark and Middle Ages that were Christian, or nothing. Compare the modern Greek with the ancient Greek, the modern Roman with the ancient Roman! Look at Abyssinia, one of the oldest of Christian countries! Look at Christianity in the East! What kind of progress was that which had witch hunts, Jew baitings, miracle cures, and heretic burnings? Where nations have advanced it is not because of Christianity, but because of other forces which Christianity has been unable to crush or control.

One day it will be recognized that, even religiously, Christianity spelt retrogression. Superstitions were current in Greece and Rome as crude as anything that flourished in the Dark Ages. But there was a steady development in a higher direction. With the conquest of Christianity the higher lost its power, the lower gained strength. The triumph of Christianity involved a revival of demonism, of miracle working, of supernaturalism generally. Compare the Middle Ages—even religiously—with Greece and Rome at their best, and we do not hesitate to say that one moves on an altogether lower plane. Christian leaders of the Middle Ages would have felt quite at home with the most ignorant of the Pagan believers. The educated Pagans would have been horrified could they have returned and seen the gross superstitions of leaders of mediæval Christian thought.

There is a chance for a new miracle at the famous St. Winifred's Well, Holywell. The spring has been running—longer than Charlie's Aunt—for centuries in fact, but it has now ceased to flow, and unless the monks discover some

substitute miracle there will be a grievous falling off in revenue. Like Lourdes, thousands of people have professed a cure as a result of using the miraculous water, and, provided faith was strong enough, we quite believe many have really benefited. Anything else would have done quite as well.

"A Week of Prayer" was held at the Queen's Hall and King George's Hall, London, and the meetings were advertised as being "in touch with Christians of all communions throughout the civilized world." Apart from the comment that the prayerful folk might as well try to tempt an earthquake with a penny bun, we wonder what the Abyssinian Christians think about it.

Sir Oliver Lodge's spiritualistic book, *Raymond*, has attracted considerable notice in the press. Mr. Clement Shorter, writing in the *Sphere*, says that "most spiritually minded people in the Christian world have thought otherwise" than Sir Oliver, and he characterizes Raymond's post-mortem messages as "feeble and futile."

An evening paper announces that the clergy are to assist the mass levy. This probably means that the parsons will see the boys off at the railway stations—and afterwards console the girls left behind.

Providence watches the sparrows fall, but did not prevent the deaths of forty-one persons who lost their lives in fires in London during December. The majority of the victims were women.

A Catholic critic in the *Dublin Review* has been attacking the veracity of Gibbon, the historian of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The critic might have remembered the striking tribute of Cardinal Newman, "It is melancholy to say it, but the chief, perhaps the only, English writer who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the unbeliever, Gibbon."

We pointed out some weeks ago that the clergy made a fatal blunder when they played so energetically the part of recruiting sergeants. It disgusted many of their followers, and made a much larger number feel uneasy. It was not that either of these classes were out of sympathy with the War; they were not; but they felt that it was not quite the business of the clergy, with their talk of love and brotherhood, etc., and their claim to rank as ethical teachers, to encourage war even when the War was defensible. It might be the business of the soldier, the politician, or the layman; the clergyman's business was of a quite different character. The net result is that the clergy have lost caste heavily. Their influence to-day is weaker than it was when the War opened. We think it will be weaker before the War ends.

We find this view of the matter endorsed by Mr. James Douglas in an article in the *Star*, the other evening. He says, in reply to an attack made upon him by the Vicar of St. Luke's, Camberwell:—

I do not claim the right to interpret either the Old Testament or the New. My attitude towards the soldier-parson is instinctive. I think he ought to stick to his parsonship. As to the Christian layman, the problem is different. I decline to dogmatise about it. But I feel that the less we mix up religion with war the better. The Kaiser is an awful warning. He also holds just war to be a Christian duty. His theologians back him up. There's the rub. There are Christians on both sides. Each set claims that its cause is just. If, as we believe, our cause is just, what about the Christians in Germany who hold that their cause is just? If the good Vicar of St. Luke's were the Vicar of Potsdam, he might hold that it is a Christian duty to murder Belgians.

That is a neat satire on the Christian conscience. It is determined by the country in which the Christian happens to dwell. For ourselves, we haven't much doubt that, if many of our bellicose parsons were in Germany, they would be just as bellicose—on the other side.

How these Christians love one another! The Catholic *Tablet* points out that "Mr. Lloyd George, who is a devout

Baptist, will now have the appointment of the Bishops of the Establishment in his hands." Just so! And his predecessor, Mr. Asquith, is an unattached Nonconformist, and an earlier Premier was Lord Beaconsfield, whose "Christianity" was more remarkable than his successors' Nonconformity.

A musical comedy star appearing in "High Jinks" has presented a war-shrine to her native town. There will be "high jinks" in the church as well as the theatre.

The Bishops of Lichfield and Stafford state that a vast number of Church people do not even attempt to understand the aspirations of labour, and that the Church has not taken an active part in fighting social ills. A striking commentary on this statement is contained in the newspaper paragraph stating that at Exhall, Warwickshire, an eighteen year old youth is discharging the duties of parish clerk and verger. He is a printer, also a bell-ringer and organ-blower at the parish church. This gifted youth ought to enjoy the salary of a bishop.

"Does the Providence of God make it certain that the right must always win?" This is the question put by the editor of the *British Weekly*, and the proper reply would be, If it doesn't, what's the good of it? Sir Robertson Nicol answers the question in another way. He says, "Yes, if we hold fast to the truth of another life." We may be defeated here, but we shall conquer somewhere else. But if the right is defeated here, what is the use of the "Providence of God"? So far as we can see, so far as we know, it simply doesn't act. And unless "Providence" acts every time, no one can be certain that it acts at any time.

Putting it off to the next world won't do. In the first place, we have no proof that there is a next world. And even if there were, we have no reasonable grounds for assuming that things will be any better there than here. A "Providence" that allows itself to be defeated here may get defeated elsewhere also. And at most it is only giving "Providence" another chance to retrieve its character. It is a case of the First Offenders' Act applied to Deity. And what kind of gratification is it to learn that right will triumph? How many Belgians who have seen their homes destroyed, or their relatives killed, will feel it enough to learn that all will be put right in the next world? How can it be put right in the next world? It won't do, Men found God in *this* world; the parsons declare it is *his* world; and he must be judged by the course of affairs in this world alone.

There is nothing very unusual in the case of Thomas Coleman, of Chester, who was charged with breaking into a shop and stealing groceries. Nor is the fact that for a "long period," while "posing" as a religious man and acting as a local preacher, Coleman had been robbing the same stores. But why does the newspaper say he was "posing" as a religious man? Being religious is not incompatible with stealing. Being moral is; but there have been religious thieves in plenty at all times. Mental derangement was suggested as a defence, but without avail. Really, that might have been associated with greater reason with his zeal as a preacher. Those two things have often gone together; but between stealing and insanity there is no very close connection.

A paragraph in the press, probably inspired, states that during the twenty-eight months of the War, the British and Foreign Bible Society has sent out 5,000,000 Bibles and Testaments to the troops, and suggests that the sacred volume may be the favourite literature of the soldiers. As this modest figure is exclusive of all Bibles sent out by rival organizations, we wonder the troops find any time to read the millions of magazines, books, and periodicals.

Some time ago, a silk undervest, worn by Charles the First on the scaffold, was sold for two hundred guineas. This was a genuine relic. Priests must have laughed at such a small return. At Treves they have made many thousands of pounds out of a curious coat of a man who never lived.

C. Cohen's Lecture Engagements.

January 14, Nottingham; January 28, Swansea; February 4, Abertillery; February 11, Liverpool; February 25, Clapham; March 11 Birmingham; March 18, Leicester.

To Correspondents.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—January 14, Leicester; February 11, Walsall.

S. L.—Charles Bradlaugh never called himself anything but an Atheist, and would have repudiated any other title. Naturally, many timid persons thought it indiscreet, but a real leader's first concern is to get his own position correctly described. That was all Bradlaugh cared about.

W. T. HOLMES.—It would be necessary to get the author's or publisher's permission before reprinting. Thanks for sending.

J. BEATON (Alexandria).—We shall have much pleasure in sending you a free parcel of *Freethinkers*, etc., for distribution, and hope it will do good.

E. CLARK.—We are quite willing to accept your word that the meeting was not broken up by a hostile crowd. Our comment was based upon a newspaper paragraph. Probably the paper had some purpose to serve in misrepresenting.

T. SINCLAIR.—We have no intention of reprinting as a leaflet our "Views and Opinions" of last week's issue, but we have no objection to anyone else doing so who may feel inclined.

W. MATHER.—Pleased to have so cheerful a letter concerning both yourself and your friend. Our best wishes for the New Year to you both.

W. DODD.—We are obliged for your further subscription to the Sustentation Fund. We knew we had your good wishes and hearty support.

N. S. S. BENEVOLENT FUND.—Miss E. M. Vance acknowledges J. Pendlebury, £2 10s.

E. MORRISON.—Quite willing to take the will for the deed. Thanks.

D. CORNOCK.—No apology is necessary. We recognize that people have all sorts of calls upon them. So long as each does his, or her, best, that is all we ask or expect.

H. MARVIN.—In the course of a month, we hope. As you will see from the advertisement, *War and Civilization*, or *Religion and the Child*, will be sent at 6s. per 100.

S. SCOTT.—We are not at all surprised at the nature of your confession, and are pleased at its happy ending. We note your suggestion *re* "Acid Drops," with which we quite agree.

W. WILMER.—The support of one who was a subscriber to the first issue of the *Freethinker* is very gratifying. Shall be glad to have your aid in any way. Posters are being sent.

R. WILSON.—Membership subscription to N. S. S. has been handed to N. S. S. Secretary. We agree with you that "after the War is over our strides will be rapid." That is why we are so anxious to get the Movement into as good a fighting trim as is possible.

T. S. NEWALL writes:—"Good luck to you in your plucky swim against the tide; and congratulations on your maintenance of the editorial high-level of the fearless and peerless little journal."

F. W. LLOYD.—Mr. Mann's articles may be reprinted. The chief difficulty in the way at present is the excessive price of paper.

L. MARSHALL.—We are much obliged for your efforts in securing new subscribers.

T. E. STAFFORD.—Mr. Cohen is writing you.

F. R. GLOVER.—We hope that Mr. Cohen's visit to Nottingham will have the effect of stirring up interest in Freethought.

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.

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

Friends who send us newspapers would enhance the favour by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.

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

Letters for the Editor of the "Freethinker" should be addressed to 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.

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.

Our Sustentation Fund.

THE object of this Fund is to make good the loss on the *Freethinker*—entirely due to increased cost of materials, etc.—from October, 1915, to October, 1916, and to provide against the inevitable further losses during the continuation of the War. This Fund will close on Jan. 14.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Previously acknowledged, £236 14s. 9d.—A. Johnson, £1 V. M. Phelps, 10s. 6d.; H. J. Slack, 4s.; D. Cornock, 2s.; J. Murphy, 2s. 6d.; E. Morrison, 5s.; W. Dodd, 10s. 6d.; W. Mather, £1; J. W. Arnott, 10s. 6d.; R. Allen (N.Z.), £1; Debtor, 5s.; S. Scott, 10s.; J. J. B., 3s.; F. W. S. (Portsmouth), 10s.; S. Wilcomer, 2s. 6d.; Ormyc, 10s.; A. H. Smith, £1; T. J. W. (Pontypridd), 2s. 6d.; R. Wilson, £1; F. S. Newall, 4s.; P. M. McDermott, £2 2s.; E. Poynton, 4s.; Marshall and Friend (Tottenham), 5s. *Per Miss Vance*; W. Wilmer, 10s.; W. Newman, 2s.; Mrs. Helena Parsons, £1 1s.; Mr. Hinley, 2s.; Richard Moore, 2s. 6d.; W. Barton, 1s.

Sugar Plums.

To-day (January 14) Mr. Cohen visits Nottingham. The afternoon lecture will be given on "Determinism" before the Cosmopolitan Debating Society, and it is expected that a good discussion will follow the address. The evening meeting is independently arranged by Mr. Cohen, and his subject will be "Christianity and the Logic of Life." This *ought* also to lead to a good discussion. Whether it will or not remains to be seen. Both meetings will be held in the hall of the Mechanic's Institute.

At the close of the evening meeting Mr. Cohen will be pleased to meet local Freethinkers who are interested in future propaganda in Nottingham. It is many years since Freethought lectures were delivered there, and it is high time the town received attention.

There is something about the following expression of opinion which induces us to suppress our blushes and publish it. In sending subscription to Sustentation Fund Mr. S. Scott writes:—

And now shall I make you a confession? When Mr. Foote died I had fears—grave fears—for the future of my favourite paper. Mr. Foote's genius, ability, and loyalty to "the best of causes" had been for so many years tried and proved, and the paper had been so powerful and successful under his guidance, that I dreaded once his personality was removed the *Freethinker* might deteriorate, and eventually perish. But I am more delighted than I can tell you to find that all my fears were vain, and that our dear old "guide, companion, and friend" is as good as ever, if not better. I congratulate you, Sir, on its improved appearance, and on the sustained brilliancy of its articles—articles equal to any that have ever appeared in it—and that is saying a great deal. If it is any satisfaction to you, be assured that one constant reader and admirer, at any rate, thoroughly approves of and is thankful for the new editorship of the *Freethinker*.

We feel that our readers will pardon the publication of the above, in the circumstances. No one can appreciate more than ourselves the difficulty of stepping into the editorial shoes of a writer like G. W. Foote. And for the *Freethinker* to have maintained its position and its hold on the affections of its readers is a reward for the anxiety and worry of the past year and a half.

Mr. J. T. Lloyd lectures to-day (Jan. 14) at the Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate, Leicester. We have no doubt there will be the usual good audience—the usual good lecture is certain.

The death of Dr. E. B. Tylor, on January 2, has removed a great figure from the world of anthropology and comparative mythology. Born in 1832, the son of a brassfounder, he retired from his father's business because he was threatened with

consumption. A visit to Mexico created an interest in anthropology, of which science he may truly be said to be one of the great lawgivers—if not the lawgiver. Certainly his principal work, *Primitive Culture*, published in 1871, reduced chaos to order, and anthropologists have been compelled to very largely work along the lines laid down therein. In 1907 a sense of the debt due to his labours was marked by a collection of essays that were dedicated and presented to him. And whatever the corrections or modifications made necessary by the labours of later workers, it may be safely said that no more stimulative work has ever been published on the subject with which it deals.

While stopping short of a direct and detailed application of his theories to current religious beliefs, Dr. Tylor left every intelligent reader in no doubt as to his belief that he regarded these as the direct descendants of primitive savage beliefs, and resting on no other or better foundations. In saying "Animism is, in fact, the groundwork of the philosophy of religion, from that of savages up to that of civilized men," he reduced all religious beliefs to their proper level. And to his credit, be it noted, there was with him little or none of that coquetting with the word religion—which is usually an indication of a timid nature or confused thought. So, again, in the expression, "The animism of savages stands by itself; it explains its own origin," we have an illuminating expression for those who grasp its full significance. And at the close of the first volume of his greatest work, we have the following:—

It is evident that, notwithstanding all this profound change, the conception of the human soul is, as to its most essential nature, continuous from the philosophy of the savage thinker to that of the modern professor of theology. The definition has remained from the first that of an animating, separable, surviving entity, the vehicle of individual personal existence. The theory of the soul is one principal part of a system of religious philosophy, which unites, in an unbroken line of mental connexion, the savage fetish worshipper and the civilized Christian.

No one could have said much more plainly that the true parent of the Christian theology is the primitive savage. When that is realized, all the stupid chatter about "essential Christianity," "a purified religion," etc., will cease to be heard because it will appeal to none worth appealing to.

There is one point in connection with Dr. Tylor on which we have long waited for information. In 1888 he delivered the Gifford Lectures in Aberdeen. His subject was "Natural Religion," and the publication of these lectures was expected. But they never appeared, and one would like to know why. Was the fault Dr. Tylor's or that of the Gifford Trustees? It is a point on which we should appreciate enlightenment.

The following experience of a young soldier, just arrived at military age, and handed to us by the young man's father, will be of interest to our readers:—

I am glad you sent me down the *Freethinker*. The last one I gave to a man who went out in the first draft. He was a fine man. I think he was past forty. He was like a father to us all, and would help us in any way, and he was always sorry for us young chaps—not like the usual run who are always shouting "single men first." He never thought of himself; it was the hardest job out to treat him, and yet if he knew you wanted anything, he would be the first to help you. One night we had an argument on religion, and he told us then that he was an Atheist. When we saw the draft off I gave him the *Freethinker*, and it would have done your eyesight good to see how he thanked me for it. We all liked him, and he is missed by everyone.

The boyish frankness of the letter is delightful. We hope he will return from the War with the same boyish nature unspoiled.

Fear not the tyrants shall live for ever,
Or the priests of the bloody faith;
They stand on the brink of that mighty river,
Whose waves they have tainted with death:
It is fed from the depths of a thousand dells,
Around them it foams, and rages, and swells,
And their swords and their sceptres I floating see,
Like wrecks, in the surge of eternity. —Shelley.

"Free Will."

THE average person unskilled in debate, and intent on earning his daily bread, is frequently apathetic towards hundreds of questions which excite keen controversy among thinkers. For thinkers are not always inclined to accept trite commonplaces as truth without further inquiry. Such a trite commonplace is the doctrine of Free Will. The former, therefore, receives something of a shock when the other denies pointblank that Free Will exists at all. He is prone to become furiously indignant when it is pointed out that this doctrine can no longer find lodgment in rationalistic minds; that, indeed, it has been a homeless wanderer for many years, in so far as the latter type is concerned. Doubtless the doctrine has served a useful purpose. Almost any evil can serve thus under certain circumstances. The spilled ink which obliterates the falsified entries of the dishonest bank clerk is an evil serving a useful end—to the evildoer. In a precisely similar fashion, the Free Will doctrine has cemented theological fatuities in behalf of the vested interests which theology as a whole subserves. But if the will were free, it would be the only phenomenon in the cosmos, standing alone, and unconditioned. It would thus come under the category of an absolute. Even were it true, it would remain unknown and unknowable, for any means by which it reached man's consciousness would to that extent condition it. Its absolutism would instantly cease. It seems clear that the mere assertion, "I know the will is free," negatives its own predicate.

Let us now examine the position in more detail.

What does Free Will mean? We often hear some such remark as this, "A has murdered X. He is condemned to death, and he deserves his fate. Having a Free Will, he could have refused to kill him." Thus, here Free Will could have led—by implication—to what jurists call an "act of commission." Again, "B sees W running towards the edge of a cliff. B could stop him, but does not do so. Having 'Free Will,' he could have saved a life. He is guilty of W's death by an act of omission." "Believers," in their strictures against "sin," almost always argue that Free Will can lead to right action, either by commission or omission. The point we would emphasize is, that action, or some phase of physical activity, is implied in their use of the term "Free Will." From these examples we can deduce the definition as Religionists view it. For them "Free Will" is the faculty in man whereby he can either act or remain passive, undetermined by any factor save that same "will." Let us classify this as the theological definition. We may do this the more reasonably since the argument expressed, or implied, is that God gave man a Free Will, or the faculty so described, to avoid the alternative of man's being something akin to an automatic machine.

There is another aspect of Free Will. An Agnostic—supposedly—hears a discourse on the "truths" taught by the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church, from the lips of a Roman Catholic. He remains an Agnostic. The Roman Catholic may, and frequently does, argue "this man has heard the truth; he is obdurate, and hence sinful. He has a Free Will, and could for that reason accept what an infallible Church teaches. He wilfully prefers darkness and infidelity to light and belief." This view leads to another definition, *i.e.*, "Free Will is the faculty by which a man can accept and believe as true that which he knows to be false." We might label this the fanatic definition.

Again, a man hears shots in a neighbouring street. It

is said that possessing a Free Will, he can either go to the spot and ascertain the cause, or he can remain where he is.

Before dealing with each case in turn, we must dispose of one pitfall, due to theological-minded tricksters. It is this: "The will is, of course, partly determined by physical circumstances, it is all the same Free Will." This is proceeding too fast. "Partly determined" is not reconcilable with freedom. Free Will means exactly what it says. Free admits of no degree. "The eagle is freer than the caged linnet," is quite allowable in ordinary conversation, but in critical dialectics "free" ceases to be susceptible of graduated degree. In this latter, neither eagle nor linnet is free. A simpler example is the adjective "dead." If one asserts "My cat died yesterday, and his last month, hence his is deader than mine," the absurdity is plainly visible to anyone. "Dead," "free," "crystallized," "bisected," and many other qualifying terms, are inherently devoid of comparative or superlative degree.

Now for the case where A killed X. Before doing it, he made up his mind to do it. This is true even in the so-called "impulsive act," which Statute Law recognizes as a mitigation of the offence. But criticism takes the matter in hand, and deems the impulsive act equally as "willed," or as the result of making up his mind to do it. In the latter case the process of decision was exceedingly rapid. Thus, before killing X, A desired to do it. He willed it. If he did not desire to kill him, but yet did it, then he was impelled by a power innocent of desire. He was in the position of a ton of coal falling on a child, due to a breaking chain. There was no will in it. It was a circumstantial impulsion. Such a man is insane, hence has no conscious will, and that which is not cannot have any qualification attached to it. No, will cannot be said to be free or coerced. As well say, "Was no horse white or roan?"

An insane man, at any rate, cannot have Free Will. If he was sane, he willed or desired to kill X. He had a motive. A motiveless act in a sane man is unthinkable. What was the motive? Revenge, greed, anger, lust, hate.

Could he have willed *not to feel revengeful*? No. The victim had wronged him twenty times. It was a natural emotion. Could he have willed *not to feel greedy, angry, lustful, hating*? No. He might be starving and the victim rich; he had been insulted grossly; or he had been robbed of the woman he loved, and the victim had won her by poisoned tales told falsely against the lover. Every emotion was natural and inevitable, given the circumstances. We see that his mental attitude towards his enemy was the direct result of his enemy's actions towards him. His act of will was the lineal, and as it were, instant, descendant in his consciousness of sensations produced by the enemy acts towards him. A man has no control whatever over a sensation. He is insulted; anger wells up inevitably. He cannot will to be devoid of anger; as well expect one to be devoid of pain when a hot metal presses against his flesh. Anger is the reciprocal emotion to insult, as pain is the reciprocal sensation to the touch of hot iron. The will cannot refuse to allow this sequence of phenomena. If it cannot, it is not free; it is determined, hedged in, or controlled.

Having appreciated the lack of control over the emotion by the will at the moment preceding the possible act of murder, let us advance the argument a step further. Impelled by a mental attitude, by a *willing* not free, but most undoubtedly held in the grip of determining factors, he now kills or he does not. He is now about to be faced with the problem of choosing between

them. One set of factors comprises tendency to savagery, love of conquest, desire to balance wrongs received, by retaliation, as against restraint from former teaching, self-conquest in loyal adherence to a moral code, desires towards right doing, pathetic reference introspectively to noble precepts inculcated by some early friend—a mother, perchance—and perhaps fear of consequences or a passionate disregard of them. If the balance lies with the former, he slays his man; if the latter, he refrains. But is it not plain that in either case the act—or its omission—is determined, is controlled, is driven, is dominated?

Thus the will, whether regarded as conforming to the "theological" or "fanatic" definition is not free. The mental make-up determines it. This mental equipment is the result, and indeed total, of education, surroundings, former associates, previous sensations, habits of thought and cogitation, inherited tendencies, transmitted taints or blemishes, a host of factors ontogenetic and phylogenetic, possible to grasp only under the comprehensive terms, "heredity" and "environment." These two, and these only, determine the will; hence the will is not free, *i.e.*, there is no Free Will.

Perchance the protagonists of Free Will are dissatisfied with the definitions of will which we ascribe to them as theirs. Is will simply a mental attitude, or is it of necessity this attitude *plus* its translation, or shall we say fruition, into activity? We care not which they claim; we shall prove still further it is not free. Consider these examples. A woman in a factory has her hair, by accident, caught in some machinery. She is in imminent danger of being scalped. Does any man doubt that she *wills* to be released? that a passionate and overwhelming desire to extricate herself floods the totality of her consciousness? Is this overmastering desire will, or is it not? If it is, who dare assert that it is free? Can she help willing her release? Is it not the inevitable outcome of pain, danger, fear, love of life, self-preservative instinct? Here, then, if will is the mental attitude, it is not free.

But, on the other definition, will must be followed by the act desired or willed. Since she cannot, and does not extricate herself, but is maimed or killed, will is again controlled, and hence not free.

In the last case, will is controlled by the exigencies of physical happenings.

JERL. NIRRA.

(To be concluded.)

"Christian Evidence."

He who will not reason is a bigot,
He who cannot is a fool,
And he who dares not is a slave.

It is a fact that Freethinkers study the Bible more thoroughly than Christians; consequently, a Freethinker is often privileged to correct Biblical quotations and to give Scripture-knowledge lessons to an opponent.

A case in point occurred when the Cambridge University Press declared the Bible "correct." Their attention was respectfully directed to Acts xvii., verse 18: "And some said, What would this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods."

The phrase "*other some*" is wrong, nonsensical; and the publishers, together with others responsible for the production of the Revised Version, were told so. And here is their reply: "Compare your own Bible with some other or others of a different size, and if the reading is the same in them all, you may depend upon it that it is correct."

Correct, indeed! Why, the *Revised Version*, "the pure Word of God in the purest English," contains hundreds

of errors against truth and morals; and an office-boy knows grammar better than the whole company of over a hundred "learned divines," who resorted to voting in order to determine right from wrong. Consequently, "37,000" renderings were decided differently, but all of them printed as "correct." Those figures are given by one of the revising company, the Rev. Professor Moulton, D.D., sometime Master of the Leys School, Cambridge, and *he* ought to be "correct."

With such information, we understand now why there is so little of that precious faculty of the mind, *common sense*.

It is because "this well of *pure* English," with its thirty-seven thousand muddling renderings and hundreds of other pernicious teachings, contaminates both parent and child. But the sign of the Cross is always the sign of an ignoramus.

Fraud, cowardice, vice, and ignorance are grave charges. These are deliberately levelled at "the right reverends" and their puny progeny. The Right Rev. Samuel Thornton, D.D., Assistant Bishop of Manchester, deliberately stated that men of letters have "access to the original"; as if its existence were a verity. Why, of the sixty-six books constituting the Bible, there is not one "original." The earliest MS. of the Old Testament of which the age is certainly known, is dated A.D. 916, and no "copies" agree.

In the Authorised Version we read that a man was born two years before his father (2 Chron. xxi. 20 and xii. 2), but the revisers had not the courage to expunge this monstrosity. The clergy also condone their predecessors' disgusting teaching (1 Cor. vii. 36), which actually advocates incest; adding, *it is not a sin to practise a most degrading obscenity*. This revolting and "inspired" vice is placed indiscriminately in the hands of youths and maidens by clergymen whom the nation tolerate and the State encourage with payments!

With regard to ignorance, university prelates have yet to learn that pronouns in the English language refer to nouns nearest to them of the same number and person; this is very elementary grammar, but they do not know it.

In John i. 6 we read: "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John." That sentence gives God a new name—JOHN GOD! Again, "Jesus answered..... he that delivered me hath greater sin" (John xix. 10-11). Now, remembering that Jesus was *delivered up by God* (Acts ii. 23), Jesus therefore not only declares that act as a sin, but deliberately charges God as the great sinner. Also, according to Acts xii. 21-23, God was eaten by worms: "He gave not God the glory, and he [*i.e.*, God] was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost." "What blasphemy!" exclaims the man who puts his collar on backwards. Maybe, Christian, but these are evidences from your own "blessed" book, which also states that *God has a big brother!* Such is the rendering of 1 John iv. 21, and it necessarily follows as a duty binding all Christians who loveth God to love God's brother also.

The Bible expressly states these ideas with utmost clearness. They could not possibly be rendered in plainer language, as the "learned" revisers declare in the preface: "As to pronouns and the place they occupy in the sentence, we have been particularly careful."

Consider one proof in 1 Tim. iii. 2, and in conjunction with it 1 Tim. iii. 12. In verse 2 of the Revised Version a definite article, "the," is inserted before the word "husband." The bishops thereby are prevented from having a licence for whoredom. But in the twelfth verse no such alteration has been made; therefore, permission for unlawful sexual intercourse is given to the deacons.

Upon this statement relative to bishops, the Rev. A. Edgar, D.D., remarks:—

Such a rendering (*i.e.*, with an "a" instead of "the") would present unutterable horror to the episcopal mind; for, while forbidding the bishop to indulge in polygamy, it would give Scripture sanction for his wife's luxuriating in barbaric dignity of polyandry. Therefore, for the bishops' sake, the "Revisers" did *not* revise the passage, but continue to make the rules of grammar succumb to the dictates of sober theology.

But why attempt to preserve the bishops and wholly neglect a poor deacon? This is clearly a case of blessing the bishops and damn the deacons. And the evidence is quite lucid. The Bible states that the "one wife" is to be the common property of "deacons" who are to be her "husbands" and she their prostitute. And this is what the Right Rev. Samuel Thornton, D.D., Assistant Bishop, calls "light in all its purity and clearness"!

Poor old Job is made to swallow his riches and vomit them up *again* (Job xx. 15). In explanation, before anything can be *vomited up again*—but, verily, verily, it is too sickly; so we leave the full explanation to the "revisers." Moreover, this is a gratuitously foul simile, because a Freethinker—Mr. E. J. Dillon, Professor of Oriental Languages—is privileged to convey a cleaner and more sensible meaning in his *Poem of Job* than that repulsive translation of the "learned revisers," who know little Hebrew and less English.

Similar offensive expressions—*e.g.*, filthiness of a woman's latter end (Lam. i. 9)—are gratuitous insults to both sexes. "Light in all its purity," indeed!

A specimen of "particular carefulness" is offered in Mark vi. 16—"him that was possessed with devils, and concerning the *swine*. And *they* began to beseech him." What extraordinary swine! and the more so since they had previously been drowned (Mark v. 13).

Truly the "learned" divines have well said: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. x. 22).
W. A. V.

A Hasty Judgment.

It has always seemed to me that the punishment meted out to Ananias and his good lady was a trifle severe. His case stands out as a tremendous warning against landed proprietors who may intend to make a little out of a sound business transaction. Of course, neither of them should have fabricated that little fib about the price of their freehold. Still, they might have argued that, even if their statements did not quite accord with the whole truth, yet their slip was "only a little one." They might have alleged that even amongst the apostles themselves were to be found small attempts at "terminological inexactitudes." They might have mentioned Peter, who, at a very critical moment, deliberately said the thing that was not. Or, if they cared to ransack Bible history, they could have found many instances of religious prevarication without being attended with fatal results. Why, then, was this worthy couple brought to an untimely end in their prime, just when the new commonwealth was about to be successfully established?

Firstly, I think their "story" must have lacked artistic quality. Though they had evidently rehearsed the part they each had to play, yet in the telling of it there must have been absent that polished verisimilitude which is so necessary to the stamina of a healthy religious lie. One must admit—we all admit—that if lying is imperative, it ought to be done, especially if it be for the glory of God, with some concern for artistic effect. No mere tyro should be allowed to bungle this business; it should be left to the adept at romancing; one who is glib at

tongue-twisters, one who can easily persuade you that black is white and that scarlet is no colour at all. It requires a proficient mathematician, who not only knows how many beans make five, but who can add two and two together and secure the wished-for result. If we had the documents at hand, I think it would be found that the pair had blundered, and blundered badly, as they very soon found to their cost. They received a lesson which lasted the rest of their lives.

Secondly, the tragic affair of the property-vendors was an example of the swiftness of Nemesis. As our rector says, he was judged on the spot. We must all agree to that. Though we have certain differences of opinion—the rector and I—yet we agree to his verdict in this case. It makes one happy to find oneself in harmony with our rector. How many Freethought lecturers have been struck down dead! but it was generally after the lapse of five minutes. Though they tempted Providence too rashly, yet they chose the time for their exit, and they probably could have escaped had they so wished. But here our landed speculator and his wife had no choice. Like Hamlet's father, they were—

Cut off even in the blossom of their sin,
Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd.

The retribution was swift and inexorable. There was no dalliance on the part of Omnipotence.

Thirdly (as this is a sermon I might as well keep to the beaten path), one may discover a wonderful instance of how the bad name of a dog sticks to him after he has been christened. Down the ages the name of Ananias has been synonymous with a disregard for truth. You may call a man by a shorter name, but if you call him "Ananias" he will understand you perfectly. The lady does not figure quite so prominently, yet if her name was used in a family squabble, most people would perceive the significance. Perhaps "Jezebel" has outshone her humbler sister in the Billingsgate firmament, but that may be because the former was a kind of encyclopædia for the termagant. The epithet "Jezebel," hurled at a neighbour with sufficient vigour, is almost certain to bring about strained relations. It is one of the most bellicose terms in our language.

Please do not misunderstand my motive in attempting to state a case for Ananias. It may have been that he committed "a grievous fault." But, surely, "grievously" he had to answer it. It was a case of "Jeddart" justice, where they hanged a man first and judged him afterwards. He may have been "on the make" in his deal with that little plot; but the punishment did not fit the crime. And, again, what would our politicians do without Judas and Ananias? They come in very handy at times for these gentlemen.

ALAN TYNDALL.

Correspondence.

COLONIZATION AND THE BIRTH-RATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Permit me to thank Dr. Dunlop, M.B., for his letter in the *Freethinker* (Jan. 7), in reply to my article on "Biology, Economics, and War."

I am sorry he has drawn the implication that I think the birth-rate factor can now be entirely neglected. Widespread intelligent birth-rate control is needed now, and will continue to be needed if man is ever to become master of his "fate" in the fullest possible way. But I hope Dr. Dunlop realizes that the necessity for birth-rate control is conditioned by the methods of food production and food distribution that prevail from time to time. Consequently, control of the birth-rate can only become fully effective when it takes place along with national control of other important factors in social

evolution, such as the means of food production and distribution, etc. Might I suggest that birth-rate control need not imply keeping the population of a country stationary? The birth-rate only needs to be kept within the limits of man's capacity for socially producing and socially distributing food and other essentials of life, with a reasonable degree of comfort for all.

Dr. Dunlop's difficulty with regard to *international* colonization could, I think, be overcome. (1) Each nation concerned would only have to supply a proportion of the adult emigrants that would have to be supplied by a nation doing the work on its own account. (2) If nations exploited the earth for the benefit of all, a large number of able-bodied men, who in past years have lived in unproductive idleness, would be brought into the field of labour. Hence, each nation could afford to draft off some of the adults for the purpose of colonization.

The necessity of birth-rate control might have been mentioned in my article, but I was limited with regard to space.

E. EGERTON STAFFORD.

Death of William Platt Ball.

It is with the very deepest regret that we learn of the death of William Platt Ball, whose name will be familiar to all the older Freethinkers and to a large number of younger ones. Born in 1844, Mr. Ball gave up his earlier profession of school-teaching from a disinclination to teach religion. He became associated with the Freethought Movement during the days of the Bradlaugh struggle in the early 'eighties, and, after Mr. Foote's imprisonment, joined the staff of the *Freethinker*. It is pleasant to have to say that he always regarded the five years' work in connection with this paper as amongst the happiest years of his life, and only ill-health compelled him to give it up. But his interest in the paper and in the Freethought Cause continued undiminished. For some time he contributed occasional articles, but later only a weekly useful batch of newspaper cuttings. We received the last only a day before his death.

Mr. Ball's quiet and unassuming nature was apt to mislead superficial observers as to the mental resources at his disposal. He was naturally of a genuine scientific cast of mind, and whatever subject he took in hand was studied with a rare patience and a quiet homage to the supremacy of facts. Those who are acquainted with his small work, *Are the Effects of Use and Disuse Inherited?*—a really excellent piece of work, will appreciate what is meant. And perhaps the best compliment paid to that work of Mr. Ball's, was the one paid by Herbert Spencer. There were numerous other critics of the Spencerian position with reference to the Inheritance of Acquired Characters, and most of these Spencer ignored. But amongst the few to whom he did reply was W. P. Ball.

Brave and modest, a steady supporter of a Cause that has the quality of selecting the best for its servants, W. P. Ball leaves behind him more friends than he knew of, and more mourners than he would care to have. For his chief desire was not to give those around him pain or trouble—even in mourning for his death. He would have them face his death as he faced it himself. Fortunately, perhaps, for human nature, that cannot be. We mourn for our dead, even though that mourning is unaccompanied by foolish and superstitious fears. And those who knew William Platt Ball know that the world is the poorer for the death of a brave, honest, and simple soul.

By Mr. Ball's own request, the funeral is to be without ceremony of any kind, and also without—in the customary sense—mourners.

Where to Obtain the "Freethinker."

The following is not a complete list of newsagents who supply the "Freethinker," and we shall be obliged for other addresses for publication. The "Freethinker" may be obtained on order from any newsagent or railway bookstall.

London.

- E.—E. T. Pendrill, 26 Bushfield Street, Bishopsgate. M. Papier, 86 Commercial Street. B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields. J. Knight & Co., 3 Ripple Road, Barking. Messrs. Duncumb & Sons, 287 High Street, Stratford.
- E.C.—W. S. Dexter, 6, Byward Street. Rose & Co., 133 Clerkenwell Road. Mr. Siveridge, 88 Fenchurch Street. J. J. Joques, 191 Old Street. Mr. Henderson, 66 Charing Cross Road.
- N.—C. Walker & Son, 84 Grove Road, Holloway. Mr. Keogh, Seven Sisters Road (near Finsbury Park). Mr. West, New Road, Lower Edmonton. T. Perry, 17 Fore Street, Edmonton. H. Hampton, 80 Holloway Road. E. S. Smith, 7 Turnpike Lane, Hornsey.
- N.W.—W. I. Tarbart, 316 Kentish Town Road. W. Lloyd, 5 Falkland Road, Kentish Town.
- S.E.—J. H. Killick, 1 Tyler Street, East Greenwich. Mr. Clayton, High Street, Woodside, South Norwood. W. T. Andrews, 35 Meetinghouse Lane, Peckham. B. Dean, Southwark Bridge.
- S.W.—R. Offer, 58 Kenyon Street, Fulham. A. Toleman, 54 Battersea Rise. A. Green, 29 Felsham Road, Putney. F. Locke, 500 Fulham Road. F. Lucas, 683 Fulham Road.
- W.—Mr. Fox, 154 King Street, Hammersmith. Mr. Harvey, 1 Becklow Road, Shepherds Bush. Mr. Baker, Northfield Avenue, West Ealing. Thomas Dunbar, 82, Seaford Road, West Ealing.
- W.C.—J. Bull, 24 Grays Inn Road.

Country.

- Aberdeenshire.—J. Grieg, 16 Marischol Street, Peterhead.
- Barrow-in-Furness.—J. Jowett, 56 Forshaw Street. E. L. Jowett, 84 Dalton Road.
- Beccles.—C. Chase, Station Road.
- Birkenhead.—Mr. Capper, Boundary Road, Port Sunlight.
- Birmingham.—J. C. Aston, 39-40 Smallbrook Street. A. G. Beacon & Co., 67 & 68 Worcester Street. F. Holder, 42 Hurst Street. Mr. Benton, High Street, Erdington. Mr. Kimber, Ash Road Post Office, Saltley. W. H. Smith & Son, 34 Union Street. Messrs. Stanford & Mann, New Street.
- Bolton.—E. Basnett, Church Street, Westhoughton. W. Atkinson, 364 Blackburn Road.
- Brighton.—W. Hillman, 4 Little Western Street.
- Bristol.—W. H. Smith & Son, Victoria Street.
- Cardiff.—W. H. Smith & Son, Penarth Road.
- Carshalton.—Mr. Simmons, 29 North Street.
- Gateshead.—Henderson & Birkett, 4 & 5 Hills Street.
- Cheltenham.—S. Norris, Ambrose Street.
- Cullompton.—A. W. Clitsome, The Square.
- Derbyshire.—Mr. Featherstone, Chapel-en-le-Firth.
- Dublin.—Mr. Kearney, Upper Stephen Street.
- Dundee.—Mr. Cunningham, St. Andrew's Street. "The Hub," High Street. Mr. Lamb, 121 Overgate.
- Falkirk.—James Wilson, 76 Graham's Road.
- Glasgow.—David Baxter, 32 Brunswick Street.
- Gravesend.—Mrs. Troke, 10 Passock Street. Mr. Love, Gassick Street. Mr. Gould, Milton Road. Mr. Troke, Clarence Place.
- Hastings.—King Bros., 2 Queen's Road.
- pswich.—A. E. Hiskey, 1 Old Cattle Market. T. Shelbourne, St. Matthew Street. Mr. Fox, Fore Street. Mr. Fox, St. Helen's Street. Mr. Roberson, Back Hamlet. Mr. Joyce, Fore Street.
- Jarrow.—L. Prescod, Railway Street.
- Kent.—E. J. Voss, 148 Broadway, Bexley Heath.
- Lancashire.—John Turner, Scourbottom, Waterford. W. Restall, Station Bridge, Urmston. J. T. Middlehurst, 43 Water Lane, Preston.
- Leeds.—C. H. Pickles, Ltd., 117 Albion Street. J. Bray, 95 Park Lane. J. Sutcliffe, West Street.
- Liverpool.—S. Reeves, 316 Derby Road, Bootle. W. H. Smith and Son, 61 Dale Street.
- Manchester.—Mrs. Tole, Whitelaw Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy. John Heywood, Ltd., Deansgate. Abel Heywood & Son, 47-61 Lever Street. W. H. Smith & Son, Blackfriars Street.
- Monmouth.—Mr. Davies, Pontnewydd. Wm. Morris, Windsor Road, Griffithatton. Wyman & Son, Station Bookstall, Pontypool Road.
- Neath.—W. G. Maybury, 57 Windsor Road.
- Newcastle-on-Tyne.—W. H. Smith & Son, 2 Forth Place.
- Northampton.—Mr. Bates, Bridge Street. A. Bryan, Barracks Road.
- Southend-on-Sea.—Harold Elliott, 1 Belle Vue Terrace.
- Stockton-on-Tees.—Mr. Elgie, Bowesfield Lane.
- Teddington.—H. H. Holwill, 105 High Street.
- Torquay.—L. Priston, 103 Union Street. A. Priston, 47 Market Street. A. Peters, Old Mill Road, Chelston. Mr. Ronayne Walnut Road. H. Peters, 193 Union Street. W. J. Peters, 37 Union Street. Mr. Hunt, Lucius Street.
- Yarmouth.—C. H. Knights, 87 & 88 Northgate Street. H. Bird, 19 Howard Street South. J. M. Headley, North Howard Street.

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.

INDOOR.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (St. Pancras Reform Club, 15 Victoria Road, off Kentish Town Road, N.W.): 7.30, Debate, "Republicanism *versus* Royalism." Opened by H. V. Storey.

MR. HOWELL SMITH'S DISCUSSION CLASS (N. S. S. Office): Jan. 18, at 7.30.

OUTDOOR.

HYDE PARK: 11.30, Messrs. Saphin and Shaller; 3.15, Messrs. Dales and Kells, "Give Truth a Chance"; 6.30, Messrs. Beale and Yates.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

LEICESTER (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate); J. T. Lloyd, a Lecture.

NOTTINGHAM (Mechanics' Institute): 7, C. Cohen, "Christianity and the Logic of Life."

Population Question and Birth-Control.

POST FREE THREE HALFPENCE.

MALTHUSIAN LEAGUE,

QUEEN ANNE'S CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

THE TRUTH SEEKER.

FOUNDED BY D. M. BENNETT, 1873.

CONTINUED BY E. M. MACDONALD, 1883-1909.

G. E. MACDONALD - - - - - EDITOR.

L. K. WASHBURN - - - - - EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTOR.

Subscription Rates:

Single subscription in advance	- - - -	\$3.00
Two new subscribers	- - - -	5.00
One subscription two years in advance	- - - -	5.00

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.

The Religion of Famous Men.

BY

WALTER MANN.

A Storehouse of Facts for Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians.

Price ONE PENNY.

(Postage 1/2d.)

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

A

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF FREETHINKERS OF ALL AGES AND NATIONS.

BY

J. M. WHEELER.

Price THREE SHILLINGS Net.

(Postage 5d.)

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

**A New Pamphlet that will prove Useful to Freethinkers
and Enlightening to Christians.**

PRAYER: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, & FUTILITY

By **J. T. LLOYD.**

PRICE TWOPENCE.

(POSTAGE ½d.)

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

Two New Pamphlets by Chapman Cohen.

WAR AND CIVILIZATION.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

(POSTAGE ½d.)

RELIGION AND THE CHILD.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

(POSTAGE ½d.)

Special Price for Free Distribution, Six Shillings per Hundred.

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

Pamphlets by G. W. FOOTE.

	s.	d.
BIBLE AND BEER. 40 pp. post ½d.	0	1
WHAT IS AGNOSTICISM? 32 pp. ½d.	0	1
ROME OR ATHEISM? 32 pp. ½d.	0	1
MRS. BESANT'S THEOSOPHY. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
MY RESURRECTION. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
THE NEW CAGLIOSTRO. 16 pp.... .. ½d.	0	1
THE ATHEIST SHOEMAKER. 32 pp. ½d.	0	1
THE PASSING OF JESUS. 24 pp. ½d.	0	1
HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE. 58 pp. .. 1d.	3	
CHRISTIANITY OR SECULARISM? 120 pp. .. 1½d.	0	4

Pamphlets by COL. INGERSOLL.

A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM. 48 pp. ... post 1d.	0	2
WOODEN GOD. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. 24 pp. ½d.	0	1
MISTAKES OF MOSES. Pioneer Pamphlet, No. 3. 32 pp. ½d.	0	1
COMING CIVILIZATION. 30 pp.... .. ½d.	0	1
DO I BLASPHEME? 28 pp. ½d.	0	1
HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
IS SUICIDE A SIN? AND LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. 28 pp. ½d.	0	1
MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
THE GODS. An Oration. 47 pp. 1d.	0	1
LIVE TOPICS. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
ABRAHAM LINCOLN. An Oration. 30 pp. .. ½d.	0	1
LIMITS OF TOLERATION. 29 pp. ½d.	0	1

	s.	d.
ROME OR REASON. 48 pp. post ½d.	0	1
WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED? 39 pp. ½d.	0	1
CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
SUPERSTITION. 48 pp. 1d.	0	2
SOCIAL SALVATION. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
WHY I AM AN AGNOSTIC. 23 pp. ½d.	0	1

Other Freethought Pamphlets.

REFUTATION OF DEISM, by P. B. Shelley. 32 pp. post ½d.	0	1
UTILITARIANISM, by J. Bentham. 32 pp... .. ½d.	0	1
PAGAN MYTHOLOGY, by Lord Bacon. 60 pp. .. 1½d.	0	3
ESSAY ON SUICIDE, by D. Hume. 16 pp. .. ½d.	0	1
MORTALITY OF SOUL, by D. Hume. 16 pp. .. ½d.	0	1
MARTYRDOM OF HYPATIA, by M. Mangan- sarian. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
CODE OF NATURE, by Diderot and Holbach. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
FREEWILL AND NECESSITY, Anthony Collins. 82 pp.... .. 1d.	0	3
ESSENCE OF RELIGION, by L. Feuerbach. 82 pp. Nett.	1	6
LIBERTY AND NECESSITY, by D. Hume. 32 pp. ½d.	0	1
LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY, by Percy Bysshe Shelley. 16 pp. ½d.	0	1
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ETHICS, by Chapman Cohen ½d.	0	1

About 1d. in the 1s. should be added on Foreign and Colonial orders.

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

Books Every Freethinker should Possess.

HISTORY OF SACERDOTAL CELIBACY.

By H. C. LEA.

In two handsome volumes, large 8vo., published at 21s. net. Price 7s., postage 7d.

THE WORLD'S DESIRES; OR, THE RESULTS OF MONISM.

By E. A. ASHCROFT.

440 pp., published at 10s. 6d. Price 2s. 6d., postage 5d.

NATURAL AND SOCIAL MORALS.

By CARVETH READ.

8vo. 1909. Published at 7s. 6d. net. Price 3s., postage 5d.

PHASES OF EVOLUTION AND HEREDITY.

By D. B. HART, M.D.

Crown 8vo. Published at 5s. Price 1s. 6d., postage 4d.

THE THEORIES OF EVOLUTION.

By YVES DELAGE.

1912. Published at 7s. 6d. net. Price 3s., postage 5d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK.

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

For Freethinkers and Enquiring Christians. New Edition. 162 pp. Cloth. Price 1s., postage 2d.

THREE ESSAYS ON RELIGION.

By J. S. MILL.

Published at 5s. Price 1s. 6d., postage 4d.

HISTORY OF THE TAXES ON KNOWLEDGE.

By C. D. COLLET.

Two vols., published at 7s. Price 2s. 6d., postage 5d.

DETERMINISM OR FREE WILL?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price 1s. net, postage 2d.

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT.

By G. W. FOOTE.

First Series, with Portrait, 216 pp. Cloth. Price 2s. 6d. net, postage 4d. Second Series, 302 pp. Cloth. Price 2s. 6d. net, postage 4d. The Two Volumes post free for 5s.

BIBLE STUDIES.

By J. M. WHEELER.

Essays on Phallic Worship and other curious Rites and Customs. Price 1s. net, postage 2½d.

About 1d. in the 1s. should be added on all Foreign and Colonial orders.

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

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President :

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Secretary :

MISS E. M. VANCE, 62 FARRINGTON STREET, 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 assails it as the historic enemy of Progress.

Secularism accordingly seeks to dispel superstition; to spread education; to disestablish religion; to rationalize morality; to promote peace; to dignify labour; to extend material well-being; and to realize the self-government of the people.

Membership.

Any 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.....19.....

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

P.S.—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 the Free-thought Societies, for the maintenance and propagation of heterodox opinions on matters of religion, on the same conditions as apply to Christian or Theistic churches or organizations.

The Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws, in order that Religion 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 Sunday opening of State and Municipal Museums, Libraries, and Art Galleries.

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

The Equalization 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 labour.

The Abolition of all hereditary distinctions and privileges fostering a spirit antagonistic to justice and human brotherhood.

The Improvement, by all just and wise means, of the conditions of daily life for the masses of the people, especially in towns and cities, where insanitary and incommensurable 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 Labour to organize itself for its moral and economical advancement, and of its claim to legal protection in such combinations.

The Substitution of the idea of Reform for that of Punishment in the treatment of criminals, so that gaols may no longer be places of brutalization, or even of mere detention, but places of physical, intellectual, and moral elevation for those who are afflicted with anti-social tendencies.

An Extension of the moral law to animals, so as to secure them 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.