

The

# FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. XXXVII.—No. 7

SUNDAY FEBRUARY 18, 1917

PRICE TWOPENCE

## CONTENTS.

	Page.
Juvenile "Crime" and Religious Education.—The Editor	97
The Light of Life.—J. T. Lloyd	98
The Freethinkers' Burden.—Mimmermus	99
The Emergence of Man.—T. F. Palmer	100
A Play by a Peripatetic Patriotic Parson.—S. V. K.	102
Acid Drops	103
To Correspondents	105
Sugar Plums	105
The Bowman Case.—H. V. S.	105
Religion in Russia.—E. Egerton Stafford	107
Compulsory Religion.—Ignotus	109
Obituary	110
Notica of Meetings	110
Books and Pamphlets	111

## Views and Opinions.

Juvenile "Crime" and Religious Education.

We have had occasion recently to wonder at the sharply circumscribed knowledge of legal specialists. At the same time, it is only fair to add, we have been further impressed by the acuteness of mind displayed in their own department. But outside that, their excursions into the fields of philosophy or sociology have impressed us with their elementary character. That is, perhaps, the price we have to pay for specialists; but at the same time it does indicate a very real danger of departmental knowledge. For however much we may separate life into compartments, yet it functions as a whole, and the labours of specialists only become of their utmost value when the results are properly coordinated. And an added danger to specialization is that the specialist, because of his acknowledged authority in his own department, contracts the habit of expressing opinions *ex cathedra* in other directions, which opinions are often received with a deference to which they are not at all entitled. \* \* \*

### A Magistrate's Indictment.

We have been led to the above observations because of a short article contributed to *Reynolds'* newspaper by Mr. Cecil Chapman, one of our Metropolitan magistrates. The subject of Mr. Chapman's article is juvenile criminality—a phrase which in itself requires to be used with extreme care. For "juvenile crime" often means little more than juvenile mischief, although the police authorities call anything a crime which offends some article of the police code. Mr. Chapman divides the causes of "juvenile crime" into two parts—direct and indirect. And it seems to us that, whatever increase there may be, the direct causes enumerated by Mr. Chapman are enough. These are: the excitement induced by the War; the absence of the father and elder brothers from home; the absence of mothers from home, due to their being engaged in War work; the closing of some schools, and the depletion of the school staffs generally. Mr. Chapman also adds a rather

doubtful word on the influence of cinemas which show how children can elude policemen, and would picture the villain as the hero of the piece. But even without the last, the other causes seem quite enough to account for any increase of lawlessness that may have occurred amongst juveniles.

\* \* \*

### Religion and the Child.

Mr. Chapman's observations as to the direct causes of lawlessness—we much prefer that word to "crime"—are such as would occur to any thoughtful person. It is when he comes to deal with the indirect causes that he illustrates the danger of some men stepping outside their proper sphere. Of the indirect causes he says:—

I do not think that education in our schools makes for a well-established or well-grounded sense of morality. In the first place, so far as I can judge, religion is only taught at stated periods, and it is taught, not compulsorily, but as something of a by-product, and in the same way as mathematics and chemistry are often taught, only to be forgotten as soon as possible. Religion, if it is to be worth anything at all, must be the basis of all conduct. Religion ought to be the atmosphere of the schools, not a separate lesson at the beginning of the school which children need not attend unless they like. Moral teaching is of little use if it is negative in character. The fact of being told not to do a thing is the very thing which makes you want to do it. Negative teaching of morality is a definite incentive to immorality; at any rate, it does not produce the best conduct. All moral teaching should be on the positive side—loving our neighbours as ourselves, and doing something for our neighbours as we would do for ourselves.

We have no wish to be offensive, but the tenour of this paragraph strikes us as the utterance of a man who considers the subject from the point of view of a preconceived prejudice rather than from that of an impartial study of the facts. For the main theme here is a plea for religion as the basis of morality, with the assumption that no satisfactory teaching of morality can be adequate that is separated from its influence. And that contention is justified neither by theory nor fact.

\* \* \*

### Morality and Religion.

Let it be granted, at least for the moment, that our schools do not provide an education that makes for "a well-grounded sense of morality." We think there is a deal to be said in favour of that, but the fault does not lie wholly with the teachers, nor even with the higher authorities responsible for the schools. But we can say with certainty that in the training of the young the schools partly secularized have been more successful than were the schools wholly under the influence of religion, and in which there existed that atmosphere for which Mr. Chapman sighs. Let him take the pre-1870 period, when education was dominated by religion. Was there a higher standard of moral character developed then than now? I do not think Mr. Chapman will answer in the affirmative. Or let him take the Church schools



and the Roman Catholic schools, where a very definite form of religion is taught, and where one may assume there is more of a religious atmosphere than in Council schools. Is there a higher type of character developed there? We are quite sure that no one conversant with the facts will say there is. If there is one thing plain, it is that neither with the child nor with the adult does religion guarantee any certain development of character. Mr. Chapman, as a police-court magistrate, must have before him, in the course of the year, hundreds of people who have received a careful religious education. What refining influence do these cases show? Would he use a knowledge of the religious convictions of the people charged before him as any guide to arriving at a decision as to their guilt? We venture to say he would not. Or in so simple a case as choosing between affirmation and the oath: Does he find the one who takes the oath more truthful than the one who affirms? Again, we do not think he does. In actual life, whether on the Bench or off it, no one ever takes the presence of religious belief as a sure indication of high moral character. The religious man *may* be an upright person, or he may be a rogue. And we cheerfully admit that the same is true of the non-religious person. The lack of organic connection between strong religious belief and a highly developed character is one of the plainest facts of universal experience. \* \* \*

#### Negative Moral Teaching.

We quite agree that moral teaching is of little use if it is negative in character. We have also little faith in moral teaching that is positive in character, as moral teaching is usually conceived. In aiming at a paragon, it most often produces a prig. If one will pay attention to a development of sympathy and imagination with children, this, along with a decent social environment, will dispense with any pressing need for stereotyped moral instruction. But, unfortunately, for Mr. Chapman, a moral instruction based on religion does nearly always take a negative form. "Thou shalt not" is the main form of religious moral teaching, as it is the main form of every police code. And, again, we agree that a parade of prohibitions is an invitation to infringement. The suggestion of the opposite is a commonplace of psychology. It is not only the cinema that makes the villain the most interesting person in the piece. That is also a peculiarity of religious morality. There is so much talk of "sacrifice" and of "restraint"—two words that should never, on any account, be heard in connection with moral teaching—it is the villain who is impressed upon the Christian's mind as the only one who has a really good time. The good man has all the suffering and experiences all the sacrifice, and the bad one leads a life of enjoyment—at least in this world. And, quite naturally, many are inclined to risk the next. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush—particularly when the existence of the bush is a matter of uncertainty. \* \* \*

#### Morality a Weird Fact.

Morality can never be safely taught save as a *social* fact. Base your morality upon God, you do but impose an heavenly policeman on a terrestrial one. Permeate it with religion and you breed difference, discord, hatred, and uncharitableness where there should be nothing but a broad harmony and an enlightened humanitarianism. Morality is a social fact or nothing. It arises out of the natural, the organic relationships of members of the same species. Moral laws are laws of social health, they describe and prescribe the conditions under which human beings may dwell together with both pleasure and profit. And if our moral teaching has not been as

effective hitherto as it might have been, secular teachers may well plead that it has never had a fair chance. Vested interests have seen to it that it is more or less allied with religion. Inside the school the teacher may be doing his or her best to turn out a finished character. Outside there is the home, too often sadly defective, and the social environment too often more defective still. The important truth lost sight of by Mr. Chapman is that as the impulse to morality comes from life, not from theory, so it is life which will determine its form and measure the degree of perfection attained. A community less saturated than ours with religious cant would see to it that the work of the teacher was enforced by the pressure of social life, instead of using the imperfections of the social environment—particularly during so decivilizing a period as the present—to belittle the work of education.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### The Light of Life.

ACCORDING to some thinkers, there are at least two fundamental entities in the Universe, namely, matter and life; life being, possibly, "a real and basal form of existence." The present advocates of this theory are not themselves biologists, and they deliberately ignore the fact that biologists have completely abandoned it. Its chief champion is Sir Oliver Lodge, a distinguished physicist, who goes to the extreme length of declaring that there exists a "central store" of life, out of which all living things have received their respective vital sparks. In a tree or an insect, the vital spark fails to develop into personality, and at death "returns undifferentiated and unidentified to its central store." That is to say, a tree or an insect is not immortal. In man, however, life becomes sufficiently individual, characteristic, or real, to retain its identity, or its individual character, after it returns to "its central store." That is to say, man is worthy of survival. The distinguishing characteristic of this hypothesis is its utterly unscientific nature. Professor Lionel Beale published several eloquent volumes in its defence, but towards the end of his life he was obliged to admit that "the idea that life is a power, force, or property of a special and peculiar kind, temporarily influencing matter, separating and combining, directing, controlling and regulating, but entirely different from, and in no way correlated, or by necessity connected, with ordinary matter or force, has been often ridiculed, and is now frequently rejected as being too absurd to require refutation" (*Protoplasm*, p. 1). Professor Benjamin Moore, of Liverpool, exclaimed, at a recent meeting of the British Association: "Vitalism is dead; but I should like to worship at the shrine of the dead love." Professor Schafer, also, in his famous Dundee Address, affirmed that "Vitalism as a working hypothesis has not only had its foundations undermined, but most of the superstructure has toppled over." "At the best," he added, "vitalism explains nothing, and the term 'vital force' is an expression of ignorance which can bring us no further along the path of knowledge."

What, then, is life? It is a product of evolution; not an entity that enters into matter at a given moment and leaves it at another, but a condition, or process, that always occurs when matter is in the colloidal state. Let it be clearly understood that animate matter is subject to precisely the same laws as inanimate, and that in no essential sense does living matter differ from the not-living. Take any living substance you please, and you will find that it does not contain a single new element. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and phosphorus are found in all living substances, accompanied in many forms of life



by certain inorganic salts, such as chloride of sodium, salts of calcium, magnesium, potassium, and iron. Now, all these elements, without exception, abound, in various forms, in lifeless Nature. It is safe to affirm that there is no absolute difference of constitution between animate and inanimate matter. The apparent difference lies in the fact that in living matter those elements are so combined as to form what the biologists call a colloidal—gelatinous or glue-like—compound, and the result of the formation of this compound is the state or condition known as animate. For the introduction of life there was no need to create any new principle or entity. Until quite lately it was generally taken for granted that between the living and the not-living there yawned an impassable gulf; but recent discoveries have done something infinitely better than to bridge this gulf; they have even proved that no gulf existed at all except in the imagination of the ignorant.

This theory of the origin and nature of life seems to fit all the facts concerning it which are at present known to us. If life is a product of evolution, and is governed in all its stages by the same physical and chemical forces as inanimate matter, it inevitably follows that to step outside Nature for the interpretation thereof is a radical mistake. To explain Nature in terms of a purely imaginary Supernature is not only an inexcusable blunder, but an act of high treason against Nature herself, a violation at once of the laws of logic and ethics. In what terms, then, are we to interpret life? In terms of the very Nature that has produced it. The first thing to be borne in mind is that life and death are equally inevitable, that organization is invariably followed by disorganization, and that neither life nor death fulfils any ultimate purpose or design. In other words, Nature is neither moral nor immoral, but merely non-moral. The only virtue is conformity to her laws, which she unconsciously rewards, and the only vice consists in vainly trying to break her laws, an action she as unconsciously punishes. The second great truth to remember is that intelligence is an attribute of life in its more refined and complicated forms, which has been won through countless æons of evolution. It is with Nature alone that all living beings have to settle their accounts. The joy of life is the reward of obedience, and misery the inevitable penalty of disobedience.

From those two principles we arrive at two definite and practical conclusions. The first is that life possesses no intrinsic value. To Nature the life of a Plato or a Shakespeare means neither more nor less than that of a fly. All valuations are artificial, and of artificial applications. One may ask, What is the object of existence? To which question a hundred different and more or less conflicting answers may be returned, not one of which could legitimately claim the merit of being true. The riddle of the Universe flatly declines to be read, though millions of attempts to decipher it have been made in all ages and countries. The men of the pulpit give a reading of it which they have the audacity to pronounce infallible, the responsibility for which, however, they throw on the shoulders of a being who has never once spoken for himself. The truth is that existence has no intelligible object, nor serves any known purpose. And this suggests the other conclusion, namely, that its evolved intelligence enables mankind to interpret life in terms of society. The laws of social life are these two, that of self-preservation and that of the preservation of others. Each of these laws is as essential to the welfare of the community as the other. He who does not serve himself possesses no real qualification for serving others. A selfless life would be fully as senseless. Self-service is the best possible preparation for vicarious service. If a father loses his way, how

can he act as a guide to his children? In an article in the *Christian World* for February 8, Dr. J. A. Hutton, of Glasgow, says:—

One fails us and another; but there is One left who will not fail us. We have Christ. Alas, it would seem that we cannot give ourselves to Christ with all the tenderness of the deepest love, until we see his beauty, his deep understanding of us, by contrast with some love of the world which has proved unstable, or mean, or false.

Then he gives the following advice to young people:—

Permit nothing to become a light within your life, if it in any way obscures within you the light of Jesus Christ. Give to no mere human prospect, however dear, the power to lift you to the heavens, or the power to cast you into the dust. Give no hope or prospect any intimate place amongst your motives, if, when it is strongly in your mind, at the same moment Christ and the faith of your people must be far away.....In all your loves, love Christ.

Now, in direct opposition to that teaching of the pulpit, we venture to set Nature and her laws, than which we know of absolutely nothing higher and worthier of trust. To keep in touch with God and Christ, one must walk by faith all the time: the moment faith goes, they vanish. We prefer to walk by knowledge, by our ever-growing knowledge of our Mother-Nature, for knowledge is the only light of life that never fails. To walk by faith is to be a somnambulist, who sooner or later is bound to be overcome by disaster. To walk by knowledge is to face life intelligently, with indomitable courage and well-grounded confidence.

J. T. LLOYD.

## The Freethinkers' Burden.

Rough work, iconoclasm, but the only way to get at truth.  
—*Oliver Wendell Holmes.*

If Christians would teach infidels to be just to Christianity, they should themselves be just to infidelity.

—*John Stuart Mill.*

POETS and apostles are ever prophets. Swinburne saw and sang "A Vision of Spring in Midwinter," and long before Shelley asked the question: "If winter comes can spring be far behind?" Happy are the pioneers who can ignore the mistakes of the past and fix their gaze on the promise of the future. For them the darkest night is jewelled with the brightest of stars. For them there is a budding to-morrow in every midnight, and for them there is nothing irrevocable, for their eyes are ever looking forward.

Some time since, Mr. Lloyd George, turning aside from the pettiness of party politics, related to an astonished audience the drawbacks of a political career. He spoke of the calumnies to which a politician was exposed, and, in characteristic fashion, explained the seamy side of politics. After describing the burdens of a politician's lot, he went on:—

Tradesmen have their worries and anxieties; but suppose that in addition to their ordinary troubles they found a constant mob of detractors standing outside their doors, some doing it for hate and others for hire, yelling into every customer's ears as he entered their shop: "Don't go there, whatever you do. You will be robbed and cheated at every turn if you do business with those fellows. They are all thieves, rogues, and liars." The whole time you are attending to your customers you have to dodge bricks, clods, and worse hurled at your head. Most men would rather give up business than endure this, if they had to break stones for a living.

There is much sad truth in this frank avowal; but if there is sacrifice in the case of a prominent politician,



what is to be said in the case of the leaders of a really unpopular movement, to whom sacrifice is a science and denial an art? Freethought is a far wider and nobler evangel than a merely political one. It has its roots in intellectual necessity, and, deeper still, in ethical right. It is based on the psychological law of human development, only appended by a few choice spirits for ages, but latterly taking on a new significance and a fresh urgency. Perpetually reaffirmed from generation to generation by unnumbered examples of unselfish martyrdom, from the days of Hypatia to those of Ferrer, it is to-day changing the direction and character of the ideas of the civilized world.

The Freethought leaders are the most potent forces of progress. No other men are discussed so widely as these apostles of freedom, but magnificent as is their life-work, the men are greater. Hissed at by the superior people, stoned and cursed by the vulgar, they have many trials to submit to. Perhaps the hardest which can be mentioned is that of seeing charlatans ride by in their motors; or, in other words, to mark the success of humbug, whilst they find that intellectual honesty is not a paying career.

Yet good and true men and women have had to submit to this treatment. Richard Carlile endured over nine years' imprisonment for championing free speech. Charles Southwell was aged prematurely by his fight for liberty. Charles Bradlaugh suffered defeat after defeat for sixteen years in a battle which was Homeric in its intensity, and his dying ear never caught the echo of his triumphs, a tragic boon which was not denied to Wolfe at Quebec, or to Nelson on the shot-riven *Victory*. Francisco Ferrer, fronting the rifles of his enemies, had to find his triumph in his own heart. George Foote had to listen to the mocking voice of the Christian judge telling him he had devoted his great talents to the service of the Devil. Yet, in their hours of apparent failure, these men had triumphed. They were martyrs who missed the palm, but not the pains of martyrdom, heroes without the laurels, and conquerors without the jubilation of victory, labouring not for themselves, but for the universe and for the coming generations, for them was influence as far-reaching as the utmost reach of the great wave whose crest they sometimes were.

When a politician carries on a campaign against the landed privileges of the nobility, he encounters, necessarily, the resistance of only a portion of the community, whereas a Freethought leader, directing his force against 50,000 priests and clergymen, and their hundreds of thousands of satellites, has to bear the brunt of an enormously greater opposition. No enmity is more relentless, or more venomous, than religious hatred. The abuse directed against the leading politicians is politeness itself compared with the assault and battery made upon the reputation of a Freethought leader. The politician has, at least, the support of half the newspapers of the country, but a leading Freethinker is certain to be grossly insulted by Liberal, Tory, and Socialist papers alike. Accused of almost every crime in the calendar, their actions constantly misrepresented, this well-nigh intolerable animosity, is, in reality, a tribute. Yet the men against whom a hundred thousand pulpits and platforms fulminate abuse will have their reward in the coming time. Thanks to their courage and devotion, heterodoxy is no longer the danger it once was to the citizen. They have forced attention to Freethought advocacy, placed its exponents on a strong platform, organized its forces, and justified its rights to equal citizenship. Through the religious prejudices of our time they have knocked an opening large enough for heretics to pass through in future, and, in very many directions, our lives are easier because of their life-work.

The rights of open-air advocacy in London have been attacked, and there are signs of a recrudescence of bigotry. There was never a time when it was more clearly the duty and the interest of the party to resist the "mailed fist" of the Churches. It is for Freethinkers to stop this plunge into mediævalism. Persecution will offer no insuperable obstacle if we front the enemy with a full war-chest and up-to-date equipment. Forgetting trivial distinctions in the face of our opponents, let us secure the movement from attack. To-day the situation is ominous. Let to-morrow and all to-morrows find it becoming less so, and those who have done their duty be judged worthy successors of those past leaders, who, in the days of peril, thrilled mankind, and raised with swords the form of trampled Liberty.

MIMNERMUS.

### The Emergence of Man.

AN immense interval separates a Shakespeare or a Goethe from a savage, yet all the supreme intellects of the ancient and modern world are by universal assent regarded as distant relations of the most lowly of mankind. Still, many who accept this truth without question continue to view our unmistakable kinship with apes and monkeys with feelings of repugnance. Not that the upholders of the Jewish creation fable possess any logical objection to the doctrine of descent, for the obvious reason that they must necessarily suppose that all the innumerable human stocks have evolved from a single divinely fashioned pair. From the first man and woman—presumably Jewish—have, in terms of this theory, arisen, in a few thousand years, the Bushmen, Chinese, North American Indians, and all the various European and other races. So that logically the supporters of the creation theory can urge no objection to the principle of modified descent.

Civilized and uncivilized peoples alike have always detected a caricature of themselves in the monkey tribe. Their hands and faces, their movements and expressions, present ludicrous likenesses to man's. And there exists one small group which more closely resembles man than any other of all the monkey genera, and we distinguish its members by the term "anthropoid," or man-like apes. These animals are tailless, semi-erect, and long-armed, and their nasal organs more nearly approach man's than those of the flat-nosed monkeys of America. The man-like apes dwell in the tropical regions of the Old World, where the forests are densest and a constant supply of vegetable food is assured. These creatures are now well known to naturalists, and comprise the gibbons, small long-armed apes of South-Eastern Asia; the larger orang-utan of Sumatra and Borneo; and the gorilla and chimpanzee of equatorial West Africa.

One has only to compare the skeletons of these apes (and they stand side by side in the Natural History Museum) to realize their striking anatomical resemblance to the human framework. Shortly before the Darwinian doctrine gave offence to the orthodox, Professor Owen candidly confessed his inability to separate man as a thing apart from the animal domain. In 1857, in his *Essay on the Mammalia*, while comparing the chimpanzee with man, the great anatomist declared that the differences between them were simply those of degree, and he continued: "I cannot shut my eyes to the significance of that all-pervading similitude of structure—every tooth, every bone, strictly homologous—which makes the determination of the difference between *Homo* and *Pithecus* the anatomist's difficulty." Yet, after the theory of evolution had aroused an array of furious antagonists, as it did a couple of years later, Owen



practically suppressed the above admission, and alleged an unbridgable chasm between man and ape. As Huxley scornfully comments: "Surely it is a little singular that the anatomist who finds it 'difficult' to determine 'the difference' between Homo and Pithecus, should yet range them, on anatomical grounds, in distinct sub-classes."

The principle of evolution is now granted by all instructed minds. Since Darwin's, or for that matter Huxley's, day, eloquent evidences of its truth have been furnished by all departments of Nature. The birthplace of the human family was probably Asia, and the ancestors of extant apes appear to have originated in the same continent. Millions of years ago, early in Oligocene times, the Propliopithecus left its remains in the Northern Egyptian desert. In succeeding Miocene times, true tree-dwelling gibbons lived in Europe, and continued their residence through the whole of the later Pliocene Period. One of these apes, the Pliohylobates, ranged as far north as the forest regions of Germany. In Miocene days, the Dryopithecus dwelt in France, and the dentition of this ape is similar to that of the orang, while its jaw suggests that of the lowly savage whose remains were discovered at Piltdown, in Sussex, a few years ago. Other fossils are known, but perhaps the most interesting of these is that of Palæopithecus from the Siwalik Hills, an ape that represented a more generalized type, from which the later specialized chimpanzee, gorilla, and gibbon are descended. And it is also suggestive that the upper pre-molars of Palæopithecus approach the human form.

These several extinct man-like apes are, perhaps, not to be regarded as forerunners of man, although Neopithecus and Dryopithecus have been claimed by such eminent experts as Gaudry and Branco either as ancestors or as nearly related kinsmen of humankind. Fuller researches, however, appear to prove that Dryopithecus was an ancestor of the larger contemporary tailless apes, and was not in the direct line of human descent. But if there is little to indicate direct kinship with man, there appears overwhelming evidence that fossil and living anthropoid apes have, in company with ourselves, arisen from common ancestors in highly remote times. Such marks of common origin have been observed in surviving savage stocks, and are still more pronounced in the bony structures of extinct human races. As Professor H. F. Osborn states, in his *Men of the Old Stone Age* (Bell & Sons, 1916), the anatomy of the ancient Palæolithic peoples cannot be interpreted "without a survey of the principal characters of the existing anthropoid apes."

Although all the higher and more specialized regions of the human brain are present in the cranial contents of our anthropomorphous cousins, the brain of modern man manifests a marked advance. Professor Elliot Smith and other competent judges contend that the arboreal environment of the primitive ancestors of man led to the development of—

quick, alert, and agile movements, which stimulated the progressive advance of the posterior and lateral portions of the brain. The sense of smell had been well developed in a previous terrestrial life; but once these creatures left the earth and took to the trees, guidance by the olfactory sense was less essential, for life amidst the branches of the trees is most favourable to the high development of the senses of vision, touch, and hearing. Moreover, it demands an agility and quickness of movement that necessitates efficient motor centres in the brain to co-ordinate and control such action as tree life calls for. The specialization of sight awakens curiosity to examine objects with greater minuteness, and guides the hands to more precise and skilled movements.

One has only to consider the general build of the

human body to realize how admirably adapted it is for life in the virgin forest, and a survey of man's cerebral structures recalls various pictures of his early arboreal life. Those sections of the brain in which the senses of sight, hearing, and touch are seated display a fuller development than our present conditions of life require. If we study a good collection of brains in a museum, or examine a diagram illustrating the evolution of the organ of mind beginning with the chimpanzee and ending with living man (*Homo sapiens*), this early advance of the posterior regions of the brain stands clearly revealed; while, on the other hand, the relative and absolute increase of the frontal or anterior portions of the organ displays itself more and more as we ascend from the higher apes to *Pithecantropus erectus* (the ape-man), and then step by step advance through the Piltdown, Neanderthal, and other primitive types, up to contemporary European races. In other words, the brain centres first evolved are those that minister to the senses of sight, hearing, and touch; while those which furnish us with our higher mental powers are the last to appear.

The ascent of man was largely conditioned by four important factors. The gorilla and other apes are semi-erect, but the rude forefathers of man at last attained the erect posture. A second advantage was the development of the opposable or pliable thumb, which conferred on its possessor enormous possibilities. A third improvement was the expansion of the brain, which, in cooperation with the newly acquired capacity to walk upright, enabled man to cope more successfully with his adverse surroundings. Then, to crown all, his gestures and animal cries were supplemented by the advent of speech, which, however primitive, must have constituted a marked advance over all previous modes of communication. The bipedal attitude enabled man to cultivate the use of his hands, and the rich experiences gained by manual dexterity provided food for reflection, thus giving his mental organ full occasion to exercise its powers. These four progressive modifications acted and reacted on each other, and the advance of one coincided with the development of the rest. Where the hand is partly employed as a foot, as in all animals that move on all-fours, its liberty as a grasping organ is curtailed. In consequence, the freedom conferred on the hands by the attainment of the upright position is enormous. Our antique ancestors were now able to descend from their leafy retreats and explore the adjacent earth, to wander down the streams, and somewhere reach the sea. Such was man as we find him, probably, in late Pliocene times; rude and rugged, but capable, as his after-history proves, of surmounting the risks and dangers that environed him.

Our acquaintance with primitive man is fullest in Europe, and his ancient records are largely associated with the great Ice Age. And science to-day is in possession of sufficient facts to enable us to present a more or less accurate outline of the changing terrestrial and meteorological conditions which heralded the arrival of the strange vicissitudes of that polar period. Authorities of weight differ concerning the duration and extent of this frigid visitation, but the testimony afforded by animal and plant life, in addition to that furnished by various geological phenomena, has convinced all unbiased investigators as to the far-reaching nature of the glacial catastrophe.

During the Pliocene Period, the woodlands of Central France and Northern Italy were composed of trees similar to those that flourish in the forests of the middle United States to-day. The present flora of the Carolinas was well represented in Upper Italy in earlier Pliocene times; while further south, on the margin of the



Mediterranean, the vegetation was more tropical in form. In the words of Osborn, while we have—

the bamboo, the sabal palm, and the dwarf fan palm; most interesting is the presence of the sabal, which now flourishes in the sub-tropical rain forests of Central Florida. The sequoia also was abundant. Towards the close of the Pliocene, the first indications of the coming Glacial Epoch were a lowering of the temperature, and in the higher mountainous areas, perhaps, a beginning of the glacial stages.

T. F. PALMER.

(To be continued.)

## A Playlet by a Peripatetic Patriotic Parson.

"MAN in his time plays many parts," and the Rev. A. J. Waldron has already made his bow as a Naval Architect, a Nonconformist preacher, a peripatetic dealer in mongrel politics, a special lecturer to the Christian Evidence Society, a writer of music-hall sketches, a public instructor on questions of morality, Vicar of Brixton, and hooligan opponent of the N. S. S. platform, whose favourite amusement it was to ostentatiously put pebbles into the collecting-bags at the meetings of the Society—therefore, the recent announcement that he was to appear at the Victoria Palace in a sketch perpetrated by himself and a collaborator, entitled "Nature's Call," excited the curiosity of a possessor of an intimate knowledge of stage technique, who desired to see him still further distinguish himself. Desire was gratified. The purpose of the playlet is well and briefly summarized in the following quotation from the *Referee* :—

It suggested that the Empire's need for a rise in the birth-rate should be met by the abolition of clerical celibacy and the satisfaction of the spinster's maternal instinct without regard to existing conventions.

A youthful spinster, recognizing that there are not enough men to go round, discusses her thwarted natural instincts with a young married man of her acquaintance, who, in turn, submits the problem to the "Padre" (the Rev. A. J. Waldron), who evidently fearing that he should be commandeered to furnish a practical solution, waxes indignant, and declares in a frenzied speech, in which he most effectively "tears a passion to tatters," that he is wedded to the Church and he will not so dishonour his mother (whether he refers to his maternal progenitor or Mother Church is rather uncertain), not even for England! and after this unpatriotic announcement from so patriotic a parson, dashes off, and the curtain descends to a mixed accompaniment of ribald laughter, hisses, and the timid attempts at applause of a few elderly spinsters, who had done violence to their feelings by attending a music-hall performance to support "the late, great Vicar."

Fearing he may have disappointed the ladies by this exhibition of virtue (there *could* be no other reason for his appearance), Mr. Waldron comes before the curtain and proceeds to unsay all he has said in the play by declaring in a long and rambling speech (in which he ranged from his own activities at the Fronts of Belgium, France, and Serbia with a motor ambulance, and without the consent of his Bishop, to the virtuous lives of members of the theatrical profession, of which his knowledge seems to be extensive and peculiar): "I protest against the clergy and bishops who speak about the necessity of filling the empty cradle but do not fill it themselves - no parson should speak about such things who takes the vow of celibacy. Let them show by practice what they mean." (Applause from the lady members of the audience, who appeared to take heart again.) After

much more in this strain, the reverend gentleman retired, amid expressions from the audience of a mixed nature, which finally necessitated the compulsory retirement of some of its members also, at the invitation of the attendants.

As to the acting, in fairness to Mr. Waldron, it was announced that he appeared for the first time on any stage, though rumour hath it that in former days he had distinguished himself in that line of business known to the theatrical profession as the portrayal of "dead bodies on battle-fields," and, lest it be thought that this criticism is prejudicial, the following is an extract from the *Weekly Dispatch* :—

"There be players that I have seen play," says Hamlet despairingly. And yet he can never have seen the late Vicar of Brixton.....At its best, the pulpit style is not for the fashion of the stage, at its worst—as Mr. Waldron does his best to show—it suggests a new terror to the playgoer. The "argument" of the ridiculous piece itself is in keeping with what the poverty of the language compels one to call the acting. No wonder that there was a marked display of disapproval by so many in the audience.

Mr. Waldron had, however, nobly sacrificed his appearance in his make-up for the part. His good looks and graceful carriage, so familiar to Freethinkers, were entirely obliterated; and the Padre appeared as a slovenly, shabby, aged, bald-headed, toothless, somewhat inarticulate dodderer, decidedly shaky in the text. His very hands were made up to represent dirty, raw beef-steaks, over which he cleverly managed to convey that he had lost control, as he wore them alternately crossed upon his breast, or flapping like the ears of an infuriated elephant. But the greatest loss to his acquaintances in his new role was his wonderful personality.

Where was that magnificently pugilistic and defiant attitude with which, in his zeal for his Church, he confronted a London police-court magistrate when charged with assaulting an aged Freethinker harmlessly selling this paper for a livelihood, and trampling on and destroying his stock? Where was the arrogant bearing, the withering sarcasm, the insolent manner, with which he had been wont to overawe his Free-thinking opponents? and the effrontery with which he used to repeat his libellous and scandalous misrepresentations of their meetings and their principles? Gone! absolutely gone! and in their stead, there stood before the curtain, a garrulous, shapeless, extraordinarily ordinary piece of humanity, overweighted, overrated, subjected to the ridicule of the audience, whom he referred to as "the most thinking audience in the world."

But let Mr. Waldron be of good cheer. There is always an opening for an original pantomimist, or a seaside nigger minstrel, and a cinematograph performance would cause less pain to an audience who would lose nothing by the omission of the words. But for the legitimate stage—he really ought not to do it again!

Oh, Mr. Waldron! Oh, those hands! S. V. K.

An old Scotch woman was dying. The storm was raging without, the wind was howling, and the rain dashing against the window panes. Her people and the doctor were gathered round her bed. "I maun dee, doctor; I maun dee," said the sick woman. "Ay, Ay, I'm mickle feart ye are gaun," the doctor replied. "Weel, weel, the Lord's will be done," his patient responded, "but it's an awfu' night to be gaun skirlin' through the clouds."

A minister, some few Sundays ago, astonished his hearers by addressing the Deity, not as "Thou who holdest in thy hands the heart of kings," but as "Thou, in whose hands is he king of hearts."



## Acid Drops.

*Apropos* of the Church of England's investment of three and a half millions in the war loan, there is one point that appears to have escaped observation. We speak under correction, but we believe that money left to the Church of England is, legally, money left to the State. If this be so, in using this money for the purposes of conducting the War, the State would only be using its own. The capital could, of course, be re-directed at any time to the original purpose for which it was set aside. But to pay interest on what is really its own money, and as the Church of England is part of the State, it is clear that, to pay interest on it, seems much like the State paying the parsons for permission to use its own funds.

We have another suggestion to make with regard to the clergy. While the State hires clergymen, it is justified in paying them. The absurdity lies not in their payment but in their employment. Still, when a call for service is made upon all, and all are asked to place their labour at the disposal of the State and be content with what is at most a living wage, why not put the same principle into operation with regard to the clergy. Settle what is a living wage, and then let the State see that none of its servants—particularly the clergy—receive more than that. The clergy, we feel sure, would not complain. They believe that the essence of Christianity is sacrifice, and would, doubtless, welcome the regulation as a genuine sign of the Christianization of the State.

Defending himself in a recent breach of promise action, a Highland minister, the Rev. M. S. Maclean, pleaded that no importance should be placed on his having kissed the lady in question. Kissing was a Highland habit, he said, and the Macleans were a very affectionate people. The judge, Lord Anderson, said it was a great privilege, and it was a pity it didn't come farther south. But as privileges must be paid for, Mr. Maclean was ordered to pay £200 damages. Perhaps the kissing habit will be less pronounced in the future.

The Rev. A. J. Waldron does not appear to be setting the Thames afire now that he has left the Church. The following remarks were printed in a Sunday paper concerning Waldron's latest music-hall sketch, entitled "Nature's Call," which the paper referred to, unkindly, as "Nature's Bawl":—"I am surprised that the severity of the criticism of "Nature's Call," the Rev. A. J. Waldron's very silly 'play,' did not kill it. Last week the Rev. gentleman acted in it at the Boscombe Hippodrome, so I presume it is still on tour. I suggest that while England is so short of war workers parsons do not seem quite in their element on the stage, even if they *are* bad actors."

A number of sixpenny weekly publications have been raised to sevenpence owing to the increased price of paper and labour. All these periodicals are well supported by advertisers, so it is a feather in our cap that the *Freethinker* remains at the same price and size as before the War.

Although the bishops and clergy do not fight—and do not intend to—they like to strut about in khaki uniforms. A newspaper paragraph states that the Bishop of Birmingham sat in the stalls of a London theatre, dressed in khaki. That is about as near to the War as most of these clerical heroes desire to get, but a few are courageous enough to conduct services at a safe distance from the Front.

Sir James Yoxall says 13,000 schoolmasters are serving with the Colours, and 1,000 have fallen fighting for England. What a contrast this affords to the conduct of the clergy, who are exempted from military service.

Mr. W. A. Appleton, Secretary of the General Federation of Trades Unions, said he did not remember many instances during thirty years in which the Church had sought to find

which side was right in disputes between Capital and Labour. Just so! And he might have added that the Church is notorious for its generous treatment of its own curates, organists, and church helpers.

"Women of Britain, save your country from possible starvation by the utmost economy." Such, in short, is the appeal of Lord Devenport to the women of a Christian country. Where, however, is the person mentioned in the Gospels, who fed 5,000 persons with a few fishes and loaves?

The story of a singular conscience was told at Sheffield, when an Army absentee, who objected on conscientious grounds, was stated to have been living with a soldier's wife, the husband being on active service. Another example of the elasticity of the Christian conscience is seen in the case of the clergy, who tell people that one of God's commandments is "Thou shalt not kill," and who christen battleships and consecrate regimental flags.

Officiating at Westminster Chapel, the Rev. T. C. Williams, of Menai Bridge, perpetrated the following prayer:—

Famine will not come to this land unless it is sent by Thee. There is no power on earth that can bring famine to a country unless thou dost send it.

Starvation in this connection is a relative thing, and we have it on the highest authority that there is a food shortage in this country as well as in Germany. And if Mr. Williams is correct the food shortage here, and the semi-starvation in Germany is "sent" by God. This, we admit, is "sound doctrine," but, if it be true, it does away with the submarine menace to England, and the peril of the blockade to Germany. It is the Lord who is responsible in both cases.

Here is another sample of Mr. Williams—we cite him because he is really a preacher of standing. He told his congregation that he knew a man who was at the head of a flourishing business when the War broke out. "First his business disappeared, and he was plunged into poverty. Then his two sons enlisted. One was killed early in the War, the other about a month ago. 'And now,' he said, 'I have just taken my wife to the asylum.'" "But," said Mr. Williams, "Christian optimism will ultimately be vindicated. God will never betray the trust of my poor soul." A more fatuous deliverance is hardly conceivable. How on earth can "Christian optimism"—whatever that may be, make up the loss of the man's two sons, and the insanity of the wife? And if God arranges famines, we presume he arranged this kind of thing also? Mr. Williams's God is a cheerful kind of deity. We congratulate ourselves on not believing in him.

"We know that without morality religion is nothing," says the Rev. Dr. Hastings, editor of the well-known Bible Dictionary. We are quite pleased to see the matter put in this way. And the reversal of the order is significant. For it doesn't matter a hang what kind of a religion a man has, there are so many of them, that the choice of one is of not much greater consequence than the pattern selected for a new suit. But it is of the utmost importance the kind of morality a man practices. That is everything.

*The Mythology of All Races*, in thirteen volumes, at 30s. per vol., hails from America, and the size and price sounds as though it were an important work. We have not seen the work, and, as it costs £19 10s., are not likely to. But from a review of the work we gather that the editor states, "It will perhaps be well to stress the fact that there will be nothing in our series that can be, in Roman Catholic phrase, 'offensive to pious ears';" and, further, everything is omitted which by modern writers is usually "veiled in the obscurity of a learned language." *A Mythology of All Races*, written with one eye on "pious ears" and the other on Sunday-school teachers, is not likely to be worth anyone's study. The strange thing is that a number of writers should not be ashamed to make such a confession. If pious ears cannot stand the truth, they should be stopped. Any of the Churches will gladly supply the stopping.



There are few places where religion is unaffected by the War. The Henley-on-Thames Workhouse chaplain's report states: "The religious state of the inmates seems below what it has been. Most take part in the hymn-singing, but the responses and psalms lack fervour, which may be due to inability to read."

The Gospel Temperance Crusade has been at work for generations, with little result; but since the Government took the matter of drink restriction in hand, convictions for drunkenness have been reduced by half. Yet it used to be a favourite boast with pious folk that a nation could not be made sober by Act of Parliament.

Why is it that Christian utterances are usually of the "Bath-bun and glass of milk" description? Lord Selborne has been condemning British foreign policy as anti-Christian. England, he suggests, relies on ships, not on God. Well, that's true. But suppose England relied on God, and other nations on ships; where would England be, with her population depending on foreign food supplies? "Aye, there's the rub!"

The Rev. D. Ewart James, a Congregationalist minister of Southend-on-Sea, has been objecting to Sunday concerts in aid of wounded soldiers. It seems as if the men of God want a monopoly of money-taking.

The Catholic Federation of the Archdiocese of Westminster have been urging their views on education, and have made recommendations for increased science training for children. "Increased" is good, for Catholics, who believe in "transubstantiation" and other marvels, have a long road to travel towards scientific knowledge.

The *Weekly Dispatch* has been discussing the duties of a film censor, and suggests, among other matters, that the cinema be forbidden to show pictures that burlesque the clergy, or that are offensive to religious orders, or present sacred figures. This is very comprehensive, and forbids the screening of "The Private Secretary" and "The Life of Christ." It even excludes Dickens's characters, "Stiggins" and "Chadband," to mention no others. That editor had better try again.

Roderic K. Clark, a well-known Quaker, and director of a Croydon firm, has been sentenced to 112 days' imprisonment with hard labour for refusing to obey military orders. Brother Clark, doubtless, appreciates the benefits of being a Christian in a Christian country.

What Secularists Christians are! The Bishop of Chelmsford, writing to the *Daily News* on a recent explosion in a munition works, asks whether it is necessary for such work to be carried on in crowded districts. Cannot "God" protect people in a large town; and, if not, why not?

"The man who insists on more than two lumps of sugar in his tea deserves the fate of Lot's wife," writes a society journalist. Unhappily, Mrs. Lot was as salt as a herring, so the Bible suggests.

The dear clergy are too proud to fight, and it appears that some of them even object to taxation. A newspaper paragraph states that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is considering applications from churches for an exemption from the entertainments tax. What are these men of God doing in this great War?

The Bishop of Salisbury, whose salary is £5,000 a year, advises the clergy of his diocese to do work on farms, or as postmen, in their spare time. We shall be agreeably surprised at a hearty response from the sky-pilots.

In a recent publication, the *Devonshire House Circle*, there is a good story of the nobleman who took his child to the Bishop of Durham's confirmation: "My lord, this young lady is my daughter. Pray give her a double portion."

This recalls the declaration of a French aristocrat of the old school, "God will never damn a man of my quality."

"Germany has dethroned Christ," says the Earl of Selborne, echoing the pulpit nonsense, "and set up a plague-spot of devilry." The Teutons must be "up the pole" to worship a "plague-spot."

α The Earl of Selborne says "we must in future take the law of Christ as our law in politics, in international relations, in all the work of life." His lordship must mean a dim and distant future, for Christ enjoined his disciples to love their enemies, and the Beatitudes have little affinity with bayonets.

Mr. Ian Malcolm, M.P., complains that scandalously little religious teaching is given to the children of a nation calling itself Christian. Well, there is no law preventing parents giving all the religious teaching they care to give, nor parsons giving them all the parents will permit. But Mr. Malcolm, like other Churchmen, is aiming at getting the State to force religion on the children, whether the parents desire it or not. Mr. Malcolm says that the faith should be taught from "school pulpits" by men "passionately believing in what they taught." So that not alone is the State to enforce religion, but is also to see that the teachers are of the proper religious type. If these religious cranks had their way, the country would be in a pretty state.

A ticket meeting has been called for the 26th Feb., chair to be taken by "The Right Hon. and Right Rev. Lord Bishop of London," to urge the release of all civilian prisoners of war between this country and Germany. Like the rest of the activities of this bishop, the idea is preposterous. Neither the British or the German military authorities are likely to release men of military age during the war. Moreover, an appeal is made for donations before sending tickets, we are not "struck" with the suggestion, and advise friends of prisoners in Germany to give the meeting a wide berth.

"If I were a journalist," said Mr. Justice Darling, "and I wrote one thing and the newspapers published another, then I think I should give up being a journalist." His lordship might have heard of pen-pushers turning Christian for half-an-hour to write their articles.

Two-and-a-half years after the declaration of War the Pope has delivered an "allocation" condemning all persons who make aerial attacks on unfortified cities. The distinguished theologian was in no hurry to let the world know his disapproval of the murder of defenceless women and children.

The dear Nonconformist *Daily News* recently published some headlines, "A Waste of Time. Forty Persons to Try a Man for Stealing Honey." That's a mere trifle in a Christian country, where 50,000 clergymen are explaining the consequences of the theft of an "apple" in Eden thousands of years ago.

The Congregational Churches show another decline during 1916, part of which will, doubtless, be attributed to the War. But the Sunday-schools also show a decline of 633,656, which can hardly be attributed to that cause. And if the Sunday-schools break down, where else may the Churches look for recruits? It is quite useless looking to the world of adults.

The Convocation of Canterbury at its next sitting will consider the question of the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor during the War and for six months after. We wonder if they will include "communion port" in the prohibition?

In his will, a Mr. William Andrews, of Watford, expresses a strongly adverse opinion of "the new theology," and complains that "worldliness" is increasing in the Churches. However, he leaves money to the churches he fancies, but it is refreshing to find that criticism has found a voice in the pews.



## C. Cohen's Lecture Engagements.

February 25, Clapham; March 11, Birmingham; March 18, Leicester.

## To Correspondents.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—February 25, Nottingham. March 25, Avondale Hall, Clapham.

"FREETHINKER" SUSTENTATION FUND.—D. Seddon, 10s.

A. MILLAR.—Cheer up! Things *are* a bit black, but the recuperative powers of Nature are great. You are pretty correct in your estimate of popular journalism. If one is built that way, it pays; but it is a poor way of getting a living.

R. MORELAND.—Received with thanks.

E. GREENWOOD.—Received, and shall appear so soon as space permits. Thanks.

MR. W. FITZPATRICK informs us that the Glasgow Branch of the N. S. S. has decided, for the present, to hold meetings on the second Sunday of each month in the Good Templars' Hall, Ingram Street. Glasgow friends will please note.

T. B. HOPE.—Obliged for cutting. Certainly the "blasphemy" of a thing is often determined by who says it, and where it appears. We frequently see in even religious papers things that the writers would stare at even in the *Freethinker*.

B. DUPREE.—Mr. Cohen had already written you. Thanks for lines, which will no doubt prove useful.

J. PARTRIDGE.—Pleased to learn that your Annual Dinner, with Mr. Lloyd as the guest of the evening, passed off so pleasantly.

*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.*

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

*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.*

*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.*

## Sugar Plums.

We regret there was a slight error in our note on the Bowman case last week. The case was adjourned until Thursday, February 8, not the 16th, as there stated. On Thursday (Feb. 8) the counsel concluded their arguments, and all that remains is the judgment. That is, as we expected it would be, reserved. It is far too important a case for judgment to be delivered offhand, and we must now wait for the final word—final, that is, so far as this case is concerned. For whichever way the judgment goes, it is only a stage in the history of Freethought.

We are pleased to have a good report of the new ground broken at Walsall on Sunday last by Mr. Lloyd. There was a good audience, lively questioning, and intelligent opposition. No speaker could desire better. These new places are being attached with the aid of the Special Propagandist Fund, which is doing exactly the work we said it would do. So far as the organizing of the meeting was concerned, that was done by the Birmingham Branch, and the Secretary, Mr. Partridge, writes that Walsall "evidently offers good ground for work." We thank the Branch for its assistance, and we are quite sure its officials feel they were rewarded by the success of the meeting.

With regard to Manchester, Mr. Cohen broke his journey to Liverpool on Saturday, Feb. 10, in order to consult with the members, and, after some discussion, it was decided to take immediate steps to secure a hall for a Sunday's meetings, when another meeting of members could be called to settle the question of reorganization. The old Secular Hall

is in need of repair, and for that reason is not, at present, available for meetings. But that difficulty may be overcome once the Branch again settles down to work.

We were sorry to find that the old and present secretary of the Branch, Mrs. C. Pegg, is extremely ill, and has been more or less unwell for some time. Mr. and Mrs. Pegg have a record of thirty-five years of work for Secularism, and the Freethought party is their debtor for all they have done. We hope to hear soon that Mrs. Pegg's health has undergone an improvement, and, though Mr. and Mrs. Pegg may be unable to take part in the more exacting demands of society work, they will have the consolation of knowing that whatever success may attend the work of others, their own thirty-five years has had a share in producing it.

There are not many debates now-a-days, but there will be one this evening at the St. Pancras Reform Club, 15 Victoria Road, Kentish Town Road, on the "Sinister Influence of the Catholic Church in Politics." Mr. Friedberg, who has had some experience of the Catholic Church in Spain, attacks, and Mr. Baker, a Roman Catholic, defends. North London Freethinkers will please note.

The South London Branch is continuing its propaganda at Avondale Hall, Clapham, although the severe weather has been something of a hardship to it. To-day (Feb. 18) the lecturer is Miss K. B. Kough; subject, "The God Idea." The lecture commences at 7 o'clock, and we hope there will be a good audience.

Will members of Mr. Howell Smith's Discussion Class please note that this week the meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 21, instead of on the regular meeting night, which is Thursday?

We see that the Sunlight Soap man, Mr. S. H. Lever, has been made a Knight Commander of the Bath. This is quite a case of making the punishment fit the crime.

A correspondent writes:—

I have again to thank you for my weekly "cold bath." By which I mean the strong and bracing tonic of the *Freethinker*. What you say about war is too true; but there are other forces arising which will make it unpopular. The nations cannot afford it as carried on under modern conditions. The glorious "free" press loses money by it; and the Philistine gets hit in his "little Mary," and never in the heel, as depicted in erroneous mythology.

Meanwhile Europe has, as it were, placed a sieve in the hands of Death, through which pass the young and the sound. Fancy, if any breeder of animals raised stock in that manner! And the "Imperialists," or pirates, of the world scream out for more babies, much as a miller would ask for flour, that he might grind it. Truly, all wise men contend against the same enemies. And they have no worse foe than Christianity, which corrupts the minds of the living through the fears of the dead.

## The Bowman Case.

## House of Lords Appeal.

THE historic Bowman Case reached its final stage in the House of Lords last week, on Appeal from the Court of Appeal. The day fixed by their Lordships was January 30, the anniversary of the death of Charles I.; this report is written when still no one knows which party shall be headed.

Members of the court are the Lord Chancellor, Lords Buckmaster, Dunedin, Parker, and Sumner. The court is sitting in the House of Lords, amid the famous red benches.

For the Appellants there appeared Mr. G. J. Talbot, K.C., and Mr. Price; for the Secular Society Ltd., Mr. M. Tomlin, K.C., and the Hon. M. M. McNaughten.

The Appeal was opened by Mr. G. J. Talbot, K.C., for the Appellants, who reviewed the Case as carried through the courts below. He quoted from the Memorandum of Association of the Secular Society, Ltd. to show that its object is



the overthrow of Christianity. He asked the court to go beyond the Memorandum and to examine all the activities of the Society and to declare that its work is dangerous to public policy. If the Society is illegal it cannot receive a monetary legacy in aid of its propaganda. He submitted that the court could not allow such a Society to exist. That was the main burden of the proceedings when they were adjourned for two days.

On Thursday the Appeal was renewed by Mr. Talbot. He claimed that Christianity is part of the common law of England. He quoted the Toleration Act and other Acts in support. He went back to the Stuarts, and earlier times to find evidence for his contention, and outlined the treatment of Jews, Unitarians, and others. He explained the meaning of the word Heresy, Apostasy, Arianism, etc. Church and State never tolerated small cliques, but only large bodies of regular dissenters, and even they were not allowed to meet behind locked doors.

Counsel examined closely the doctrines and principles of the Secular Society and their relation to the law of Blasphemy, and claimed that all Englishmen were still under ecclesiastical law, and declared in answer to a question that even Huxley's essays against Christianity were sold to-day illegally. Atheism was an offence against morality. He quoted judgments to prove it. Not only an offence, but as much subject to ecclesiastical law, the preserver of public morality. All Englishmen are subject to ecclesiastical law doubly, because they are subjects of a king who is the legal head of the Church. The Church can excommunicate still, and offenders against ecclesiastical law could receive six months' imprisonment.

At the third day of hearing Mr. Talbot was continuing his argument when the Lord Chancellor suggested that he might give way to Counsel for the Respondent Company, which he did at 11.45.

Mr. Tomlin then rose and proposed to put his case under four heads.

I.—That the question of the illegality of the Company is not open.

II.—Even if one of the Articles of the Company is illegal that does not make a gift to the Company illegal.

III.—A true construction of section 3 (a) of the Memorandum of Association does not involve an attack on Christianity necessarily.

IV.—A temperate discussion of the doctrines of Christianity involves no illegality.

He quoted from the Companies Act of 1862 to show that the Certificate of Registration was a guarantee that the Company was a fully legal entity, and had complied with all the conditions precedent to the formation of a company. The question before the House was not whether the Company was going to use its money illegally, but whether the gift was good or bad in law. He gave a history of the Case in the courts below to show that the legal standing of the Company had stood all tests. If the Company did make illegal use of money left to it then the Company could be restrained by proceedings in Chancery, but not by such an action as this.

Members of the Company claimed the right not to force others to embrace what they did not believe but merely to hold and teach their own beliefs. They wished to apply natural principles to human conduct as we do in such problems as sanitation and the use of chloroform to alleviate pain in surgery, both of which were opposed for supernatural reasons.

Under the fourth head he gave a history of persecution for opinions, dividing the history into four periods as (1) Tribal persecution; (2) Theological; (3) Legal and Political; (4) Social, and was in the middle of his account of Theological persecution when the House adjourned until Monday.

On Monday, Mr. Tomlin faced the assertion that Christianity is part of the law of the land. It is not a scientific phrase, he said, unless it means simply that we have in this country a Christian Church established by law.

In answer to a question Counsel said that he would not ask the House to countenance any doctrine that is immoral, but would ask them to assent to the proposition that while the principles of law remain, results may change. He asserted that prosecutions for blasphemy were modern, and began in

the reign of Charles II., and that not one conviction for blasphemy had been obtained without scurrility being part of the offence.

Lord Buckmaster excepted the case of the King *versus* Woolston, with which Mr. Tomlin agreed. The Lord Chancellor decided that the court ought to see the book for which Mr. Woolston was indicted, and asked whether stress was laid on scurrility in that case. Counsel replied that Woolston was charged with deriding the law.

Mr. Tomlin read from the Blasphemy Act to show that the prosecution must be for words spoken, and that the offence must be specific. He thought that the Company must either be charged with criminal illegality or that at the worst, on the other hand, it is merely a Company whose rights the law will not go out of its way to enforce.

At the afternoon sitting Counsel considered the bearing of the word Secular in the Company's title. He gave the history of the word and its connection with Holyoake who declared that Secularism was not necessarily an attack on Christianity.

Lord Buckmaster raised the problem of the Toleration Act and the opposing Counsel's assertion that it removed certain disabilities from two or three classes, but left all the others at the mercy of the common law.

Counsel asked for the authority for this contention while admitting that all who denied the Trinity were exempted from toleration. My opponents say, he said, that the common law is against me. I ask, where and how? They say, Oh, Christianity is part of the law of the land, therefore attacks on Christianity *must* be illegal. I say that no such doctrine exists, but if it does it can be only as part of the rule of public policy. The question turns on the moral interests of the State. But the rule of public policy varies from age to age. Witchcraft was punished by common law, but could not be even proved to-day.

Three hundred years ago, if the court considered certain opinions it would have given a judgment totally different from one of to-day on the same point. He hoped that when their lordships came to decide, it would be in the spirit of the age in which we live. In former days theological discussions would provoke to riot, but not now.

At the end of Mr. Tomlin's argument his Junior Counsel, Hon. M. M. McNaughten, rose and continued the plea, contending chiefly for the absolute legality of the Company and its ability in law to receive and administer a legacy such as this. He contended that the phrase: "for the subversion of Christianity," is merely rhetorical, and has no real meaning before the law.

The court then adjourned at 4 o'clock till Thursday on account of the opening of Parliament.

The Thursday's sitting began in presence of a body of Australian and New Zealand officers and men who were visiting the House of Lords. The Hon. M. M. McNaughten continued his argument for the strict legality of the Company. He submitted that only the Crown could dissolve the Company apart from a voluntary decision of the members. Lord Dunedin thought that the inviolability of a Company was a serious position in law and put a great burden on the Companies Acts.

At about 11 o'clock Mr. Talbot rose to give his final reply to the points raised by the two Counsel for the Respondent Company. He denied that the position of the Company could not be questioned simply because it had been registered. Lord Parker thought that unless he could show that all the objects of the Company were illegal he would not succeed, and in connection with a further contention Lord Parker said that he thought Mr. Talbot was meeting an argument that had never been advanced by the other side.

This Company, Counsel said, declares that the legacy does not constitute a charitable trust, that they are a legal entity, that the Corporation has been properly formed, and they declare that their objects are legal, though I am assuming the illegality of one point in their programme for the sake of argument. The Master of the Rolls has settled the point that one illegal object of a Company will invalidate a legacy. He quoted two cases in support of this contention. In effect the Master of the Rolls says that if one object is illegal the Company is in a dangerous position and must not be helped to carry out any of its objects. If a Company puts into its



Memorandum one point plainly illegal it cannot complain if that point is held to invalidate a gift. If the opposing contention is true, a Company need but put into its Memorandum only one innocent object and all the others might be illegal.

He contended that the analogy of Restraint of Trade was not sound, because in the case of this Company the one object has not become illegal by acts over which it has no control, but was illegal from the start. He quoted the case of a Company formed to promote a certain commercial process along with certain other objects, but when its main object was found to be impossible and the members petitioned for dissolution the court was obliged to sanction the petition.

He quoted the *Oxford Dictionary's* definition of the word Secular to show that it is held to involve an attack on Christianity, and from the Principles and Objects of the National Secular Society to confirm his contention that the Company existed to overthrow the Christian religion. He declared that, in law, irreligion is like immorality.

The Lord Chancellor pointed to the difference between two propositions, that the law will not enforce certain rights, and that the law will not declare certain objects illegal; and suggested that the point had never been met in the courts. In reply to this Mr. Talbot agreed that it might be a new point in equity.

Lord Dunedin said that he could not accept Counsel's dictum of irreligion being immoral in law, not in the sense meant by Counsel. He thought that Counsel's argument required him to find a middle course between the two.

Lord Parker instanced Shelley's *Queen Mab's* case as the nearest approach to Counsel's position, and the summing up in this case was read to the House.

Counsel admitted that no conviction had ever been obtained without the presence of scurrility but he asserted that the more we look into the distinction between scurrility and temperate discussion the more we see that the distinction is untenable.

The Lord Chancellor could not understand how Mr. Talbot could say that there was no distinction, and Lord Dunedin thought that Counsel was bound to admit a difference. Lord Buckmaster said that it is possible to use language in two ways, one good and one bad, both expressing the same thing.

Later, Lord Buckmaster raised the problem of the Jews, and the Lord Chancellor inquired whether a Jewish sermon, in a synagogue, against Christianity, would be illegal. Counsel thought it would be so, strictly considered. The Lord Chancellor asked a similar question as regards Mohammedans, and Counsel gave the same reply.

Counsel then read a long essay by Sir James Stephen criticizing Lord Coleridge's judgment in the Foote and Ramsey case to the effect that Christianity is the basis of English law and that temperate criticism is more dangerous to Christianity than scurrilous attacks; he also read the same writer's criticism of other judgments, especially in the *Queen versus Hetherington*, which reaffirms the principle set forth in the *King versus Woolston*.

After the interval for lunch, Counsel contended that it is unjust to draw a distinction between temperate discussion and scurrility because the scurrilous opponent of Christianity is often quite honest and sincere, and is merely speaking the language that most of his hearers understand. Why should he suffer more than the other?

Lord Buckmaster showed, against this, that, for instance, physiological facts might be put scurrilously or modestly: are both methods therefore equal?

Finally, Counsel held that the legacy must be declared illegal because its reception could not be enforced. Not one case can be quoted to prove that it could be enforced in law. What justification exists, therefore, for the making of a new law? Why change the old principles of public policy? Only an insignificant minority will regard the operations of this Company with approval. These people attack Christianity at the root, and the smallness of their support demands that no alteration in the rule of public policy shall be made in their favour.

The learned judges in the courts below have done that; but, I ask, said Counsel, how far is this to go? Are all the foundations of public policy to be changed simply because we live in changed times? The courts below have torn up

the old rules, and if that is allowed, why not tear up the Common Law so far as it rests on public policy?

The Lord Chancellor inquired here whether restraint would not do more harm than good, and a little later said that he would be sorry if the judges had to decide matters of personal opinion.

After some further discussion Counsel brought his case to a close with a request that if the House decided against his clients they should be allowed their costs out of the estate in dispute.

The Lord Chancellor announced that the House would take time to consider its judgment and then rose at 3 o'clock.

H. V. S.

---

## Religion in Russia.

### II.

#### CHRISTIANITY.

(Concluded from p. 87.)

As Christianity, in one form or another, has for several centuries been the dominant religion in Russia, I shall only mention the Mohammedans, Buddhists, and other non-Christians, except that something must be said concerning the Jews.

The exact date of the introduction of Christianity into Russia is doubtful. Some writers place it in the ninth century, about 868, when the Patriarch of Constantinople, it is supposed, had permission to found a church in Kieff, one of the oldest towns on the Dnieper. Others, while implying or admitting the possibility of an earlier introduction, are inclined to take the tenth century, about 988, as giving a more satisfactory date for the definite founding of Christianity in Russia. There seems little doubt that the first Russian duke, or king, to make Christianity his State religion was Vladimir (988). His wife, sister to the emperor of Byzantium, gave her patronage to Greek missionaries, who were allowed to found schools and churches in the dominions of Kieff, (See S. Reinach's *Orpheus*, p. 270; J. M. Robertson's *S. Hist. Christianity*, p. 213; N. Orloff, M.A., *The Russian Church in Rel. Syst. of the World* pp. 418-422; Moshier's *Ecclesiastical History*, Reid's ed. (1848), p. 289, sec. 4; Wallace's *Russia*, p. 364, vol. i.)

To this day the majority of Russian Christians belong to the Russian section of the Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church, and the Church of Rome has no State influence in Russia.

Ever since its early days the Russian Church has been a centre of ignorance and superstition. Perhaps no body of clergy has remained as ignorant as the Orthodox Russian. The influence of the Church in Russia has been anything but uplifting both in the lives of the peasants and of the aristocracy.

This is not to be wondered at, when so much faith is placed in the miraculous power of Icons, or pictures of Jesus, the Madonna, and many of the saints. Nor, in view of their ignorance, is it surprising that the peasants are to-day not by any means rid of belief in the old pagan deities and spirits, many of which have simply been transformed from friendly into harmful beings. Both in private and in public Icon-worship holds sway to such an extent that important Icons are often lent out, to people in great trouble, by many of the churches. In this way a good deal of revenue is secured. Stepniak, when writing of the popular worship of Icons, says: the people "believe that the icon feels pain and pleasure, resents insults, and is gratified by kind treatment, just as a human being would be." (*The Russian Peasantry*, 1 Vol. ed. (1905) p. 361). Forlong mentions that an Icon of the Iberian Chapel at Moscow earns as much as £10



per day, by being sent out to the sick. (*Faiths of Man*, vol. iii.; p. 209, art. "Russia.") Stepniak says (as above, p. 375) "our churches are not houses of prayer, but houses of plunder," and states that many a churlish orthodox priest will refuse to bury the dead, if a poor peasant is unable to pay the exorbitant price he asks. It is of this church that the "Holy Tsar" is the head—and right well does he use it to keep his subjects in subjection. He is "known as *Jembla Bogh*—"The God on Earth," etc. (Carl Joubert's *Russia as it Really Is*, p. 1 and p. 296). But we must now take a glance at the Rascolniks or Dissenters. Schism appeared in the Russian Church, probably, two centuries prior to the appearance of the Rascolniks in the time of Patriarch Nikon, about 1659, but the earlier dissent does not seem to have been very numerous.

Nikon, along with Tsar Alexis, determined to alter the ritual and improve the text of the mass-book. To this a large number of the people objected, believing that any alteration in mass-book, or ritual, would be detrimental to salvation. Consequently, the substitution of the use of three fingers, instead of two, when making the sign of the cross; the alteration of the spelling of Jesus from "Jsus" (an abbreviation long in use) back to "Jesus"; and instructions that the Hallelujahs should be sung three times instead of twice, led to rupture in the Holy Russian Church. Matters of doctrine as distinct from ritual were left untouched, and yet thousands of people seceded from the orthodox pale of the Church. Because they objected to changes in ritual, and corrections in the spelling of words, many thousands became fanatical and met death at their own hands or those of others. The revolt against the innovations was gradual, but as time went on it brought out a great deal of bitterness on both sides. The dissenters not only frequently gloried in destroying themselves, but persecuted with as good a heart as did the orthodox.

Whatever explanation of the Rascolnik movement we may adopt, it is clear that Christianity had failed to improve Russian life, whether social or religious, in such a way as to make progress possible on the lines of peaceful co-operation by those who had accepted the "Divine Revelation."

As a result of this great movement of dissent a large number of sects ultimately came into being, but here we have not room to mention many. (For details on "The Rascol," see Wallace's *Russia*, vol. i., p. 337, etc.; Stepniak, as above, p. 385-490; *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Russia"—Sept. ed., 1914, p. 20). Belonging to the general movement of dissent, but probably preceding the date on which the appearance of the Rascolnik is usually fixed, are the sects known as the Chlists.

About 1645, a peasant named Danilo Filipovitch, claimed that God the Father had become incarnate in him. In time he established a number of sects in the province of Kostroma. These sects spread to various parts of the empire in the form of secret societies. They called themselves "Christs," but owing to their habit of self-flagellation becoming known the orthodox gave them the name of "Chlists," that is "whips." Some of the Chlistic sects were also in the habit of exciting sexual feeling at their meetings, and when the lights were extinguished a promiscuous orgy was indulged in. Doubtless the sanctity of human nakedness was deemed to be gracious in the sight of the "Lord," to whom there is no darkness. Even now a good deal of excitement is indulged in, although some of the Chlistic sects have sobered down a little. "At their prayer-meetings the Khlysti dance to the accompaniment of hymns, the dance gradually developing into a wild dervish-like spinning which is kept up till

they drop, foaming at the mouth and prophesying" (*Ency. Brit.*, art. "Russia," Sept. ed. 1914, p. 21).

Among the Skoptsi a reaction against the Chlistic indulgence in sexual promiscuity set in. On the other hand, they formed the habit of castrating themselves after having one child. The male and female were mutilated usually at midnight. (See Forlong's *Faiths of Man*, vol. ii., p. 317).

A division took place in the sects of the Rascolnik proper at an early stage of their history. Two sections were found: the one consisting of the Popovzy, or those having priests, the other consisting of the Bezpopovzy, or those without priests.

In turn each of these main divisions became subdivided into sects having slightly different forms of ritual. It is interesting to note that many sects of the Popovzy were content to accept, as their priest, one who had been turned out of the Orthodox Church for drunkenness or wrong-doing. A washing in the baptismal water made him fit to act as priest again. To many of the Popovzy the being able to perform certain rites was more important than moral living.

A sect of the Bezpopovzy, which needs to be mentioned, is the Ikonobertsi. This sect refuses to have anything to do with images and pictures in connection with religion. A feature that is not outstanding either in the official Russian Church or the Rascolnik.

A few words must now be said concerning the Dukhoborzy and Molokane. According to Stepniak: "the Molokane seceded from the Dukhoborzy during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and the Dukhoborzy is much the elder." (*Russian Peasantry*, 1 Vol. ed., p. 505.) There seems to be no knowledge as to the origin of the latter sect, but it has been suggested that they were in some way connected with the Ikonobertis, as they reject Icons. The doctrine of the Dukhoborzy is of a theosophical turn. The Deity is the soul of the world, a kind of reasoning principle which is superior to the world, but dwells in and is inseparable from the souls of men. In fact, it is through man alone that the Deity is able to reveal himself. He is incarnate in the faithful, each one of which is a "Son of God," inasmuch as he possesses the indwelling spirit. The "Fall" is repeated every day in the wrong-doings of men. Man's soul is immortal, according to the Dukhoborzy, but only in the sense that it is inseparable from the indwelling "soul of God." There is neither hell nor paradise, the soul is able to transmigrate at the death of the body. Christ was only a good man, and all Scriptures should be interpreted by the "inner light."

The Molokane are mentioned as far back as 1765. This sect is Christian and not theosophical like the Dukhoborzy. The Bible is accepted as the rule of faith and conduct, and is to be understood according to the spirit and not the letter. A great deal of indifference is shown towards outward forms of worship, and the sacraments. Most of the Christian doctrines are believed by the Molokane, but a fair amount of latitude is allowed for individual interpretation. As a rule, the members of this sect live good and quiet lives of mutual help.

No small measure of persecution has been the lot of both the Dukhoborzy and the Molokane. Stepniak says: "the penalties inflicted on the political offenders of the educated classes—from the Decembrists to the Nihilists—reflect but a faint image of what the guileless Dukhoborzy and their younger brothers have had to undergo almost uninterruptedly for the space of about sixty years." (*Russian Peasantry*, 1 Vol. ed., p. 520.)

In relation to the Jews in Russia, there has been, for a long time, a frequent and energetic application of the



higher ethic of Christian brotherhood (Matt x. 34-36). No ferocity, no humiliation, has been deemed too Christian to apply to the Jews. For details concerning the sufferings of the Jews in Russia, I must refer the reader to the section on the subject in C. Joubert's *Russia as it Really Is*; to Israel Cohen's *Jewish Life in Modern Times*, per Index of Subjects, p. 366; and to the section on "The Jewish Pale," in Victor Berard's *The Russian Empire and Czarism*, pp. 125-177.

It is the lot of the Jew in Russia to be restricted to his "Pale," that is, "the ten provinces of the kingdom of Poland, and the fifteen frontier governments of Lithuania, White Russia, and Little Russia, where he had formerly been planted by the Lithuanian-Polish conquest (Berard, as above, p. 127). But this is not all. Within their "Pale" the Jews must be content to exist, huddled together chiefly in hovels, in the towns and small market-towns. They are usually very poor, the men and women being glad to work for very small wages, a fact that should explode the theory that the Jew can always "get on" and make money.

In the universities and regular schools the Jew suffers from many restrictions, if he has the good fortune to be allowed to enter. But, in spite of this, the majority of Jewish children receive better instruction than is received by the average Russian peasant's children. The Jewish schools do much to make up for the loss in education, caused to their people by the Russian official restrictions.

This systematic persecution of the Jew is also carried out in the Army, which he must join if fit. Although usually a good and loyal soldier, he is dealt with in a humiliating manner, and can never become an officer or even a bandmaster. But, to crown all, the Russian Jews have frequently been butchered to death by thousands, the Christian populace having, in many cases, been set on them at the instigation of the priests.

For some time past there have been rationalizing forces at work in Russia, but the day when the cloud of Russian religion shall have vanished seems to be a long way off.

E. EGERTON STAFFORD.

## Compulsory Religion.

WHAT must we do to be saved from bigotry? Who shall cast out for us the devil of fanaticism? Charlotte Bronte described bigotry as "that parent of crimes." Injustice is ever heedless of its effects. See how petty rulers and magistrates, "clad with a little brief authority," abuse their positions. It matters not to them that in their community there may be Rationalists, Jews, and Mohammedans; they persist in using their official names and official positions to fortify the Government religion. A clergyman is installed in a new cure, and the least that can be done to mark his arrival are *civic* welcomes, *civic* addresses, and *civic* soap. An overseas Premier gets the freedom of a town, or has a University degree conferred upon him; the proceedings in each case must be opened with prayer. A statue is unveiled to a statesman, an explorer, a scientist, or a man of letters; here again the man of God must take precedence of all others and invoke the Divine blessing on the ceremony. Sessions of Parliament and Town Councils cannot begin without pious orisons. The clergy regard themselves as State officials who are indispensable to the nation's welfare. This they certainly are not. On the contrary. But they must be recognized as astute advertisers, and keenly alert in looking after their own interests. And so long as they can secure belief in their pretensions to the possession of supernatural commissions, they will con-

tinue to exploit the common people. A "Divine call" gives them a confidence and an assertiveness which human credulity regards as well founded and well justified. They are a peculiar people, set apart by an all-powerful God to execute his purposes—separate from "sinners"—made of a different clay from Tom, Dick, or Harry. And in the human poultry-yard they go about rooketty-cooing and swelling their chests like the vainest and most arrogant of pigeons! How these two-forked radishes waddle and wallow in their dignity behind dog-collars, cassocks, aprons, and surplices! How sweetly benign is their condescending smile; how Turveydopian their gentle, cat-like deportment! How the pearls of wisdom gleam as they drop from their holy lips! Could any outlawed infidel imagine that these portals of grace would ever frame a big, big D, ever curl with the sneer of pride, or ever pout in baffled petulance? Nay, the priest, like Agag, walks softly. As he surveys the crowd of gaping, unthinking believers, he assures himself that the bitterness of death for his profession is past.

Yet time and again it has been demonstrated to unprejudiced minds that his profession does not fit in with his practice. It is proverbial: "Don't do what I do; but do what I tell you." People are beginning to realize that all his work is *talk*. The house of priestcraft is founded upon sand. The priest may not perceive that the numbers of those who do their daily work and enjoy their daily recreations without reference in any sense to God or religion are increasing year by year. The clergy may still be "first oars" at the crowning of kings, the christening of battleships, or the dedication of colours; but the *spade-work of life* is done to day better, more strenuously, with more effective and more beneficent results without any tinge of religion or religious association. For years we have been told that everything that was not mixed with religion was accursed. Gradually the people are beginning to see that everything that is not "mixed with brains" and commonsense is destined to failure. The priests warned us that all our human talents must be employed in the service either of God or of the Devil. There could be no middle course, What advancement humanity was to make, and the way in which, and the means by which it was to be made, were to be determined by the clergy.

Is it so now? May Freethinkers not congratulate themselves that it is only the ignorant, unthinking, and uninformed who concede such claims? Over the Christian Churches of Britain may be inscribed in gigantic characters the word "Failure." All the galvanizing methods in the world cannot bring back life to moribund sects. Men are thinking more profoundly; aspiring far higher; looking far further—both backwards and forwards—than ever they did before. Religion tries to keep the scales on the eyes of Humanity; Reason pierces them with a light that heralds the coming of Freedom. Religion has never succeeded yet where it was not imposed by compulsion of some sort. The mediæval weapons were physical and mental torture—the Inquisition, the dungeon, the rack, the stake, and the thumbscrew. The modern weapons are social ostracism, business boycotting, and the sedulous sowing of the idea that unbelievers are filthy-minded, dirty-living pariahs, home-wreckers, and social subverters, with no sense of personal honour. However the suggestions may be gilded, that is the meaning of the attitude of the Christian to the Atheist.

Religion depends upon compulsion; if not the compulsion of terror, then of some other sort. But physical force and money cannot for ever stand against the assaults of knowledge. What mockery to bleat in the parent's ear as he watches his beloved child in the



grip of consumption, that "God's in his Heaven; all's right with the world"! What lunacy to preach the doctrine of non-resistance to the man who sees a tiger springing upon his own mother!

Ecclesiastical corporations can survive only so long as they can make religion compulsory. This cannot be too much emphasized. From the pages of a weekly paper, friendly to the Faith, we cull the following paragraph, which is an interesting commentary upon the compulsory system of religion which prevails in our Army:—

A young B.Sc., who has served as a private in Gallipoli, and latterly in France, sends us an interesting story of the way in which religious matters are treated by the ordinary soldier. He remembers incidents happening at the usual Church parades as follows: The Church of England men were marched off to service. Then the Wesleyans and the Presbyterians. When the turn of the United Board came there were only three, and they were dismissed. On the following Sunday the three had grown to a dozen, and again they were dismissed. The third Sunday there were thirty, and they were then marched off to the Y.M.C.A. tent, where a chaplain of the United Board gave them a two-hour service. On the fourth Sunday the numbers declined to the original three. There the story ends.

It is wise not to underrate the forces opposed to Free-thought. Religion is buttressed by powerful and wealthy interests. Willy-nilly we must pay for the maintenance of the Government religion. Clerics of the Church of England still sit upon the Benches of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Willy-nilly we must consent to be called Christian when we are nothing of the kind. But one is entitled to expect that State servants and State officers shall study to cultivate and preserve, in so far as their official capacity is concerned, the grace of a correct and strict neutrality. Unfortunately, too many of these gentlemen go out of their way—though they must be well aware of the many divergent faiths and philosophies represented in the British—Empire to advertise the inestimable benefits of the Christian religion. Why should Viscount French, for example, have, at the opening of a Salvation Army Club, descanted upon the high and ennobling ideas which young soldiers had been taught by the Salvation Army? There are thousands of people in the real Army, and out of it, who entirely deny that Christianity is in any respect a *sine qua non* to a high and noble life. Lord French, like some other State officials who are given to masquerading on religious platforms, would be well advised to "stick to his last" and leave the professional religionist to his.

IGNOTUS.

### Obituary.

A staunch old Freethinker, in the person of Mr. George Kemp, passed away on Friday, February 9, in his eighty-sixth year. He was the father of H. A. Kemp, who, with the historic prisoners, G. W. Foote and W. J. Ramsey, was prosecuted for blasphemy in 1883, and received a sentence of three months' imprisonment as publisher of the *Free-thinker*. The veteran Mr. Kemp, who preserved his mental activities to the last, was a well-known propagandist in North-East London, and never tired of relating how he had met Mr. Bradlaugh, as a boy, at Bonner's Fields; had seen all three Presidents of the N. S. S. come into the Movement; and how, in one of the Hyde Park riots of 1878, his shoulders served Mr. Bradlaugh as a platform from which "the Chief" put and carried a resolution in favour of peace. A constant reader of the *Freethinker*, his enthusiasm and loyalty for the Cause never wavered. The funeral takes place at Chingford Mount Cemetery, at 4 o'clock, on Saturday, February 17, when a Secular Burial Service will be read.

E. M. V.

## 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, "The Sinister Influence of the Catholic Church in Politics." Affirmative, P. Friedberg; negative, R. O. Baker.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Avondale Hall, Landor Road, Clapham, S.W.): 7, Miss Kough, "The God Idea."

MR. HOWELL SMITH'S DISCUSSION CLASS (N. S. S. Office, 62 Farringdon Street): Wednesday, Feb. 21, at 7.30.

HYDE PARK: 11.30, Messrs. Saphin and Shaller; 3.15, Messrs. Kells and Dales, "Christian Hypocrisy"; 6.30, Messrs. Beale and Saphin.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

LEICESTER (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate); 6.30, A. J. Essex, "The Starry Universe." Lantern illustrations.

**W**ILL Freethinking Family in Northampton Billet Pte. Arthur F. Thorn, for Accommodation under Military System? Must be billeted somewhere in town, and prefers the atmosphere of a Freethinking home.—Write, 12 The Arcade, Northampton.

## Population Question and Birth-Control.

POST FREE THREE HALFPENCE.

MALTHUSIAN LEAGUE,

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

## The Religion of Famous Men.

BY

**WALTER MANN.**

A Storehouse of Facts for Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians.

Price **ONE PENNY.**

(Postage  $\frac{1}{2}$ d.)

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

## BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF FREETHINKERS OF ALL AGES AND NATIONS.

BY

**J. M. WHEELER.**

Price **THREE SHILLINGS Net.**

(Postage 6d.)

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

## 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.



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? 82 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
HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE. 58 pp. .. 1d.	0	3
CHRISTIANITY OR SECULARISM? 120 pp. .. 1½d.	0	4

**Pamphlets by COL. INGERSOLL.**

A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM. 48 pp. ... post 1d.	0	3
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. ... .. 0	1	
FREEWILL AND NECESSITY, Anthony Collins. 82 pp.... .. 1d.	0	3
ESSENCE OF RELIGION, by L. Feuerbach. 82 pp. ... .. Nett.	1d.	0
LIBERTY AND NECESSITY, by D. Hume. 32 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 Freethought 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 incommodious dwellings, and the want of open spaces, cause physical weakness and disease, and the deterioration of family life.

The Promotion of the right and duty of 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.