

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED • 1881

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

VOL. XXXVII.—No. 16

SUNDAY APRIL 22, 1917

PRICE TWOPENCE

CONTENTS.

	Page.
<i>Providence and the War.—The Editor</i> - - -	241
<i>The Roots of the Christian Tree.—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - -	242
<i>Swinburne: Man and Poet.—Minnermus</i> - - -	243
<i>Science and Spiritualism.—W. Mann</i> - - -	244
<i>The Two Mono-Gods.—Keridon</i> - - -	246
<i>The Bishop and "Cain's Wife"</i> - - -	247
<i>Acid Drops</i> - - -	247
<i>To Correspondents</i> - - -	249
<i>Sugar Plums</i> - - -	249
<i>The French Revolution.—Robert Arch</i> - - -	250
<i>The Monarch of Cereals.—T. F. Palmer</i> - - -	251
<i>Letters to the Editor—Religion in the Army, 253; Atheism in the French Revolution</i> - - -	253
<i>Notice of Meetings</i> - - -	254
<i>Books and Pamphlets</i> - - -	255.

Views and Opinions.

War As It Is.

The powers that be have issued innumerable warnings that we are on the verge of a food famine. The destruction of shipping, and the diversion of labour from the work of agriculture to that of manufacturing material for war has involved of necessity a shortage of food, and may end in acute want. And there are prophecies that the food supply may be the ultimate factor in the settlement of the War. If Germany can force starvation on the Allies before the Allies can force starvation on Germany, then terms acceptable to the Central Powers may be arranged. If the reverse, then the Allies may be able to force upon Germany and her Allies whatever terms are thought advisable. To such a pass has this business of "glorious war" come. The course of events have stripped war of its last semblance of greatness, and shown it to be the barbarous, brutal, even cowardly thing it really is. Victory may be determined by the starvation of old men and infants, women and children. For, make no mistake, if starvation be the decisive and deciding factor, it is these who will suffer first and most. So long as food can be obtained, it will be supplied to the fighting men first. The fitness of the fighting line must be maintained at all costs. And it requires little insight to perceive that in this attempted all-round food blockade it is by the starvation of the old and the young, the weak and the sick, that an issue is sought. So much for the chivalry of modern war, stripped of its false glamour and meretricious glitter.

* * *

"Our Father."

In the Christian armoury there is, however, one weapon that seems to fit the occasion. It is contained in the so-called Lord's Prayer—which is, by the way, no more Christian than are most other things in that mosaic of Pagan religious ideas and reversion to primitive animism which the world knows as Christianity. "Our Father, which art in heaven.....Give us this day our daily bread." That prayer seems to fit the situa-

tion. If we have a father in heaven, what more natural than that we should ask him for our daily bread? If, as the Bishop of Ripon has assured us, "Our cause is identical with God's cause," if the Bishop of London is right when he says that "this is the greatest fight ever made for the Christian religion," what more natural than to expect God to help? Man is "doing his bit." He is working away in the fields and in allotments. And just at the critical time "God" extends the duration of wintry weather so as to minimize the result of human efforts. Surely that is a poor way of helping his Allies? It is not the way one would expect a heavenly father to respond to "give us this day our daily bread." No earthly father would see his children starve if he could prevent it. Nay, it is his business to prevent it. The law says so, and punishes by fine and imprisonment all who neglect this duty. What are we going to do about God? Not being domiciled within the British Empire, we cannot cite him to answer in a court of law. We cannot fine him, but we could cease paying him tribute. If God won't trouble about us, why should we trouble about God? A neutral deity is of no use in this War. And a deity who ignores us during the War deserves to be ignored by us when peace arrives. And why should we not start *now*? If we can disband thousands of small businesses that at least produced some obvious result, why not turn our backs upon a deity who does not manage even the weather in a satisfactory manner? * * *

The Difficulties of Deity.

Of course, one can appreciate the difficulties of deity. For it is not alone the Allies who are his children. Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, and one must assume, the Turks are his children also. And they also pray "Give us this day our daily bread." Their prayer, one must believe, is as genuine and as heartfelt as ours, and it is answered in the same way. After all, they are *his* children. German and British, Austrian and Russian, created he them. And to take sides by giving bread to the Allies and refusing it to the Central Powers would be an act of gross partiality. Not only would it show partiality, but it would be risky. It might mean the loss of some seventy millions of worshippers at a time when they are dropping off with alarming rapidity. It is, perhaps, safer to imitate the Pope—unless it is the Pope who is imitating him—and refrain from interfering. Of course, a really intelligent parent would take his quarrelsome children by the scruff of their necks, or the seat of their pants, and knock their heads together in the hope of teaching them better. But God's ways are not as our ways—for which we ought to be grateful. For did man act as God acts we should not now be celebrating America's entrance to the War. Still, this policy of somnolence has also its dangers. When piety cries for potatoes, and belief asks for bread, there is not much satisfaction in offering—Lord Devonport. And when the Government curtly declines to sanction a day of prayer for victory, but emphasizes the need for ships and shells, it may dawn upon even the intelligence of

many pietists that this talk of "Our Father, which art in heaven" is part of the world's mental lumber which deserves to be swept away with the close of the War.

* * *

An Unworkable Theory.

Many Christians used to argue—many still so argue—that whether the Christian theory be true or not, at least it works. The War has for thousands exposed the absurdity of that plea. For the Christian theory simply does not square with the facts. Up to yesterday, people in this country were blaming President Wilson because he persisted in maintaining neutrality up to the last possible moment. They insisted that the inhumanity of Germany had been great enough to demand the active interference of all neutrals. At last President Wilson gave the expected word, and a special service is to be held at St. Paul's to thank God for America's intervention. But God still remains dumb. It was not God that brought America in, but German ruthlessness and American interests. The other day two hospital ships were sunk—one by torpedo attack, the other by running across a mine. These ships were not engaged in fighting. They were bringing home wounded men—men who had "done their bit" in "God's cause." And Providence, which could so easily have interfered, did nothing. They sank as certainly as though there were no God looking on. The world is clamouring for food, and the God who could once create a miraculous draught of fishes to satisfy a few fishermen can do nothing to help us. Providence could do nothing to prevent the outrages of the War; it can do nothing to stop their perpetuation. In an age of ignorance, God is active; in an age of science, he is impotent. The Ministry of War does not ask for prayers, but for men and munitions. The Minister of Agriculture asks for more labour; the Chancellor of the Exchequer for money. God is not wanted. He does nothing. The Atheist has always asserted this; and now few of his avowed followers expect him to do anything. The theory of God is unworkable and untrue.

* * *

The Burden of Belief.

But, after all, the War brings nothing to bear on this question that is essentially new. Carnage and folly and brutality are all as old as humanity. All exist in their degree in times of peace as well as in times of war. It is only that more suffer during war that makes duller minds aware of the facts. And whether they exist during war or during peace, they are equally an arraignment of the God-theory. If there is a God, he is quite careless of human well-being or human suffering. The deaths of a hundred thousand men mean no more to him than the deaths of a hundred thousand ants. A couple of million of men locked in a death struggle on the battle-field is only a replica of the struggle that has been going on in the animal world throughout all time. If there be a God, he made, he designed, all this. He fashioned the lust for slaughter, the teeth for tearing, the talons for destruction; and man, with his multiplied weapons of murder, has but imitated his example. The War has only brought the question to an issue for less imaginative folk. To the Christian plea the Atheist need only put the question, "With a God like that, how comes a world like this?" You simply cannot marry the facts to the theory. It is an outrage on decency to attempt it. Common sense forbids the banns. A world *without* God, and in which humanity is gradually learning the way to better things, is an inspiration to renewed effort after the right. A world such as this, *with* God, is enough to drive insane all with intelligence enough to appreciate the situation.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

The Roots of the Christian Tree.

IV.

WHENEVER we say that Paul makes a certain statement, all we mean to convey is that it occurs in some document which bears Paul's name, whether actually written by him or not. The genuineness or spuriousness of the Pauline Epistles is a problem that does not at present concern us, our only point being that the claim found in Galatians i. 11, 12, whether made by an historical Paul, or by someone writing in his name for a school known as Pauline, is absolutely false. The Pauline Gospel, in all its essential features, had been in existence for centuries before the Christian era began. Those influential religions of personal redemption by mystic union with a dying and resurrected Saviour-God, of which Professor Bacon speaks in his *Making of the New Testament*, were Oriental cults, some of which had flourished in the East for countless ages before the marvellous conquests of Alexander rendered their diffusion in the Western world practicable. Osiris, Adonis, Attis, and Mithra were ancient Saviour-Gods, after the order of whom the Christian Saviour-God came to be fashioned. Baptism was a well-known rite of initiation into the Mysteries, even in the West, before Christianity appeared on the scene. It mystically brought the initiated into vital touch with the slain and risen Lord; and the Christian sacrament of baptism was instituted on the lines of its Pagan prototype. The same thing is even more prominently true of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the truth of which proposition we shall now proceed to establish.

The following is Harnack's account of what the Eucharist meant to the primitive Church:—

It was a mysterious, divine gift of knowledge and of life; it was a thanksgiving, a sacrifice, a representation here and now of the death of Christ, a love feast of the brotherhood, a support of the hungry and distressed. No single observance could well be more than that, and it preserved this character for long, even after it had passed wholly into the region of the mysterious (*Expansion of Christianity*, vol. ii., p. 53).

According to the teaching of the orthodox Church in all ages this sacrament was instituted by Christ himself on the eve of his crucifixion. So far as the Four Gospels are concerned, however, only the Synoptists record such an institutionary ceremony, and so meagre is this record, that one is naturally led to doubt the historicity of the alleged event. So vague is the language employed, that we cannot legitimately infer from it that the Gospel Jesus intended that that simple parting meal of bread and wine should become a permanency. The only hint that such a permanency was contemplated occurs in Luke xxii. 19 ("This do in remembrance of me"), a passage which Westcott and Hort regard as no part of the original text. The curious thing is that the Fourth Gospel contains no allusion whatever to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, although it does represent the Master as teaching (vi. 53) that "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves." This is fully developed mysticism, and it shows that the writer must have been familiar with Pagan mythology.

Another illuminating fact is that the author or redactor of 1 Cor. xi. 23-29 represents the institution of the Lord's Supper as having been specially revealed to the Apostle Paul by the Lord Jesus himself, as if the occurrence of such an institution had been wholly unknown until the apostolate was Divinely conferred upon him. It is a fair inference from this claim that the institution never took place at all, and that the Synoptic accounts of it were interpolated from that passage in Corinthians. The truth

seems to be that the Christian Eucharist is the counterpart of several Jewish and Pagan sacred meals which had been in existence for a long time. Examining the Pauline statements concerning this sacrament, we discover two things, namely, that Christians of the latter half of the first century habitually observed it, and also that there was a Pagan sacrament practically identical with it, which the Corinthian converts were tempted to celebrate as well as their own. Of those Gentile feasts Paul could not speak with common politeness, though, on his own showing, the celebration of the Lord's Supper was frequently disgraced by disgusting scenes of intemperance in both food and drink. Yet this is how he addresses his readers on the subject:—

Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he (1 Cor. x. 21)?

However, we must do the author of that passage the justice of calling attention to the fact that "devils" is a deplorable mistranslation of the Greek word "daimoniown," which means not "devils," but "divinitis." Socrates boasted that he was under the sway of a "daimon," by which he understood God's spirit, or God's voice; and he assures us that whenever he listened to and obeyed his "daimon," "dæmon," or "demon," he felt very pleased with himself. It does one good to find that the *New Standard Dictionary* reminds us of the fact that "demon" in English denotes an evil spirit, devil, simply because "the wrong translation in the New Testament of *daimon*, as devil, has given currency to this meaning." And yet, after all, perhaps the translators are not so much to blame, because, in the estimation of the early Christians, the very Gods of the Heathen were but so many devils, who, stealing the secrets of the true God, were always more than delighted to forestall him in the execution of his holy purposes. As Mr. J. M. Robertson observes: "it is quite clear that the Supper was a Mithraic institution, and that Paul recognized its existence outside his sect"; but that recognition of its prior existence among the Pagans did not prevent him from ascribing its origin to the intervention of Gods which were but evil spirits. Of course, it was their dense ignorance of the history of religions, and their invincible prejudice, which induced the Church Fathers to accept the Pauline view as accurate and authoritative. To Justin Martyr, Mithraism was practically unknown, except on hearsay of people whose acquaintance with it was of the most superficial character, and it is no wonder that he accused the votaries of that religion of having borrowed its essential features from the Christians. Tertullian was vastly superior, in every respect, to Justin, but even he held the view that it was the Devil who had given the Eucharist to the Heathen in anticipation, and as a more or less exact copy of what God would later present to his own people in Christ.

Of the antiquity of sacramental meals there can be no doubt whatever. To the Jew, in ordinary circumstances, the drinking of blood was an intolerable abomination, but he was not at all averse to the mystical partaking of it. What was the blood of the covenant that became so common a phrase on the lips of Christians? The covenant was between God and his people who had been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and so it was looked upon as a blood-covenant, or a covenant sealed by blood. This imagery arose, doubtless, from the habit indulged in, under all the great religions of the East, of partaking of a sacrificial banquet at which the God was mystically eaten, or sat as being at once both host and guest at his own table. The sacrifice offered on the altar was a mystic representation of the slain Deity, who, by his death and resurrec-

tion, became the spiritual food and drink of his devotees. This custom obtained among primitive Jews and surrounding nations; and everywhere the conviction was that the blood symbolized the very life of the slain sacrifice, because the shedding of it invariably brought about death. Therefore blood was conceived to be the most nourishing food of gods and men. Even the shades of the departed were too feeble to enter into conversation with Ulysses until he gave them blood to drink. Now, in sacrificial meals wine generally stood for blood, and, consequently, we read in most Sacred Writings of the sacramental aspects of bread and wine, the bread representing the torn body, and the wine the shed blood of the Saviour-God. Such was the case in the cults of Osiris, Adonis, Attis, and Mithra, and such became the characteristic of the Christian Eucharist. The Gospel Jesus is made to say of the broken bread: "This is my body which is for you," and of the poured-out wine: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood"; and the partakers were instructed to cherish the fond belief that by thus mystically eating and drinking their Redeemer they would ultimately grow into his likeness.

Now, what ground is their for believing that the Christian Eucharist is of Divine origin, while similar institutions among the Heathen owed their appointment and continuance to the forces of evil ever at work in the universe? And yet Paul is represented as being responsible for the following amazing statement:—

I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Seeing that we who are many are one loaf, one body; for we all partake of the one loaf. Behold Israel after the flesh; have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar? What say I then? That a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have communion with devils (1 Cor. x. 15-20).

As a matter of fact, the Pagans had as solid a right to believe that their Gods were real beings as the Christians had to cherish the same faith in their own. To the former *daimoniown* were quite as really Divine Beings as God and Christ were and are to the latter, and the communion table was the Lord's table to both alike.

J. T. LLOYD.

Swinburne: Man and Poet.

The Boyhood of Algernon Charles Swinburne. By his cousin, Mrs. Disney Leith. Chatto & Windus, 1917.

Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne. By Edmund Gosse. Macmillan, 1917.

No two books of the season are likely to attract such attention as the above-mentioned volumes, for well-written biographies of Algernon Swinburne were much needed. Only the first few pages of Mrs. Disney Leith's book have to do with the actual boyhood of the great poet, but the rest of the pages are of outstanding importance. Mr. Gosse's monograph is a full-dress biography in the grand manner, which is refreshing in these days of book-making and reprinted journalism.

Swinburne's own impression of the sprightly Mrs. Procter who, when near ninety, "walked like her own granddaughter," is something like that left upon the reader by these accounts of the poet's life. For Swinburne attracts one as a child, and one likes him from the time he first goes to school hugging a volume of Shakespeare under his arm. Lord St. Aldwyn, who was at Eton College with him, remembered his big red head

and pasty complexion, but other witnesses are kinder in their recollection.

From Eton College, Swinburne went to Balliol College, Oxford, where he drew the attention of Benjamin Jowett, who had a keen eye for intellect. Oxford, that "home of lost causes," had little attraction for the fiery young poet, who was already a red Republican. He tried his prentice hand at verse, but failed to win the Newdigate with a poem entitled "The Discovery of the North-West Passage." As an undergraduate he was a failure, and he left the University without a degree, but with an excellent knowledge of Latin, Greek, French, and Italian. So fervent was his Republicanism that he hung a portrait of Orsini, who attempted to assassinate Napoleon the Little, in his sitting-room. This alarmed Swinburne's parents, who would not allow the poet to go to Paris until he had promised to do nothing to undermine the authority of the French monarchy. Swinburne's political views were well-known, and he was invited to stand for Parliament by the Reform League, at that time a body of much influence, but, on the advice of Mazzini, he wisely declined to give up poetry for politics.

Of Swinburne's personality, Mr. Gosse writes admirably. He notes the "dead pallor" of the poet's face and his "balloon of red hair," which had a faded appearance, although Swinburne was but in his thirty-third year when his biographer met him. Mr. Gosse says that Swinburne had no ear for music, save those of words; but he emphasizes the poet's "rich and flute-like voice." There is much that is interesting in Swinburne's table-talk, but on this point Mr. Gosse exercises too much restraint, with the result that the poet appears too much of a book-worm, and his poems the only incidents of his life.

Few men loved little children and was loved by them so much as Algernon Swinburne. His poems on childhood are among the most exquisite in the language; but his actual experiences were as delightful. Mrs. Disney Leith tells us that few things pleased him more than his encounter with two ragged, highway urchins, each about the height of his knee, who demanded a ha'penny and received twopence, and trotted after him. "Well, what do you want now?" "Want to kiss you." And the poet adds, in the letter describing the incident, "I needn't say whether or not I squatted down and opened my arms, and first one and then the other put her bits of arms up to my neck and kissed me so affectionately that I felt once more how much too good little children are to us."

Swinburne fluttered the doves of respectability with his first series of *Poems and Ballads*, although some of the poems had already appeared in the sober *Spectator*, and the austere John Ruskin had given the book his blessing. "In power and imagination and understanding," Ruskin said, "he simply sweeps me away before him, as a torrent does a pebble." Indeed, the volume aroused as much excitement as Byron's *Don Juan* had in a previous generation. Robert Buchanan voiced the respectable view in a pamphlet, entitled *The Fleshly School of Literature*, and complained that *Poems and Ballads* were unfit reading for young ladies. Swinburne retorted with crushing effect: "I do not write for school-girls, I leave that to the Buchanans." The accusation of fleshliness was ill-founded, but it served to advertise the book, which was a masterpiece among masterpieces. Swinburne's vogue became extraordinary. Some idea of the poet's influence may be gathered from Canon Scott Holland, who says young men shouted the poems, sang them, flung them about to the skies and winds. Then the Canon quotes:—

Dream that the lips once breathless
Can quicken if they would;
Say that the soul is deathless;
Dream that the gods are good.

Say March may wed September,
And time divorce regret;
But not that you remember,
And not that I forget.

Not only University men were affected by Swinburne's verse, for G. W. Foote has told us how the poet's lyrics roused him like a trumpet-blast. One memorable day the future Freethought leader, then a young man, recited Swinburne's *Mater Triumphalis* on the hills outside Edinburgh, while his life-long friend, Joseph Wheeler, lay on the grass at his feet and applauded. Nor is this to be wondered at, for Swinburne has surpassed all other poets in the ardour of his devotion to Liberty and Freethought.

The last thirty years of his life he lived at Putney with his "best friend," Watts-Dunton, and so quietly did the years run, that Mr. Gosse has crowded the history of that period into almost as few pages. Owing to this compression, there are few good stories of the poet's life. One of the best-known is an altercation with a greedy cabman, who had asked for an excessive fare in bad language. Swinburne told him to "come down from his perch and hear how a poet could swear."

Only one love-story is recorded in Mr. Gosse's pages. Swinburne at the age of twenty-five proposed to a girl who had given him roses. He declared his passion suddenly and too impetuously, and she laughed at him. Afterwards, Swinburne, always shy and reserved, seemed only to care for literary companionship. An interesting story deals with the first meeting between Swinburne and Guy de Maupassant, in which the distinguished French novelist was rowing in the brilliant sunshine of a bay in the Riviera, when suddenly there emerged from the water beside the boat the head of Swinburne, who, while he was one of the greatest of swimmers, was the greatest of living poets. It was astonishing to Maupassant to make the acquaintance of Swinburne thus—in the middle of a bay.

When Swinburne died in 1909, there was stilled for ever a voice that had sung vigorously, melodiously, and with wonderful freshness for half a century. His genius, indeed, dazzled us so much, that his own reputation has suffered to the extent of his being regarded rather as a singer than as a seer also. But for his outspoken views about priestcraft and monarchy, he must inevitably have succeeded Tennyson as Poet Laureate. He was the last of the great world-poets who dominated the imagination of all races.

MIMNERMUS.

Science and Spiritualism.

VI.

(Continued from p. 211.)

A deep longing for some direct proof of existence after death has made hundreds of people accept the grossest impostures of "Spiritualism," impostures which contradict the most massive experiences of the race, and which had nothing to support them save this emotional credulity acting where direct knowledge was wholly absent.—G. H. Lewes, "*Problems of Life and Mind*" (1879), p. 168.

As to the so-called psychic forces, materializations, etc., it will be useless to busy ourselves with them here. They have attracted the attention of eminent scholars, such as Crookes, Lodge, Richet, and others, but they have yet to be demonstrated, and until this is done, it is better to try to interpret the phenomena observed by known causes. I had occasion to examine without prejudice, and with the assistance of M. Dastre, a subject with a European reputation, but our investigations, continued throughout several seances, disclosed to us nothing demonstrative.—Gustave Le Bon, "*The Evolution of Forces*" (1908), p. 352.

It should be borne in mind, as Mr. Podmore points out: "It is important to note that none of Home's manifesta-

tions seem to have been peculiar to himself. At the outset of his career, indeed, he appears to have won no special distinction as a medium. Raps were heard at his seances; tables and chairs were moved about; the room was shaken; bells, accordions, and guitars were played under the table or even at a distance from the circle, with no hand near them; spirit voices would speak through the medium; spirit hands were felt under the tablecloth, and occasionally seen above it; spirit lights made themselves visible, and the medium himself would be levitated. But all these performances were the common property of the guild. The Fox girls, Gordon, Cooley, E. P. Fowler, Abbey Warner, and even Willis, the Harvard divinity student, were Home's rivals, and apparently, in the estimation of his contemporaries, at least his equals in all these feats. It is noteworthy that Home appears to have attracted comparatively little attention in the American Press before his journey to England."¹

We have always been taught to believe that spiritual intelligence far transcends in knowledge and power the limited intelligence of poor, earthy, material man. All knowledge to them is an open book; nothing is hidden from them either in the illimitable ages of past time or in the equally illimitable ages of the distant future; for do they not, so Spiritualists claim, sometimes warn their earthly friends of coming danger? If the spirits are indeed so marvellously gifted, how can we explain their actions when they condescend to appear at a spiritualistic seance? With the shifting of tables and chairs like furniture removers, playing the accordion like an itinerant Italian or the guitar like a nigger minstrel, plucking dresses and coats with spiritual hands, raising the medium in the air like a professional strong man, and all the other stupid and senseless tricks performed at a Spiritualist seance, it is evident that these spirits, since leaving their human habitations, instead of gaining the enormous intellectual power claimed for them, have degenerated into childish imbecility.

However, there is no need for any intervention of spirits to account for these hooligan antics. We know perfectly well how they were manipulated; and although Home was never publicly exposed, we know, from the exposure of others, how the tricks were done.

Take, for instance, the playing of the accordion and the guitar, which was a common feature of Home's seances. Mr. Hereward Carrington, who has made a life study of the subject, and is a member of the Society for Psychical Research, and also of the American Society for Scientific Research, explains the trick as follows: The guitar is prepared beforehand with a hole in the neck for the insertion of the lazy-tongs, as they are called in America, a lattice-work contrivance of steel, which, when extended, reach out several feet, and will close up to a few inches. "Inside the guitar, which is specially constructed, is a small music-box, which may be wound up and set in motion by merely releasing a catch spring. When the seance is in full swing, the medium gains possession of the guitar, inserts the rod in the hole in the neck of the instrument, sets the machinery going, and waves the guitar over the sitters' heads, when they will have presented to them the strange phenomenon of a guitar floating in the air and performing a tune upon itself! It does not sound exactly as though the music were produced on the strings; but it is near enough for the illusion to pass, in the circumstances. At any rate, the music has never been challenged, to my knowledge."² The obvious reply of the medium to such a challenge would be that spirit music

could not be expected to sound the same as an instrument played by human hands.

That this was the method of producing music practised by Home is confirmed by a perusal of his autobiographical work, *Incidents of My Life*, where we learn the titles of the pieces played, namely, "God Save the Queen," "Home, Sweet Home," and "The Last Rose of Summer"¹—the very tunes found in small music-boxes.

The medium Monck also used a music-box at his seances. Says Mr. Carrington: "He would place a music-box on the table, and cover it with a cigar-box, or other box, and the sitters were at liberty to keep their hands upon this throughout the sitting. Nevertheless the music-box played at command, though the box and table could be examined, and the medium's hands were held. This effect was produced by the aid of a *second* music-box, playing the same airs as the first, and attached to the leg of the medium, just above the bend of the knee, within the trouser. When not in use the box rested beneath the knee, but when required for action it was brought around to the front of the leg, resting above the knee. The box was so arranged that pressure on a stud at the top caused it to play, the music immediately ceasing when such pressure was removed. Of course, the box on the top of the table is silent throughout, the music being under the perfect control of the medium."² Holding the medium's hands would make no difference, for he only had to press the stud on the top of the music-box against the under-side of the table to start the mechanism to play, and when the pressure was removed it would stop.

Sir William Crookes, the famous chemist, in his book, *Researches in the Phenomena of Spiritualism*, gives an account of how he, along with his brother, Dr. Huggins, and Sergeant Cox, tested Home's power of producing music from an accordion without touching the keys, and comes to the conclusion that Home succeeded under the test. But the man who suffered himself, as we have seen, to be hoodwinked and deluded by such common adventuresses as Annie Fay and Florrie Cook, was not likely to detect the imposture of the astute and tricky Home.

To make the test, Mr. Crookes, as he then was, made a round topless and bottomless cage with wooden hoops and insulated copper wire. "The height of this cage," says Mr. Crookes, "was such that it would just slip under my dining-table, but be too close to the top to allow of the hand being introduced into the interior, or to admit of a foot being pushed underneath it." Mr. Home was to get music from an accordion, newly purchased by Mr. Crookes, while holding it by one hand in this cage under the table.

Mr. J. M. Robertson, under the title "A Spiritualistic Farce," subjected this test to a drastic criticism. He says:—

Observe, while Mr. Crookes carefully arranges a cage which shall just fit under his table and leave no room for a hand, Mr. Home is actually allowed to keep the edge of the cage a little beyond the side of the table and put his hand in freely, holding the accordion by the bottom, so that the key end hung downward. The illustrative woodcut given by Mr. Crookes shows this. The table, then, played no part whatever as a test, and the adjustment of the cage's height was a pure blind or a pure irrelevance. If Mr. Home was going to employ a new force under scientific conditions, there was no need for the table at all. He might much more convincingly have done it in the open. The investigators

¹ Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism*, vol. ii., p. 231.

² Carrington, *The Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*, p. 197.

¹ Home, *Incidents in My Life* (1863), pp. 145-186. Also vol. ii. (Second Series; 1872), p. 121.

² Carrington, *The Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*, p. 199.

saw that he had placed his other hand on the table, and they held his feet. All these checks could have been better employed if they sat in a free space with the accordion in the middle.¹

Of course, under these conditions, the accordion moved and played; but Mr. Crookes states that when, after a time, Home removed his hand from the cage, the accordion still continued to play. After a very careful analysis of Mr. Crookes' statement of the proceedings, which is too long to quote here, Mr. Robertson further points out: "In all this narrative there is not a grain of scientific proof that the sounds heard really came from the accordion under notice. It is a well-established scientific fact that it is often extremely difficult to fix with accuracy the locality of the source of sounds. This has been brought home by ocular demonstration to thousands of people at the entertainments of Mr. Stuart Cumberland, who got persons from his audience to submit to be blindfolded on his platform, while he clicked coins in various positions near them. When I saw the performance, none of the blindfolded persons ever came near guessing where the sounds had been made; and the miscalculations were generally astonishing. A sound visibly produced at a blindfolded man's knee would be supposed by him to come from behind his head, or from some way off. Now, in the case of Mr. Crookes' accordion experiment, the whole explanation may perfectly well turn upon this. There may be, for all I know, plenty of ways of playing tricks with accordions; but I have here simply to point out that Mr. Crookes, a so-called scientific man, did not take a single precaution against this notorious form of hallucination, or against the many possible tricks by which sounds like those of an accordion could be played near at hand while attention was concentrated on the one that was visible.....It is needless to ascertain what was the particular device by which Mr. Home got another accordion played near at hand, or produced notes like those of an accordion (the investigators were evidently not anxious to ascertain the quality or timbre of the particular notes heard) from some machine about his person. He may have done the whole thing by one of those little instruments which I believe are sometimes called 'mouth accordions.' The fact that his instrument was 'generally an accordion, for convenience of portability,' as if there was any want of portability about a violin or a cornet, need hardly be dwelt upon."

We are dealing at some length with Home because, as Mr. Podmore says: "In Home and in his doings all the problems of Spiritualism are posed in their acutest form; with the marvels wrought by or through him the main defences of Spiritualism must stand or fall."²

(To be continued.)

W. MANN.

The Two Mono-Gods.

A REGULAR reader of the *Freethinker* has written to ask if I would oblige him with a fuller description of the distinction between the two kinds of Mono-theisms to which I briefly alluded to in my article on "Religion and Brutality." As, however, other readers of this journal may be similarly interested in the subject, I take the liberty of replying to it through the medium of its columns.

Philosophic Mono-theism is the product of that irresistible impulse of the human intellect to speculate or guess about imagined existences behind the veil of phenomena. In other words, it is the product of metaphysical speculation in its vain search for ultimate realities. Priestly Mono-theism, on the other hand, is

the off-spring of human superstition, sacerdotal ambition, and arrogant pride.

The distinction between them is very analogous to that existing between mind and body. The metaphysical variety is a kind of spiritual entity or "soul"—a disembodied abstraction without temple, church, altar, fane, or any kind of sacred abode; without priesthood, Bible, or any form of ritual worship. It has, likewise, no dogmatic creed. Its tenets are not dogmas but mere postulates to be knocked down and replaced by the next metaphysical conjurer. Its Deity is a nameless abstraction of man—without body, and more or less without feelings and emotions. Only intellect is left, but not the intellect which *acquires* knowledge through experience and reason. But a kind of divine receptacle of self-existing cognition. In short, it is an abstraction of *knowledge*, as "whiteness" is of the quality "white" which things possess in relation to the eye. There is no such a thing as whiteness apart from white things. But the mind can think of the quality as if it were self-existent; so it can do of cognition or knowledge and call it God. It is probably found embodied in a pure form only in Greek philosophy.

Now, contrast with this bodiless abstraction of the metaphysical mind the corporeal product of the priesthood. The Theism of the latter is fully embodied in a material cult with all the self-interest, appetite, and voracity which the possession of a body entails. This spectacular manifestation is not ghostly in "texture," but is a very tangible object with substantial limbs and organs—temples and churches, sacred shrines and books, priesthoods, dogmatic creeds, and expiatory rites. This bodily incarnation of the Deity in a sacerdotal cult has been guarded by its priesthood with all the jealous care of one fully realizing the fact that when this "body" is slain its good perforce dies with it. It is, therefore, perpetuated from age to age by a deeply rooted and widely spread organization of material self-interests.

How two conceptions so diametrically opposite should become included under the same term is an instance of the treacherous imperfection of speech. The two ideas became identified in exactly the same way as all Pagan practices, rites, and festivals became Christian—by adoption and absorption.

The early Christian apologists first denounced and reviled all Pagan speculation, but later espoused its tenets by identifying them with some of its own dogmas. In this manner the speculations of Platonism and of its derivatives were, one by one, incorporated and assimilated with Christian dogma. We have a noted example of this practice in the fourth Gospel, which is simply an ingenious adaptation of Logos speculation thrown into the form of a story of a concrete life. Just as the Roman Saturnalia became the Christian Christmas, so the Monotheism of Greek philosophy became identified and fused with that of the Jewish and Christian priesthoods—that is, with promoted and exalted Jahveh. Ever since, this Deity has played a double role. He is a metaphysical Mono-God in "learned" theological treatises and metaphysical disquisitions, but simply a tribal-God, whose tribe is the Church, in the current religion of Christendom.

KERIDON.

Man is by birth so poor a creature that he is good only when he dreams. He needs illusions to make him do what he ought to do for the love of good. This slave has need of fear and of lies to perform his duty. You get the mass of men to make sacrifices only by giving them assurances that they will be paid back. The self-denial of the Christian is only a shrewd calculation, an investment for the sake of the kingdom of God.—*Renan*,

¹ The *National Reformer*, September 20, 1891.

² Podmore, *Modern Spiritualism*, vol. ii., p. 223.

Acid Drops.

"Speak, that I may know you," said a wise old philosopher, and no one better illustrates the wisdom of the saying than our Bishop of London. He was interviewed recently by Mr. Raymond Blaythwayt, and as that gentleman thinks there is "no finer representative of Anglicanism than Dr. Ingram," either the reflection hits the Anglican Church hard, or interviewer and interviewed were well matched. The mental calibre, and perhaps the truthfulness, of Bishop Ingram are well shown by his informing Mr. Blaythwayt that when he first addressed a crowd of East End men, he was asked by them to talk on "Cain's wife." But, said the Bishop, "I soon settled Cain's wife, and we buried the poor old lady in Bethnal Green that afternoon, and I do not believe they've dug her up since." And to this piece of history Mr. Blaythwayt adds that the Bishop's addresses to Atheists in Victoria Park "were for years the most popular and effective things in the whole religious life of that part of the world."

To begin with, the Bishop of London never gave any addresses to Atheists. His lectures were delivered, either from a Christian Evidence platform to a crowd of Christians, or to other Christians in the hall of Oxford House. And their effectiveness may be gauged by the fact that Free-thought propaganda was never more flourishing in Victoria Park than during the period of Bishop Ingram's activity. The only time that the Bishop came to direct grips with Atheists was on the few occasions on which he summoned courage enough to offer opposition to Mr. Cohen at the conclusion of the latter's lectures. And on that we will only say that his appearance was much enjoyed—by Atheists. Finally, Bishop Ingram's capacity for meeting Atheists in discussion is sufficiently disclosed by his impression that the cardinal point in dispute is "Cain's wife"—a subject that we have never heard any Atheist waste five minutes' serious discussion over. The Bishop has built up a perfect legend concerning the fearful onslaughts he made on Atheism in East London, and he has told the story so often that he appears to have convinced himself of its truth. But he has always been careful enough never to tell the story to an audience conversant with the facts.

The religious mind moves very slowly. The *Tablet* describes Martin Luther as a "religious revolutionist." So he was, four hundred years ago!

The *Christian Science Journal* contains four pages of names of Christian Science practitioners in Great Britain, all of whom are described as "members of the Mother Church." The patients have our entire sympathy.

Commenting on an article on cemetery reform, the *New Church Magazine* says "the author has nothing to say about what takes place after the funeral. This is what really matters." Was the writer thinking of the insurance money?

Providence, who counts the hairs of our heads and takes special care of sparrows, appears somewhat indifferent to the fate of children, three of whom were burnt to death at Spennymoor, their mother being away only ten minutes.

A daily paper refers to the greater number of boys being born as a "timely intervention of Providence." Surely, "timely" is not the right word, and the intervention is tardy, unless the War is to rage for another twenty years.

The *Tablet*, one of the leading Catholic periodicals, has some interesting remarks on Mexico: "The new constitution of Mexico appears to be established on a frankly anti-Christian basis. No monk or nun or priest is allowed to teach in any primary school. The religious are disposed of in the following paragraph: 'The State cannot recognize any compact, agreement, or contract, which will tend to lower, lose, or sacrifice the liberty of man, either through work, education, or religious vow. Therefore, the law will not tolerate

monastic orders, nor permit the establishment of such by any denomination, for any object whatever.'" All churches, colleges, and seminaries are to become the property of the State, as well as future churches. Marriage is treated as a civil compact, and the clergy are forbidden to join political associations. No wonder the Catholics do not approve of present-day Mexico.

Religious fanaticism is not dead, and recently a fine exhibition of it occurred at Beckenham. A War-shrine erected in All Saints' Church grounds was denounced by Protestant bigots, and as a result of the language used the War-shrine was totally destroyed at night-time. How these Christians do love one another!

Rev. G. C. Martin, speaking before the Glasgow Christian Endeavour Union, said: "the Christian Endeavour Movement was the one thing that was linking all the nations together at the present moment." Hear, hear! Look how they are linked together! It is a Christian endeavour—to kill as many as possible in the shortest time.

Rev. Professor Morton, of Glasgow, says that those who advocate Sunday labour on the land forget how easy it would be for God to frustrate their efforts "By a single touch of His hand on the atmosphere all their labour would be in vain." Now we get the secret of the vile weather we have been having. God has put his hand on the atmosphere. And whenever God interferes there is invariably trouble.

We are very pleased to see that the National Union of Teachers is inclined to resist the introduction of clergymen into the schools as substitutes for teachers. At the Annual Conference, on April 12, a resolution was passed promising support to any teacher who refuses to work in a school in which a clergyman of military age and fitness is substituted for a teacher doing military duty. So far, good, although the resolution is not an heroic one. It throws the responsibility upon the individual teacher, although the very reason for the existence of a trades union is to ensure co-operative action. And we confess that we should have liked to have seen a very strong protest against the introduction of clergymen into the schools on any pretence. There are very few teachers who do not fully recognize the evil of such a procedure. The presence of the clergy in the schools is a menace to all who value effective education and place any importance upon the status of teachers.

In view of the fact that the whole trend of modern legislation for the last fifty years has been to get the clergy out of the schools, it is a little remarkable that one of the first efforts of the "Business Government" to improve our educational system is to get them back again. It is obvious that in the village schools especially, the arrival of the vicar as an "emergency teacher" will make the position of the head teacher very difficult. In the large towns we assume that Anglican clergy, Nonconformist ministers, Roman Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, and Swedenborgian preachers will have equal rights of entry to the schools, and as none of them know anything of the requirements of the Code, the machinery of modern education, or the teaching methods of up-to-date schools, they are likely to be about as useful as the piano-tuners who have been sent to cultivate the land.—*Star*.

The British Army's exploits in Palestine have been made the occasion of an outpouring of sentiment by editors who cater for the religious public, and some lament the changes in the Holy Land made during recent years by the introduction of the railway. This reminds us of the story of the enthusiastic American lady-tourist who stood on the railway platform at Jerusalem and remarked, "To think that Jesus went on business from this very station."

Punch has the following ironic remarks: "I swear by Almighty God that I will speak the truth, no nonsense, and won't be foolish," was the form of oath taken by a witness at a recent case in the Bloomsbury County Court. It was

explained to him that this was only suitable for persons taking office under the Crown.

It is evident from a statement made in the *Daily Telegraph* of April 11 that when the Rev. A. J. Waldron gave up his post as Vicar of Brixton he lost nothing of consequence in a monetary sense. His successor reports the year's income—we believe it is a little better than it was—as £117 18s., out of which he was compelled to spend £116 for repair of vicarage house. He hopes, he says, to recover some of this from Mr. Waldron.

An advertisement, running to about two columns, appeared in a recent issue of the *Times*, headed "Will He Really Respond?" The advertisement consists of a reprint of a tract intended for circulation in the Army, and consists of a string of pious anecdotes of almost unbelievable stupidity. But the gem consists of a testimonial from Field-Marshal Lord Grenfell to the effect that the tract is "fully adapted for the officers and men of the Army." No more comprehensive insult to the British Army was ever offered than this. And Lord Grenfell owes the Army an apology. A body of men to whom such tracts are acceptable would offer a marked case of cerebral degeneration. If one were upholding the thesis that belief in religion implies softening of the brain, the tract and its endorsement would go far towards proving it.

Dean Wace, of Canterbury, says: "A War like this is undoubtedly a judgment, it springs from the sins of men." And the *Church Gazette* describes Dean Wace as "the premier priest of the Church of England." It does not say much for the mentality of the rank and file.

Thomas Grubb was charged at Cheltenham with having broken into a house and stolen a stewing jar. After being some five weeks in prison, he informed the magistrate that he had found the need of a Saviour. We do not doubt that in the least. Many people in prison for five weeks would feel just that way. Continuing, Thomas Grubb said that, with God's help, he intended to lead a better life, and it was only by looking to God that he dared hope. Evidently a most pious gentleman, and one who had been, so said the vicar of St. Paul's, very helpful in the Church. As, however, the police proved that this robbery was only one of a series that had been going on for years, Thomas Grubb received a sentence of two months' hard labour. And the vicar is minus his helper.

In Finsbury and Islington more than thirty War shrines have been erected. We have nothing to say against a suitable memorial to men who have lost their lives in the War, and much to say for it, but these War shrines are just one more illustration of the way in which the clergy are seeking to exploit the War in the interests of sectarianism.

Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, writes to the *Church Times* that some of their lecturers are "converted Atheists." We have heard of these converted Atheists before, and we should be interested in knowing who they are. Usually they are only known as Atheists after their conversion. Christians might retort they had the grace to hide it before. All the same, it enhances their value, even though they lack a local habitation and a name.

The Rev. Dr. Murphy has been enlightening a Belfast audience on the question of "Has Christianity Failed?" His conclusion is that Christianity has failed in Germany, but nowhere else. It has not failed in Britain, or Italy, or France, or Belgium. Well, if it had only failed in Germany, that would have been a failure on a sufficiently large scale. But in what sense has it failed in Germany, and nowhere else? Is it because Germany has trusted to get its own way by force? And is that quite a new thing in the history of nations? Were armies and navies unknown outside Germany? or have not all nations reckoned their greatness in terms of their ability to exercise military pressure whenever the occasion should arise for its expression? Dr.

Murphy says that Germany has repudiated the teaching, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," and says, "Blessed are the valiant, for they shall make the earth their throne." Presumably, Britain, with six million soldiers under arms and the largest fleet in the world, is still trusting to meekness to inherit the earth! Of all cant, the cant of the pulpit is the worst. Honesty there seems a sheer impossibility.

We wonder what Dr. Murphy would make of the Government's recent refusal to appoint a day of national prayer for a speedy victory? They are asking for more men, but decline to waste time praying for victory without the men. Of course, Christianity has not failed. It produces as many hypocrites now as it ever did.

Says Dean Inge: "As for the survival of the physical organism by which we are known to others as individuals, when we think of our bodily and mental make-up, with all its disharmonies, its inherited and acquired defects, which have fretted and tormented us all our days, do we want it resuscitated in another state of existence?" Apparently Dean Inge does not. But if this does not survive, what does? And without it how can it be me or you? All that is required to see the absurdity of the belief in survival is to reason out its corollaries and consequences.

Dean Inge thinks we have heard too much about praying for victory. He says: "It is more in accord with the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount to commend our cause to God's hands in a few earnest words and then attend to munitions and recruiting." We fancy that Dean Inge must have a different version of the Sermon on the Mount to the one we possess. We have not the opinion of the New Testament Jesus that Dean Inge has; but, for the life of us, we cannot picture him engaged in making munitions or serving behind a machine-gun.

There is no relief for the Bishop of London. The treasurer of the London Diocesan Financial Board has reported ament the Bishop's offer to surrender his income if certain conditions were fulfilled that the Board cannot accept the proposal without an Act of Parliament. So the poor Bishop must still struggle along under his burden of £10,000 a year. One would think there must be some way of getting rid of the money if one really wished to.

There were nearly 1,000 fewer confirmations in the Church of England last year, and about half a million less received in the shape of voluntary offerings. The last, we can well believe, was a cause of great regret.

Father Bernard Vaughan describes Protestantism as "dead as scrapped iron," but he adds, "the Catholic Church is as vigorous and as enterprising as ever." Yet nearly 50,000 parsons get a living out of the "dead" Protestantism in this country alone.

Germany celebrates the fourth centenary of the day when Martin Luther nailed his famous theses to the church door in Wittenberg. Surely an extraordinary proceeding on the part of a nation of "Atheists."

In a pastoral letter signed by three Essex Nonconformist ministers, readers are told that "men of all shades of opinion believe that God is allowing the War to continue until we become a God-fearing people." In that case, the War will never end; a prospect which ought to appeal to ministers of religion exempted from military service.

What a curious world the clergy do live in! All things are judged from the ecclesiastical standpoint. In the *Church Gazette* for March there is an article on the Kikuyu controversy, around which, the editor adds, "centre all the important issues of the future." And this after nearly three years of a world-war. When will the clergy realize that they are, as a class, out of harmony with modern life.

C. Cohen's Lecture Engagements.

April 29, South Place Institute, South Place, Moorgate Street, E.C.

To Correspondents.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—May 6, South Place Institute, South Place, Moorgate Street, E.C.

W. FITZPATRICK.—Thanks for cuttings.

T. WOOD.—It is depressing to reflect on the prevalence of the type of mind to which such pamphlets as those you enclose are acceptable. Thanks for cuttings.

H. T. D.—We certainly should contest the proposition that religion offers direct encouragement to dishonesty.

E. STEWART ROSS.—We are pleased to have the memento of one of our lost soldiers of the Army of Freethought. Thanks also for cutting, but the subject was dealt with a week or so back. Your appreciation of the *Freethinker* is valued.

S. L.—Sorry we cannot use the MSS. We are constantly compelled to return articles because of their length. We prefer them not to exceed two or two and a half columns.

T. W. HAUGHTON.—When possible, we act as you suggest with regard to persons criticized in these columns.

FRANCES IVOR.—We are not pleased to find that our estimate of the behaviour of the press was correct, neither are we surprised. We simply know British newspapers. And there is not a more complete imposture in the country than our "Free Press." It was not a free press in peace time; it is still worse under war conditions.

GRAMATIKO.—The correction was quite justified. Thanks.

E. ANDERSON.—Next week.

C. W. MARSHALL.—Thanks; but we almost blushed.

PAX.—Pleased you found last week's "Views and Opinions" so much to your taste. But you wield a pretty pen yourself, and your judgment is the more to be valued on that account.

The Secular Society, Limited, office is at 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4.

The National Secular Society's office is at 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4.

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. 4 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. 4.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4, 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.

The details of the course of lectures at South Place Institute have now been arranged, and will be found on the last page of this issue. The first lecture will be on April 29 by Mr. Cohen on "Religion Before and After the War." The other two evenings will be filled by Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Harry Snell. We hope that London Freethinkers will do their best to make these meetings as widely known as possible. We must largely rely upon their efforts—under present conditions—for the success of the meetings. Some conveniently sized advertisements of the three meetings have been printed, and those willing to assist in their distribution would oblige by writing to Miss Vance at the N. S. S. Offices, 62 Farringdon Street, E.C.

We publish this week two pamphlets which, we think, will be found very useful for propagandist purposes. The first is a new and revised edition of Mr. Foote's *Christianity and Progress*, to this has been added a chapter on "Moham-

medanism and the Sword." Together the two make a most effective piece of writing, and those who wish to read our late leader at his best will be able to do so in this pamphlet. Many another writer, fonder of parading his reading than was G. W. Foote, would have made a couple of volumes out of *Christianity and Progress*. But it was not his custom to place all his wares in the front window, and only those conversant with the subject can properly appreciate all that is contained in a page or even a paragraph. There is, indeed, a philosophy of the rise of Christianity in the opening paragraphs, and a complete exposure of Christianity's claim to stand as a force for progress in all that follows. *Mohammedanism and the Sword* now appears in pamphlet form for the first time.

The second pamphlet is a reissue of Mr. Mann's excellent articles on *Christianity and Morality*. Those who read these articles as they appeared will, we are sure, be pleased to have them in a more handy form. The pamphlet will supply Freethinkers with exactly the kind of information needed in their talks with Christians, and few Christians will be able to read it without having their inherited notions on the subject seriously disturbed. Not the least valuable part of the pamphlet is the authorities cited for every statement made. As a guide to reading this will be found of value to many. Each pamphlet is in a neat cover, price twopence, or by post twopence halfpenny.

We hope that our readers will pay special attention to what was said last week on the subject of "returns." It appears to be certain that a decree—we think that is the correct word in these days of democratic dictatorship—will shortly be issued, forbidding the issue of papers on sale or return. This means a diminution of income at a time when every loss in that direction is a serious item. The only way, therefore, for those interested in the *Freethinker* to get it displayed will be for them to either get their newsagent to run the risk of ordering an extra copy or so for display, or themselves guaranteeing the newsagent against loss by taking the extra copy if unsold. And, in any case, we hope that all our readers will make it a point of ordering their copy weekly, and so make sure of getting it.

Birmingham did well in honouring, on Saturday, April 14 the centenary of the birth of George Jacob Holyoake. A very appreciative letter was read from Earl Grey, in which he described Holyoake as the "architect of a great voluntary co-operative commonwealth," and declared that he had "rendered a greater service to our country than all the legislators at Westminster." Doubtless Earl Grey meant well by this expression, but the compliment does not strike us as excessive. Unless Holyoake had done more than our Westminster legislators, his services to the country would not have been nearly so valuable as they were.

Naturally, our truth-speaking press carefully refrained from mentioning that this great worker in the Co-operative Movement was an Atheist. It would never have done to have told the truth in this matter. And it is highly significant that the two men who did so much for working-class education in this country—G. J. Holyoake and Robert Owen, from whom the former derived his inspiration—should both have been Atheists. And, curiously enough, it was religious antagonism that did its best to strangle the Owen Movement, as it has tried to strangle so many social movements since.

The conditions of railway travelling are such this year that it has been found advisable to once more hold the National Secular Society's Whit-Sunday Conference in London. A large Conference can hardly be expected in the circumstances, but we hope that such Branches of the N. S. S. as can send delegates will make a special effort to do so. Those that cannot may be represented through some London member who will be attending the Conference. It is important to note that all resolutions for the Conference Agenda should be sent to the N. S. S. Secretary as early as possible.

At the last meeting of the Executive it was resolved to make a suggestion to the Branches that no additions be made to the list of Vice-Presidents this year. If the present is a period of reconstruction for the Churches, it must be no less so for the N. S. S. And the settling of the Bowman case—we are still awaiting judgment from the House of Lords—can scarcely leave the N. S. S. unaffected, whichever way the judgment goes. A thorough overhauling of the Constitution and the Executive machinery of the N. S. S. may become necessary.

The freedom of the press is a subject that should concern everyone, and we are, therefore, not surprised to find that there is considerable indignation at the War Office prohibition on sending the *Nation* abroad. An embargo on the publication of news that could be of use to the enemy we can all understand and appreciate. An embargo upon a newspaper's opinion of the Government is quite another matter. And for this to be done by the War Office makes the suppression the more unpleasant. It really raises the question of whether the country is governed by the War Office, or the War Office controlled by the nation. And we are at War to prevent the dominance of a military class—in Germany. When Parliament reassembles we have no doubt the question will be raised. We have still the House of Lords. The House of Commons is almost past redemption.

Our Business Manager tells us he would be pleased if those whose subscriptions to the *Freethinker* are due, or overdue, would remit as early as possible. As the information is not of much use to us, personally, we hereby give it as much publicity as is possible.

The French Revolution.

X.

THE AFTERMATH.

(Continued from p. 235.)

THE fall of Robespierre had enabled the Conservative element in the National Convention to recover political power after fourteen months of eclipse and humiliation. Having tolerated the Reign of Terror, and semi-Socialist measures such as the law of "maximum," as long as military necessity left them no safe alternative, they were determined now to withdraw all their concessions, declare war on the Democratic Party, and establish the supremacy of wealth on a firm footing.

The working-class of Paris, who had rejoiced with everyone else over the fall of Robespierre, soon had reason to think the change of masters a questionable one. If Robespierre and the Committees under the "Terror" had been cruel, the Tallien gang now in power were cynically corrupt. The former had threatened a percentage of the people with the guillotine; the latter condemned the whole populace to slow starvation, for the new Government not wishing to continue the policy of taxing the rich, they had expedient to an unlimited issue of paper money, with the result that prices rose to famine pitch. The abolition of the law of "maximum" removed any check on this tendency.

Against the new tyranny the democrats had to contend with weakened and demoralized forces. The main seat of their power, the "sections" or ward-meetings of Paris, which had enabled them to overthrow the throne and later the Girondists, still existed in name, but their powers had been cut down by the short-sighted policy of the late Terrorist Government. The Cordeliers' Club had been suppressed when the Hebertists were guillotined. The municipality had first been reduced to a packed body of Robespierre's adherents, and now that these had been executed with their leader, had practic-

ally ceased to exist. There remained the Jacobins' Club. After the fall of Robespierre, this society became the headquarters of all who still clung to the cause of the Democratic Republic, and the centre of opposition to the "Thermidorian" reaction.

The wealthy, now in power, did not hesitate to organize physical force against the Jacobins. Freron, one of the leading lights of the "Thermidorians," took the lead in this. One of the most odious characters in the Revolution, this man had formerly been an ultra-Democrat and "Montagnard," and had distinguished himself, as a commissioner of the Convention at Toulon in company with Barras, by shooting the captured Royalists in batches, as Collot d'Herbois had done at Lyons. Now, having feathered his nest, Freron transferred his ruffianly activities to the other side, and began to organize the wealthy young men of Paris, armed with loaded sticks, to break up meetings of the Democrats. The "jeunesse doree," as they were called, were reinforced by numbers of Girondists and Royalists, who, released from the prisons, openly paraded their opinions and sought vengeance on the defeated party.

The Democrats now reaped the fruit of their past excesses and follies, particularly of their folly in destroying Danton, their great leader. Led by bankrupt politicians, like the Terrorists, Billaud-Varennes and Collot d'Herbois, they added one tactical blunder to another. The Convention had decreed the arrest and prosecution of Carrier, the perpetrator of the "noyades" at Nantes. The Jacobins must needs defend him and plan his rescue. After a disturbance in Paris, the Convention seized the occasion to suspend the sittings of the Club; and Freron's young men having smashed the premises and bludgeoned the members, the Jacobin organization ceased to exist. Carrier was tried and guillotined.

The Convention now recalled to their seats the seventy-five Girondists who, in October, 1793, had been imprisoned for protesting against the expulsion of their leaders. The reaction now redoubled, not merely against the Terrorists, but against the whole Democratic movement. The busts of Marat were destroyed, and his body turned out of the Pantheon (February, 1795). Soon afterwards the surviving leaders of the Girondists, including Isnard, who had uttered that threat about destroying Paris which had precipitated the fall of his party, were invited back to the Convention. This amounted to a definite repudiation of the policy of May 31, 1793. One or two of the Girondists had become open Royalists during their banishment from public life, and all of them took the lead in accelerating the anti democratic movement. It is to be noted that those who were recalled were the most rancorous and violent of the old Girondist party, who had in former days continually sought to destroy Danton, Marat, and the democratic leaders generally. The milder Girondists, by an irony of fate, had all perished in the Reign of Terror.

The reactionaries now (March, 1795), attacked the ex-members of the Terrorist Government, Billaud-Varenne and Collot d'Herbois, together with Barere and another, and they were called to account before the Convention. Their former colleagues, such as Carnot, defended them to no purpose. On April 1 the working-class of Paris, under the impulse of hunger, invaded the Convention, demanding "bread, the Constitution of 1793, and the liberation of the patriots." The putting in force of the Democratic Constitution was now, in fact, the daily demand of the party. They should, of course, have asked for it a year sooner, before the smash of "Thermidor" had given the reactionaries their chance. The middle-classes and Freron's young men now came

to the rescue of the Convention. Militarism, for the first but not the last time, was summoned to the help of wealth in the person of General Pichegru, who had conquered Holland the preceding autumn. The disturbance was put down, and the ex-Terrorists condemned to transportation to Guiana.

The workers rose again, for the last time in the Revolution, on May 20, 1795. Exasperated by the enormous rise in prices and the insolence of the *jeunesse doree* (who openly jeered at the starvation of the populace, holding up loaves of bread and saying: "This is the deputies' bread, not yours!") the common people marched once again on the Convention armed with pikes and fire-arms, and still demanding "bread and the Constitution of 1793." A deputy named Feraud was shot dead by mistake for the hateful Freron. This time the majority of the Convention fled in panic. The Radical rump, under Romme, remained in the hall, and proceeded to vote everything the people demanded, the armed insurgents beating their drums in elation at every fresh vote. Then, once more, Freron's bands entered and restored order; the mob were turned out at the point of the bayonet; the majority resumed their seats, and declared what had been done null and void. During the following days the Parisian populace remained under arms threatening the Convention; but their organization was broken; the armed middle-classes marched on the working-class quarters and disarmed them; and the revolt was at an end. Romme and five of his colleagues were condemned to the guillotine, Romme and another stabbing themselves dead in court. About sixty other members of the "Mountain" were imprisoned. The Democratic Party was crushed.

In the south of France, meanwhile, the Royalists and other reactionaries were taking the law into their own hands, and avenging wholesale all that they had suffered under the Reign of Terror. A new Reign of Terror, in fact, was instituted against the Republicans. Bands calling themselves "Companies of Jesus," and "Companies of the Sun," went about killing every Democrat they could hunt down. There were prison massacres as horrible as those of September, 1792, but committed by the Royalists this time, and with no pretence of trial or discrimination. Three hundred of the Democratic Party were burnt to death in a shed at Lyons. Commissioners of the Convention, notably Isnard, the returned Girondist, encouraged the well-to-do to hound down and exterminate the defeated Revolutionists. Needless to say, historians who dwell severely enough on the excesses of the "Red Terror" of 1793-4, glaze over and palliate the yet more frightful excesses of the "White Terror" of 1795.

The working-classes of France had given their support to the Revolution, and fought resolutely and desperately for "liberty and equality," under the impression that these words meant the abolition of privilege, and of the subjection of one man to another's will. They now found that the wealthy, for whom, in the first instance, they had risen, meant by "liberty and equality" no more than liberty for themselves to do as they liked with their property, and that elusive sham which we know as "equality before the law." After the crushing of the last Paris insurrection, the Convention dropped the last pretence of wishing to put in force the Democratic Constitution of 1793. A committee of Girondists and men of the "Marsh" was appointed to frame a new Constitution. On their recommendation, universal suffrage was abolished, and the legislative power vested in two Chambers or Councils, elected, by indirect voting, by those only who paid direct taxes. Hardly a voice, now that the "Mountain" was destroyed, was lifted against the abolition of universal suffrage. One of those

who did protest was Thomas Paine. This famous man, imprisoned by the Committee of Public Safety during the "Terror," had recovered his liberty after the fall of Robespierre; but, unlike many victims of the "Terror," he did not allow his experiences to prejudice him against democracy. The most popular argument against continuing universal suffrage was, of course, that it had been responsible for the "Terror"—an argument that came very badly from those who, like the majority of the Convention, had supported the "Terror" in its worst forms, either from mere cowardice, or from a sincere belief in its necessity to the national defence. A more interesting argument, as it anticipates somewhat the economic reasoning of Mr. W. H. Mallock in modern times, was that put forward by one member of the Convention, who said that the manual workers were an idle and unthrifty class, dependent for their living on the men with money and brains, and that, therefore, the latter alone ought to have any voice in the control of the State!

(To be concluded.) ROBERT ARCH.

The Monarch of Cereals.

IV.

(Continued from p. 229.)

IN the cultivation of the cereal plants no return for toil and care of the crops is forthcoming until the year has rolled round. Among all agricultural peoples the harvest was a season of rejoicing, particularly when a bountiful crop rewarded the labours of the country side. In England and other lands the harvest home was a period of revelry, and many were the quaint customs that accompanied the festival right down to recent times. But with the coming of modern machinery and the opening up of new countries for corn culture, the picturesque observances of the past are everywhere disappearing. One ancient feature, however, has been retained. It has long been the habit of the Irish peasant to journey to Britain to work in the harvest fields, and the corn lands of France and Germany were annually visited before the War by thousands of Italians, and the various races of agrarian Austria. Italy also sends shiploads of her people to the grain fields of the Argentine at the time of harvest, and these wanderers return to their native land each season at the conclusion of their task. This migration of labour has grown from more to more in America. June is the maiden month for the wheat harvest in the States, and many of the workers move northwards when the southern crop is garnered and the cereal has ripened in the cooler latitudes. All sorts and conditions of men co-operate in the harvesting of the vast grain areas of the middle West. Dondlinger informs us that a large number of foreigners, notably Scandinavians, are to be numbered among these toilers and that—

he has found the city banker again seeking in the harvest fields during a brief vacation the health and pleasures experienced in younger years; the refined college youth earning the means with which to finish his course in the East; the Western pioneer making a desperate effort to keep the wolf from the door of the shanty that sheltered his family, and to save the homestead by paying the interest on the mortgage which drought and frontier misfortunes had placed upon it; the dreamy-faced wanderer who merely drifts with his environment; and the coarse, hard-featured criminal and ex-convict.

The leading factors in the increased yield per acre experienced in modern years are improved methods of drilling the seed, fertilization, drainage, irrigation,

selection of seed, crop rotation, and superior ploughing and cultivation. From this it follows that extensive farming under which wheat is simply sown and harvested renders smaller returns per acre than intensive cultivation, where every known requirement of the developing cereal receives unremitting attention from seed time to maturity. This distinction is clearly displayed in Australian wheat statistics. Outside Tasmania, the area under wheat in the Australian colonies, increased in most instances considerably during the period 1873-1898. Yet the yield decreased, in some cases, more than one-third:—

During the ninth decade in New South Wales the increase in acreage was slight and the decrease in yield insignificant; but in the next eight years the acreage increased nearly four-fold, while the yield fell off about one-third.

New countries, naturally, lend themselves to extensive agriculture, and France, a long cultivated State, presents the other side of the picture. Good farming in Gaul is providing a more generous return, despite the fact that poorer and poorer soil is being brought under the plough. The average yield on French farms in 1840 was 14.6 bushels per acre; in 1850 it had risen to 15.6. A steady increase in wheat yield is noted in France over a period of nearly seventy years. In Britain, from 1871 to 1898, the wheat area fell over one-third, while the yield increased one-sixth. During these years the wheat fields of France increased one-eleventh, but the crop increased less than one-ninth. The progress of scientific farming in France has been as great as in England, and the reason of the apparent anomaly is suggestive:—

In increasing her acreage France had to utilize lands of lower yield, thus reducing the average yield of all, while the United Kingdom raised the average by just the opposite process, namely, by reducing her acreage in ceasing to sow to wheat those lands of such a low yield as to be unprofitable.

The decline of wheat culture in Britain was due to the fact that corn was imported from the virgin soils of America and elsewhere at a price so small that the home grower could not raise wheat at a profit although our yield is so high.

Considerable uncertainty seems to exist concerning the causes determining the yield of the American wheat crops. The yield varies greatly in the different States. From 1866 to 1886 the average crop was 12.2 bushels per acre, while in the succeeding twenty years it was 13.7 only. Taking the States as a whole the yield is poor compared with that of Britain. The average of England in 1914 reached 32.34 bushels, while that of Scotland in the same year was a splendid crop of 42.31 bushels. According to Columella, the ancient Romans reaped from 19 to 27 bushels of grain per acre, and a very serious decline is shown by the fact that in Christian England from 1200 to 1500 the crop raised averaged a wretched yield of from four to eight bushels only. In Philadelphia, as late as 1791, wheat appears to have averaged below eight bushels per acre. The yield in the same region has more than doubled since that date. The richest American crops are, probably, those of the Pacific north-west. Soil and climate are eminently favourable to the cereal in that area, and bumper crops of sixty or seventy bushels have been grown in exceptional seasons.

Fifty years ago Spain raised so much wheat that she was a large exporter of the cereal to England and elsewhere. She is now an importing country, many million bushels of foreign wheat are at present needed for her people. Most of the wheat-producing nations have, however, increased their crops, but, probably,

not one of them, not even Russia, has maintained the ratio demanded by increase of population. In 1872 Russia was Britain's main source of supply, sending us more than four times as much wheat as she sent us in 1900. Germany and France now need, practically, all their native wheat for home consumption, although, in 1872, they respectively exported to England 910,000 and 660,000 quarters (reckoning a quarter as eight imperial bushels or 480 pounds). Canada, Argentina, and the States are now the chief countries upon which we depend for our grain. In 1872, Argentina exported no wheat to us, but, in 1900, she shipped to England 4,322,000 quarters, while the United States, which, in 1872, exported 2,030,000 quarters only to Britain, sent in 1900 13,561,000 quarters to our shores.

The cultivation of one kind of plant season after season on the same soil exhausts the earth, while weakening the crops and rendering them less resistant to disease. Rotation of crops is, therefore, adopted to overcome these disadvantages, and the modern farmer arranges his sowings in such a way that roots or leguminous plants succeed his corn crops. Various methods are followed in different countries, but they are nothing more than local modifications of the method of alternating roots, peas, beans, clovers, etc., with cereal crops as it is practised in the common four-course rotation—roots, barley, clover, wheat. Under this system the clover is ploughed up in the fall of the year, the nitrogen stored up in the clover roots being retained in the soil for the sustenance of the succeeding cereal crop. In ancient Egypt crops were rotated, and the Romans adopted this scheme. Following the land was also a custom of the Roman agriculturist, a practice still extensively followed. When arable land ceases to yield a fair return it is ploughed and permitted to rest in order to recuperate. The three-field system, so general for centuries in England, was, probably, of Roman origin. This method consisted in raising wheat the first year, barley or oats in the second, while the land lay in fallow for the third. In the eighteenth century, with the introduction of clover and lucerne into England, this wasteful fallow system was avoided by growing these green crops in the season previously sacrificed to fallow.

Pioneer farming in America proved extremely indifferent to the inevitable exhaustion of the soil. The general method was to produce crop after crop until the virgin earth had yielded up its virginity and become incapable of raising fruitful harvests, and then to abandon this exploited soil in favour of pastures new. Vast areas were impoverished in consequence, and science has been compelled to intervene to teach the improvident agriculturist the true system of economy. It has been proved experimentally that plots of land on which wheat is rotated with maize or potatoes return twice the number of bushels as the "best continuous wheat crop," while

Land which produced three crops of wheat and one cultivated crop in a period of four years, gave almost as much wheat and more profitable returns than did the land which produced four crops of wheat in succession.

In the more advanced American States agriculture has now reached a high stage of efficiency, and the prodigal methods of the past are slowly disappearing in all parts of the Republic.

Irrigation is now playing a useful part in corn culture, and its future is brimful of promise. Before the dawn of history its importance was appreciated, and in the evolution of agriculture in the two hemispheres, the English-speaking peoples have utilized irrigation on a very extensive scale. For thousands of years artificial

watering has been practised in Egypt, India, China, and Persia. The old Greeks and Romans employed it, and the latter introduced it into Gaul and Spain. In the Middle Ages the Moors irrigated the Iberian Peninsula and made it the garden of Europe, while in ancient America the Peruvians turned irrigation to useful account. In modern Italy wheat is extensively irrigated, and the system is now in operation in Australia, where immense areas originally covered with scrub are now luxuriant wheat fields, orchards, and orangeries. A fine example of British enterprize is the great Nile dam at Assuan, by means of which millions of acres of wheat are artificially watered. This magnificent dam, designed by Sir W. Willcocks, was completed in 1902:—

It is the largest irrigation dam in existence, and the reservoir has a storage capacity of over thirty billion cubic feet. The largest increase in irrigated area in recent years has been made in British India, where about 30,000,000 acres have been reclaimed or made secure for cultivation.....It is estimated that 80,000,000 acres more can be reclaimed in India.....India has the largest reservoir in the world. It covers an area of 21 square miles, and it was constructed for irrigating in Rajputana. It is known as the great tank of Dhebar.

The importance of irrigation will be vividly realized when we remember that even in our temperate climate it was ascertained by Gilbert and Lawes at Rothamsted that an acre of wheat in five months and eighteen days evaporated through its leaves not less than 335½ tons of moisture.

(To be continued.) T. F. PALMER.

Correspondence.

RELIGION IN THE ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—My communications to the Editor of my favourite paper have been very few—for which, no doubt, he sincerely thanks me. However, as I have been overseas for some time now, serving my country so far as I was allowed, I thought a few words from an Army Freethinker might prove acceptable.

As to my reason for joining the Army, I reply that, although a lover of peace and a great opponent to war, I considered my country was fighting a just cause, and, to a certain extent, in defence of some of my ideals; and therefore I felt it my duty to assist my country. Even looking on the War as two evils, I feel sure I am assisting the lesser. Anyhow, my conscience told me I ought to do something to help, and I did.

It is chiefly my career as a Freethinker in the Army I wish to write about. So to start at the beginning. As a civilian, I was a law clerk, and at the call for men I volunteered, but for a long time was unsuccessful. I was told I was of no use to the military. As the call for men became more and more insistent, I tried again and again, and was eventually accepted as an Army clerk. I passed the test, signed all the papers, and everything went well until I came before the Recruiting Officer to be sworn in. He listened to my request for Affirmation without understanding. On my going into details and explaining the matter, and informing him I was entitled to affirm, and stating my ground, viz., "That I had no religious belief," the poor man seemed overcome. He expressed regret that one so young as I did not understand the Bible, which told how the world began, etc. To this I gently replied I had not come for a discussion on the merits or demerits of the Bible, but might mention for his information and enlightenment it was through understanding the Bible that I had become irreligious. Owing to his ignorance on the subject, I had to instruct him how an Affirmation should be taken; and ultimately, with sighs for the welfare of my soul, etc., he got the job over. I must say, to his credit, he afterwards shook hands, and admitted he did not think my lack of religion would interfere with my becoming an efficient soldier.

My next passage of arms occurred when I fell ill in a camp in England, and reported "Sick." The "sick sergeant" asked for particulars of service, etc., and everything went well until he asked, "Religion?" To this my answer was, "None." "What?" he said, "what do you mean?" I replied, "I mean what I say." "Ridiculous," he replied; "you must have a religion in the Army." "I am afraid I shall have to be discharged," I answered, "as I have no religion either in the Army or out of it." "Oh, all right," he replied; "I'll put you down C. of E." I immediately told him that he would do no such thing, and requested to be taken before my C.O.; whereupon he unwillingly did as I insisted.

I have had the same trouble several times both at home and abroad; but by remaining firm, I have always got my way. I have been surprised, when mixing with my comrades, to find a fair number of them little less than Atheists, although they hid their views officially. I spoke to some of these earnestly on the subject, with the result that several promised to bring their lack of religion up on the next opportunity. I showed them it was this "silent consent" among Atheists which makes it so hard for them to get their rights. Why they should be afraid I don't know, as they are amply covered both by Act of Parliament and by Army Council Instructions.

In my opinion, a soldier has more opportunity to parade his Freethought than a civilian. For instance, a civilian is liable to social ostracism, and even loss of livelihood. There is no chance of a soldier losing his job through lack of religion, else, I am thinking, the Army would soon be considerably reduced. Therefore, I have often argued with these silent Freethinkers, and have received promises of action. I, personally, know soldiers who receive their *Freethinker* regularly, and yet permit themselves to be religiously classified as "C. of E." This should stop, and I think a note from you in the paper, together with a few words of advice, would do a lot towards bringing them out.

As a soldier, I think I am entitled to express an opinion as to religion in the Army generally. On paper, the British Army is very religious (and this may excuse the singing of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," etc.), almost every man being classified under one denomination or other. But from my own observation and experience, religion, even among the Christians themselves, is a back number. The greater the number of Christians, the greater the hypocrisy. In my opinion, all except the most bigoted are doubting Thomases as to their Creator's love.

I sincerely hope that all freethinking bodies, both in England and abroad, will not lag in their efforts to keep Freethought well alive; then, when the "boys" come home, I shall be surprised if the Churches do not get a bigger rebuff than they have ever experienced.

I could go on folios and folios; but I am afraid you will be getting exhausted, so I will close.

Wishing the *Freethinker* and all concerned therewith every success, and hoping soon to be once more in a position to hear some of those lectures I so much miss.

Khartoum, Soudan.

ARTHUR CHAPMAN.

ATHEISM IN THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. H. George Farmer criticizes my estimate of Hebert. I am grateful for his criticism, and may say at once that I shall be very glad if he can prove me wrong; for, being an Atheist myself, I do not like running down an Atheist, even when, as it seems to me, the facts compel me.

On one point, and one alone, Mr. Farmer "has" me. I have not seen an entire copy of the *Pere Duchesne*. It is not easy to see a copy of a periodical 123 years defunct, and I have had no time or opportunity to go to Paris and delve in the museums. If Mr. Farmer can put me in the way of inspecting a copy, either in the original or in the pages of an historian, I shall be obliged for his courtesy. As it is, I depend for my first-hand acquaintance with the *Pere Duchesne* on a few paragraphs culled from it by M. Aulard in his *Political History* of the Revolution. I must refer Mr. Farmer to this work, in the original French, and will only add that

if the *Freethinker* habitually employed the English equivalents of some of the phrases customary with Hebert, it would be prosecuted by the police as an obscene publication.

Apart from these quotations, I am, of course, dependent on historians; but I claim at least to have been discriminating in using them. I have said nothing as to the story of Hebert's having been dismissed from a situation for dishonesty before the Revolution, since I have preferred to suspend judgment on it, though I have seen no refutation of it in Aulard, Kropotkin, or any other pro-Revolutionary historian whom I have read. I have also refrained from making the usual capital out of the charge brought by Hebert against Marie-Antoinette at her trial, since he seems to have had evidence to support it.

But the main count against Hebert is, in my opinion, that at the crisis of the Revolution, when the Democracy of France had to choose between the right and the wrong road, he threw his influence violently into the wrong scale. I have pointed out that in November, 1793, the Government of France was fast becoming a savage tyranny, which punished not only acts, but even opinions, with death. Every enlightened man ought to have sought, as Danton did, to arrest this tendency. Hebert, on the contrary, sought to quicken it. An "easy-going man.....too little in sympathy with the people to understand and to express the popular aspirations" (Kropotkin, *The Great French Revolution*, p. 501) Hebert went so far as to speak of an "itinerant guillotine" (p. 512); "to terrorise the enemies of the Revolution and to have the Government seized by his party seemed to him far more important than to solve the questions of food, the land, and organized labour" (p. 534); and his main anxiety seems to have been to get sixty-one Girondists guillotined whom the Government chose to spare (pp. 544-5). I am afraid that not even the most brilliant advocacy of Atheism would make such a man other than a "white elephant" to any cause he espoused.

That is the case against Hebert. I wait for Mr. H. George Farmer, counsel for the defence.

ROBERT ARCH.

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.

MR. A. D. HOWELL SMITH'S DISCUSSION CLASS (N. S. S. Office, 62 Farringdon Street): Wednesday April 25, instead of Thursday, at 7.30.

OUTDOOR.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station): 7, Mr. Miller, a Lecture.

HYDE PARK: 11.30, Messrs. Saphin and Shaller; 3.15, Messrs. Dales and Kells; 6.30, Messrs. Hyatt and Yates.

ENGLISH EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS, by Wilkins and Fallows; price 6d.—WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, 14 Red Lion Square, London, W.C.

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. *Christianity a Stupendous Failure*, J. T. Lloyd; 2. *Bible and Teetotalism*, J. M. Wheeler; 3. *Principles of Secularism*, C. Watts; 4. *Where Are Your Hospitals?* R. Ingersoll; 5. *Because the Bible Tells Me So*, W. P. Ball; 6. *Why Be Good?* G. W. Foote. *The Parson's Creed*. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 9d. per hundred, post free 1s. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 62 Farringdon Street, E.C. 4.



LATEST N. S. S. BADGE.—A single Pansy flower, size as shown; artistic and neat design in enamel and silver; permanent in colour; has been the means of making many pleasant introductions. Brooch or Stud fastening, 9d. post free.—From Miss E. M. VANCE, General Secretary, N. S. S., 62 Farringdon St., E.C. 4.

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 ½d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C. 4.

Prayer: Its Origin, History, and Futility.

BY

J. T. LLOYD.

Price TWOPENCE.

(Postage ½d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C. 4.

War and Civilization.

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price ONE PENNY.

(Postage ½d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C. 4.

Religion and the Child.

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price ONE PENNY.

(Postage ½d.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C. 4.

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.

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.

This is the Third and Revised Edition, 1907, of the Standard and Authoritative Work on Sacerdotal Celibacy. Since its issue in 1867 it has held the first place in the literature of the subject, nor is it likely to lose that position.

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

An Elementary Treatise on a Realistic Religion and Philosophy of Human Life.

By E. A. ASHCROFT.

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

Mr. Ashcroft writes from the point of view of a convinced Freethinker, and deals with the question of Man and the Universe in a thoroughly suggestive manner.

NATURAL AND SOCIAL MORALS.

By CARVETH READ.

Professor of Philosophy in the University of London.

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

A Fine Exposition of Morals from the standpoint of a Rationalistic Naturalism.

PHASES OF EVOLUTION AND HEREDITY.

By D. B. HART, M.D.

Crown 8vo. 1910. Published at 5s. Price 1s. 6d., postage 4d.

An Examination of Evolution as affecting Heredity, Disease, Sex, Religion, etc. With Notes, Glossary, and Index.

THREE ESSAYS ON RELIGION.

By J. S. MILL.

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

There is no need to praise Mill's Essays on Nature, The Utility of Religion, and Theism. The work has become a Classic in the History of Freethought. No greater attack on the morality of nature and the God of natural theology has ever been made than in this work.

Recent Acquisitions.**WILLIAM HONE: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.**

By F. W. HACKWOOD.

Large 8vo. With numerous Plates. Published 10s. 6d. net. Price 3s., postage 5d.

William Hone was one of the group of Radical Reformers who played so conspicuous a part in the battle for free speech and a free press in the early part of the nineteenth century. The accounts of his trial before Mr. Justice Abbott and Lord Ellenborough for publishing parodies of the Athanasian Creed and the Lord's Prayer are of interest to all Freethinkers.

THE ENGLISH WOMAN: STUDIES IN HER PSYCHIC EVOLUTION.

By D. STAARS.

Published 9s. net. Price 2s. 6d., postage 5d.

An Evolutionary and Historic Essay on Woman. With Biographical Sketches of Harriet Martineau, George Eliot, and others.

By THE HON. A. S. G. CANNING.

INTOLERANCE AMONG CHRISTIANS.

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

RELIGIOUS STRIFE IN BRITISH HISTORY.

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

THE POLITICAL PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.

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

The Three Volumes post free for 5s.

THE CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT OF ANIMALS.

By E. P. EVANS.

A Careful Study of one of the most curious of Mediæval Superstitious Practices. There is an Appendix of Documents which adds considerably to the value of the work.

Published 1906. With Frontispiece.

384 pp. Published 7s. 6d. Price 2s., postage 5d.

DETERMINISM OR FREE WILL?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.

CONTENTS.

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

Cloth, 1s. 9d., postage 3d.

By THE SAME AUTHOR.

SOCIALISM, ATHEISM, AND CHRISTIANITY.

Price 1d., postage ½d.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ETHICS.

Price 1d., postage ½d.

A BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF FREE-THINKERS.

By J. M. WHEELER.

Price 3s. net, 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.

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, E.C. 4.

Two New Pamphlets.

Christianity and Progress.

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

Revised Edition, with a New Chapter on "Mohammedanism and the Sword."

A complete and crushing reply to the claim that Christianity has aided the progress of civilization.

Price Twopence. Postage $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4.

Pagan and Christian Morality.

BY

WALTER MANN.

The truth about the alleged originality and value of Christian teaching on the subject of morals. With a useful list of authorities.

Price Twopence. Postage $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4.

Special Sunday Evening Lectures

(Under the Auspices of the National Secular Society)

AT

SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE,

SOUTH PLACE, MOORGATE STREET, E.C. (within five minutes' of Liverpool Street.)

April 29, MR. CHAPMAN COHEN.

"Religion Before and After the War."

May 6, MR. J. T. LLOYD.

"Humanism versus Christianity."

May 13, MR. HARRY SNELL.

"The Faith-Healing Imposture."

Admission Free. Collection. Doors open at 6.30 p.m.

Chair taken at 7 p.m.