

The

FREETHINKER

FOUNDED • 1881

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

VOL. XXXVII.—No. 27.

SUNDAY, JULY 8, 1917

PRICE TWOPENCE

CONTENTS.

	Page.
<i>Baby Week.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	417
<i>The Reformation in England.—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - - - -	418
<i>A Doubting Dean.—Mimmermus</i> - - - - -	420
<i>The Sense Organs of Man.—T. F. Palmer</i> - - - - -	421
<i>The Cairn.—Andrew Millar</i> - - - - -	422
<i>Acid Drops</i> - - - - -	423
<i>Our Great Push</i> - - - - -	424
<i>To Correspondents</i> - - - - -	425
<i>Sugar Plums</i> - - - - -	425
<i>Religion and the French Revolution.—Harold W. Edwards</i>	426
<i>Anthropomorphism and Science.—Criticus</i> - - - - -	427
<i>Letters to the Editor—Religion in the Army, 428; Pros-</i>	
<i>pects of Revolution, 428; Spiritualism and Science,</i>	
<i>428; Reprisals</i> - - - - -	428
<i>Obituary</i> - - - - -	429
<i>L.C.C. Prosecution</i> - - - - -	429
<i>Scenes and Portraits.—Frederick Manning</i> - - - - -	430

Views and Opinions.

Baby Week.
 Last Sunday numerous sermons were preached in connection with "Baby Week." Attention has been directed to preventible infant mortality, and it is one of the ironies of life that the War, with its wholesale destruction of life, should be the occasion for the campaign. It is pointed out that if France had had a larger birth-rate, it would have had a larger army against Germany. If our birth-rate can be increased, we also shall be in a better position for future conflicts. The ideal is not a lofty one, nor is the inference unquestionable. To breed children for the purpose of supplying armies may cause some to reflect whether it is worth while breeding children at all. And some may hold the opinion that it is quality of population, not numbers, that is of importance. Mere numbers may create problems, but numbers will never solve them. It is, said Ruskin, of no vital consequence whatever whether a man has two children or four children, but it is of great consequence whether the children he does have deserve to be hanged or not. And in that saying we cordially concur.

* * *

Reprisals.
 Quite in accordance with their usual policy, the Churches have tried to convert this question into a Christian one. Father Vaughan and the Bishop of London have, as usual, been very busy, and have dwelt at length on the getting of babies, the rearing of babies, and the care of children generally. And their activity invites reprisals. For there is a sense in which the question of the care of children, particularly the prevention of their neglect and ill-treatment, is a peculiarly Christian one. That is, it reaches its most acute phase in Christian countries. Neglect or ill-treatment of children is seldom heard of amongst Jews; it is practically unknown amongst uncivilized peoples. We do not recall having read of it as existing in any great degree amongst Mohammedans. Japan is said to be a paradise for children. Among the Esquimaux, Nansen said that

he never saw or heard of a case of child neglect or ill-usage, and they seemed unable to appreciate why a child should ever be beaten. If a campaign for the protection of child-life is in any sense a Christian one, it can only be on the principle that a movement for cheap baths is one that peculiarly concerns dirty people.

* * *

Justice for God.
 One expression used in connection with children suffering from neglect was striking and suggestive. They were said to be "God's children." Now, on that point we should like to keep a perfectly open mind. We do not say they are not God's children; but if they are not, then it strikes us as a gross libel on Deity. If they are his children, then their state is a grave impeachment of his fatherhood. We are certain that no man would like it said of him that his children were running about the streets in a sadly neglected condition. He would not like it made public were it true; he would be indignant were it false. And we do not observe that evidence is offered that these neglected one's are God's children. All these people do is to collect a number of half-starved and neglected children, and say they are God's. Why? do they insist that they bear in their neglect the hallmark of God's paternity? It seems hardly fair to God. Mark Twain said that in all the attacks on the Devil we never get his side of the case, and he would much like to hear Satan in his own defence. One feels like that with regard to God. We hear nothing from him; and one would like to hear what he has to say of these people who, whenever there is an earthquake, or a war, or an epidemic, put it down to God. As an Atheist, we ask for justice—even for God.

* * *

God and Man.
 Now, we do not say that these neglected ones are God's children. We are trying to be impartial. All the parents we know are men and women. When they look after their children we say they are good parents. When they neglect them we say they are bad ones. And if the parents abscond, and the care of the children is left to others, we do not find the runaways praised or worshipped. What we find is a small handbill stuck up outside the police station asking for information as to where they have gone, so that they may be pursued and punished. And we really do not see how we are justified in judging God's treatment of his children by any different standard. It is not fair, it is grossly partial to punish a man for neglecting his children, and to praise God when he neglects his. Let us be fair to God, but let us also be fair to man. Or, if we haven't the courage to condemn, do not let us be cowardly enough to praise. Of course, it is not we who say we are God's children. It is Christians who say so. All we contend is that if it be so, it is the primary duty of a parent to stick to his family. And that is in accord with both law and common sense.

* * *

God's Work!
 Father Vaughan will tell us that as God's children we are called upon to help him in his work of setting

the world right. But what is God's work? And why should we do it for him, or even help *him* to do it? It seems to us that, on the whole, God does his work in such a way that it takes man no small part of his time to undo it, or to correct it. On any theological reading of the universe it is God who sends diseases, and man who discovers remedies for them. And how many generations are scourged with these diseases before a remedy is found for them? And, note, that man does not have to discover the diseases; they discover him. They are there ready to operate, part and parcel of God's scheme of creation. Nor are the remedies thus ready to hand. These have to be sought out by laborious, painful, sometimes dangerous methods. It took less than forty years for that hideous complaint, syphilis, to spread from one end of Christendom to the other. It has taken four centuries for man to discover a more or less uncertain remedy.

* * *

Man versus God.

God's work! The best phases of life is not God's work, but man's. God did not leave the world habitable by a civilized being; it was man who made it so. God spreads a river over a countryside and leaves a morass. Man deepens the channel, raises an embankment, drains the land, and so creates the possibilities of development. God leaves man ignorant, and human inquisitiveness gives him knowledge. God leaves man a savage, and human association civilizes. God leaves man the prey of brutal passions; men teach each other how to restrain them, and how to transmute them to worthy ends. And all the time, God—if there be one—is dogging his footsteps, providing a new disease for every change in life, punishing every false step with unfaltering cruelty, afflicting old and young, strong and weak, good and bad with impartial malignancy. Man's only protection against Deity is knowledge; and of all the trees in the Garden of Eden, the tree of knowledge was the one of which he was sternly forbidden to eat.

* * *

Helping God.

God's children! God's work! Helping God! How many and how varied are the brain-benumbing phrases with which religion perpetuates its rule! But the last one contains a helpful and suggestive truth. For man is always helping God, not in his work, but to exist. We see God's blunders, correct them, and then praise his wisdom for making them. Anthropologists enlighten us as to his origin and ancestry, and man straightway invents something of a more reputable character. When the doings of God are made plain, a whole army of apologists help to whitewash him. Of course, it is the duty of children to help their aged parents, and one wonders if that is what Christians have in view when they talk about helping God? We should not be surprised. For God does grow hopeless as mankind reaches maturity. The measure of God's strength is the measure of human weakness. God and man cannot both grow at the same time. As one rises the other falls; and a little less readiness to help God might easily result in there soon being nothing to assist.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

The Reformation in England.

II.

THE most damning of all evidences against the truth of the Christian religion is the evidence so abundantly furnished by its own history in all its periods. Gibbon mentions as one of five causes of its growth "the pure and austere morals" of its early professors; but it can

be conclusively proved from ancient Christian documents that those morals were much more austere than pure. Not even during the first three centuries did the Christians display qualities, or perform deeds, which justified the deduction that they were living under supernatural direction and control. We know from Eusebius and other primitive writers that it was customary to magnify their virtues and minimize, or utterly ignore, their defects. Their own claim has always been and is, not only that they possess the only true religion, not merely that the Christian code of morality is infinitely superior to all other codes, but that they are God's own people, the redeemed of the Lord, whom he fills and leads with his own Spirit; and our contention is that at no period has that claim been verified, but that in all ages and countries alike it has been completely falsified in their actual life and character. Besides, it is historically indisputable, not simply that Christians are not socially and morally superior to their non-Christian neighbours, but that their very religion, or their professed zeal for the Lord's cause, has often given rise to, or served as a cloak for, the most selfish, unjust, and tyrannical conduct on record. History makes it perfectly clear that this was peculiarly the case in connection with the Reformation in England during the whole of the sixteenth century. Of the piety of Henry VIII. and Bloody Mary no reasonable doubt can be entertained. Both verily believed that God had called them to be England's rulers. The following was Henry's Confession of Faith as a monarch:—

By Scripture it appeareth that it appertaineth unto the office of princes to see that right religion and true doctrine be maintained and taught, and that their subjects may be well ruled and governed by good and just laws; and to provide and care for them that all things necessary for them may be plentiful; and that the people and commonweal may increase; and to defend them from oppression and invasion, as well within the realm as without; and to see that justice be administered unto them indifferently; and to hear benignly all their complaints; and to show towards them, although they offend, fatherly pity. And, finally, so to correct them that be evil, that they had yet rather save them than lose them if it were not for respect of justice, and maintenance of peace and good order in the commonweal (Froude's *Henry the Eighth*, vol. i., pp. 109, 110).

That Confession of Royal Faith was set forth by Royal authority in 1536, when Henry had occupied the throne for seven and twenty years. At first he was immensely popular, and for some years he was almost an ideal king, as well as a model husband and friend. The masses idolized him, foreign ambassadors were never weary of singing his praises, and everybody was convinced that he possessed exceptional physical and mental qualifications for the efficient discharge of his kingly office. Froude says that for nearly twenty years, "as a ruler, he had been eminently popular. All his wars had been successful. He had the splendid tastes in which the English people most delighted, and he had substantially acted out his own theory" (*Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 109).

Let us now attend to a few tragically illuminating dates and doings. Henry succeeded his father in his eighteenth year, and in the same year, in conformity to his father's will and the wish of his ministers, he married Catherine of Arragon, his senior by six years. For fifteen years, to a certainty, this union was apparently a happy one, and the king took an active part in all the affairs of the nation. He was an all-round man of the world; a profound theologian, by no means a commonplace statesman, an eager sportsman, a devotee of the New Learning, always affable and free, especially with strangers. If his marriage had continued a success, it is possible that he would have been less of a despot than he actually became. He grew tired of Catherine,

however, as the years rolled by. Whether he ever really loved her or not, her failure to bear him an heir, her natural unattractiveness, and her seniority, alienated him from her. Besides, even if she had given birth to thoroughly healthy children, their legitimacy would have been open to grave doubts, because of the strong suspicion that marriage with a sister-in law was not lawful. On these accounts, it seems that in 1524 he ceased to share his wife's bed, and in 1527 his demand for a divorce was formally laid before the Pope. It should be borne in mind that Catherine was the aunt of the Emperor Charles V., who naturally opposed such a request, and that in consequence his Holiness dilly-dallied with the subject, seeking safety in delay. Clement's dilatoriness irritated Henry so much that in 1529 he called a Parliament which he knew would support his policy to the utmost, the members being nearly all his own nominees, prepared to sink their own judgment in deference to his. As Gardiner says, "when Parliament met in 1529 it contained a packed House of Commons ready to do the king's bidding." By this time the king fancied he was passionately in love with Anne Boleyn; and Cardinal Pole, in a treatise published at Rome in the winter of 1538-9, accuses him, "among other enormities, of having lived in criminal intercourse with" Anne's younger sister. Whether this charge was true or not we have no means of ascertaining, the only thing we are absolutely sure of being that, for various reasons, he was determined to get rid of his wife, and that, in order to achieve that end, this Parliament was entrusted with the task of freeing the English Church from the Pope's jurisdiction. Henry displayed consummate shrewdness and sagacity in the conduct of this affair. He saw to it that the nation was at his back, and with wonderful ingenuity he obtained the nation's approval of point after point until, by the year 1535, the authority of Rome in England was a thing of the past, and Henry had become the sole Head of the English Church.

Such was the first stage in the English Reformation, and the only purpose it was intended to serve was the securing of the king's much-coveted divorce. Convocation was forced to sign a document which bound it neither to meet nor transact any business without the king's authority. Thus the whole clergy became the mere tools of the Crown. Refusal to accept the Supremacy Act was punishable by death. For this crime Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher, two of the best and noblest men who ever lived, were beheaded. More retained his sense of humour to the end, for when the fatal blow was about to descend, he carefully removed his beard from the block, saying ironically, "Pity that should be cut, that has never committed treason." Christian apologists often refer to the Reign of Terror under Robespierre during the French Revolution, ignorantly exclaiming, "Behold a sample of the state of things which would prevail if Infidels and Atheists had the power." But during the last seventeen years of the believing Henry's reign there was an unbroken Reign of Terror in England. The least suspicion of disloyalty to the Acts of Supremacy and Succession, the remotest sign of theological heresy, or departure from orthodoxy, even though not a word was spoken, served as an excuse for the worst form of execution. At first it was the Protestants who were persecuted and slaughtered. If a man doubted or denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he was sent to the flames. Whoever spoke against the sufficiency of communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, the perpetual obligation of vows of chastity, private masses, and auricular confession was sentenced to imprisonment and confiscation of his goods for the first offence, and to the gallows for the second. The statute of the Six Articles was the quintessence of injustice and cruelty. Later on

it was the Protestants who persecuted, and they soon became past masters in the art. They broke into churches, and tore down wonder-working crucifixes and burned them in the fields. Green says:—

The miraculous rood at Boxley, which bowed its head and stirred its eyes, was paraded from market to market and exhibited as a juggler before the Court. Images of the Virgin were stripped of their costly vestments and sent to be publicly burnt at London. Latimer forwarded to the capital the figure of our Lady which he had thrust out of his cathedral church at Worcester, with rough words of scorn: She with her old sister of Walsingham, her younger sister of Ipswich, and her two other sisters of Doncaster and Penrice, would make a jolly muster at Smithfield. Fresh orders were given to fling all relics from their reliquaries, and to level every shrine with the ground (*Short History*, pp. 354-5).

Ere long a reaction set in, and once more the persecutors became the persecuted. "Anne Ascue was tortured and burnt with three companions for the denial of Transubstantiation," and the Protestants generally were very cruelly treated. In 1547 Henry VIII. died, and was succeeded by his son, Edward VI., whose reign lasted only six years, during which revolutionary period the Protestants were in power. The whole country rang with vehement invectives against all Catholic doctrines, and rivers of Catholic blood were flowing in all directions. The Statute of Heresy was repealed, and left to the mercy of the Common Law the adherents of the Catholic Faith were sent to the stake without a moment's hesitation. In 1553 Mary became Queen, and during her reign of five years the Catholics were supreme, while the Protestants were committed in batches to the flames. Five bishops were burnt. In less than four years some three hundred persons perished at the stake. In 1558 Elizabeth came to the throne, and during her reign of forty-four years England became, "as a nation, as a power, essentially Protestant," which it has continued to be to this day. Under Elizabeth persecution descended to the lowest depth of brutality. Bishop Bilson, in his *Christian Subjection*, defended the coercive enactments on the plea that toleration was absolutely sinful. Catholics were sinners doomed to die, and a Christian queen might neither pardon nor wink at their falsehood. As Lecky well says, "there is much truth as well as bitter eloquence in the taunt of an old persecuted Puritan, when he denounced Anglicanism as 'the Church that is planted in the blood of her mother.'"

Are we not fully justified, then, in our contention that Christianity dehumanizes its professors in proportion to the intensity of their belief in it? Both Catholicism and Protestantism, throughout their history, have been equally anti social and anti human, and they provide the most cogent and conclusive argument conceivable for Atheism. With the history of the Church in mind, it is absolutely impossible for thoughtful people to believe in the existence of a God of justice and love. It is simply because Christianity is gradually passing away that toleration is at last gaining ground. It is an incontrovertible fact that Supernaturalism and Humanism cannot exist and prosper together, the one being of necessity bound to crush the other.

J. T. LLOYD.

Two Antwerp priests have been condemned to five years' hard labour. This is a severe sentence for men accustomed to work one day weekly.

The endowment of superstition is by no means a thing of the past. The late Mr. W. C. Buckley, of Longsight, Manchester, has left the bulk of his estate of £178,000 to the Church of England. The poor bishops will soon be dreaming of a war bonus.

A Doubting Dean.

This mystery of vending spiritual gifts is nothing but a trade.—*Swift*.

Is not religion a cloak?—*Swift*.

Not a fantastical fool of them all shall flout me out of my calling.—*Shakespeare*.

Swift is Rabelais in his good sense.—*Voltaire*.

THE Christian Church has contained in its fold many great men. Some of them were sincere believers in the doctrines they preached. Others were Christians from force of circumstances, or held to the doctrines for the material gain which has ever been no inconsiderable bait with which to catch men. To which class did Jonathan Swift belong? Was this great genius a sincere Christian, or was he merely a professing believer for the sake of the position he hoped to gain? Would he have remained a Christian had actual deaneries and possible bishoprics with their emoluments had no existence? Should we have found him among the Scotch Covenanters on the field of battle, or in the arena with the lions at Rome, had his birth placed him in different circumstances?

His biographers, Scott, Johnson, and Thackeray, all describe Swift as religious, and the general opinion agrees with them. One hesitates to enter the lists against such eminent writers, but a candid opinion compels us to say that we believe that Swift was a Christian only in name; that he remained in the Church for the same reason that prompted Judas, in the legendary story, to sell his Master. In fact, Swift was not merely a Christian; he was devoid of religious feeling, and he was one of the most irreligious of men. Compared to him, Paine and Voltaire were saints, for these great Freethinkers had at heart that enthusiasm for humanity, that love of their kind, which was entirely absent in Swift. The author of *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Tale of a Tub* was intellectually incapable of being a Christian, and emotionally incapable of loving his fellow men. *The Tale of a Tub* is one of the most tremendous indictments of Christianity, from the purely intellectual side, that has ever been given to the world. *Gulliver's Travels* expresses such a scorn of the human race, with its Lilliputian bitterness and its Brobdignagian coarseness, that its writer was physically and constitutionally incapable of sympathizing with a religion which claims to be a gospel of love.

Voltaire, a most excellent judge, regarded *The Tale of a Tub* as casting ridicule on all forms of the Christian faith. The man who wrote that book was perfectly aware of the logical inferences of his propositions. The bishops who advised Queen Anne, when they counselled her not to appoint Dean Swift to a bishopric, were not without sagacity. There can be no doubt that Queen Anne and Voltaire were both right when, from their very different points of view, they regarded Swift's literary work as anti-Christian.

Swift was irreligious, and a life long dissembler. He could be coarser than Rabelais, and profaner than Voltaire. Men have been convicted and sentenced to death for treating sacred subjects less offensively than Swift treats the Holy Communion. Consider the facts of his life. He was brought up in the household of the epicurean Sir William Temple, and educated in the library of an avowed Freethinker. Why Swift took holy orders, except for the loaves and fishes, it is difficult to say. He put the cassock on for a living, but he was choked by its bands. Swift was the boon companion of Pope, and a friend of the freethinking Bolingbroke. He deliberately chose these sceptics as the closest friends of his life, and the recipients of his confidence and affection. It is not difficult to imagine him joining in many a profane

argument and blasphemous joke over Pope's port, or Bolingbroke's burgundy. It is significant, nay, almost conclusive, as to the insincerity of Swift's religion, that he advised John Gay, the wildest of the wits about town, to turn parson and look out for a seat on the bench.

The paper Swift left behind him, *Thoughts on Religion*, is merely a set of excuses for not professing disbelief. He says of his sermons, quite truthfully, that he preached pamphlets. They have no special Christian characteristics, and might have been preached from the steps of a Mohammedan mosque as well as from the pulpit of a Christian church. There is no cant, for Swift was too great and proud for that cowardly and sorry device. Tried even by the low standard of the eighteenth century, his sermons are singularly secular. The following amusing passage from Swift's sermon on the fate of Eutychus, who fell out of a window whilst listening to St. Paul preaching, will illustrate our meaning:—

The accident which happened to this young man in the text hath not been sufficient to discourage his successors; but because the preachers now in the world, however they may exceed St. Paul in the art of setting men to sleep, do extremely fall short of him in the working of miracles; therefore men are become so cautious as to choose more safe and convenient stations and postures for taking their repose without hazard of their persons, and, upon the whole matter, choose rather to entrust their destruction to a miracle than their safety.

But, perhaps, the surest indication of Swift's real irreligion is given in the striking verses on the Day of Judgment, which were not published till after his death. They were sent by Lord Chesterfield in a letter to Voltaire; but everybody now knows the biting lines:—

Ye who in divers sects were shammed,
And came to see each other damned
(For so folk told you; but they knew
No more of Jove's designs than you),
The world's mad business now is o'er,
And Jove resents such pranks no more.
I to such blockheads set my wit!
I damn such fools! Go, go; you're bit.

The eye which can perceive sincere religion in these caustic and vigorous lines would regard old Montaigne as a Methodist, and Rabelais as a Roman Catholic.

It is, of course, true that in ecclesiastical and theological controversy Swift always took the orthodox side, for outwardly he was loyal enough to his employers. For the Deists of his time, such as Toland, Asgill, and Collins, he expressed contempt. He refers to "that quality of their voluminous writings which the poverty of the English language compels me to call their style." In his famous and sinister argument upon the inconveniences which would result from the total abolition of the Christian religion, he drenches his opponents with vitriol. But it is all purely dialectic fencing. Swift's polemic was aimed at guarding the material prosperity of the Church, of which he was a paid official; just as a counsel will argue for whichever side pays him his retaining fee. If Swift's sword was sharp, it was a double-edged weapon, as may be seen by the sardonic climax:—

To conclude: whatever some may think of the great advantage to trade by this favourite scheme, I do very much apprehend that in six months after the Act is passed for the extirpation of the Gospel, the Bank and East India stock may fall at least one per cent. And since that is fifty times more than ever the wisdom of our age thought fit to venture for the preservation of Christianity, there is no reason why we should be at so great a loss for the sake of destroying it.

When face to face with death, Swift let the mask slip from his features, and we see for a brief moment the real man. When he wrote his own epitaph, he disdained any religious allusion. A pillar of the Church, he refused to

permit any pietistic platitudes upon his tombstone. A dignified worldliness, an appeal to the memory of his fellow-men, but not a syllable of God or Christ:—

Here lies the body of Jonathan Swift, Doctor of Divinity, Dean of this Cathedral Church, where fierce rage can tear the heart no more. Go, traveller, and imitate, if you can, an earnest, manly champion of freedom.

The original is in Latin, and the dates were the only additions. His allusion to his fight for freedom is genuine, for he fought for the liberty of Ireland.

Rabelais and Renan, both great sceptics, left the Church, and chose the road to mental freedom. Swift stayed in the Church, and failed in his ambition. In spite of a life-long servitude, Swift was a disappointed man. He had to be content with a petty deanery, when his ambition was at least a bishopric. The fierce rage, of which he wrote as lacerating his heart, was intensified by loss of preferment. He had prostituted his great and splendid genius. After all his dissembling he died, to quote his own painful words, "like a poisoned rat in a hole."

MIMNERMUS.

The Sense Organs of Man.

II.

(Continued from p. 411.)

THE sense of taste is situated in the mucous membrane which mantles the tongue and the back part of the palate. This is a curiously deceptive sense, for many of the supposed tastes are in reality complex sensations into which touch, smell, and the temperature sense are apt to enter. Salt, sugar, quinine, and various acid substances possess no appreciable smell, and these materials—the salt, sweet, bitter, and acid substances—we, unquestionably, taste. But, as Professor Haycraft reminds us, "Meat, wines, and fruit are smelt not tasted, and a bad cold dulls our appreciation of these articles of diet." If the nasal apertures are carefully closed, or if the sense of smell is defective, many substances ordinarily palatable become "tasteless." A mild onion tasted with closed eyes may be mistaken for an apple. This also explains the reason why invalids very frequently screw up their noses when swallowing a nauseous draught. It is urged that such "tastes" as depend upon smell should be referred to as "flavours" as they are entirely due to the odoriferous particles discharged by the substances in question. The true sense of taste varies in sensibility on different parts of the tongue's surface. The tip of the tongue is most sensitive to sugary substances, the sides are most affected by acids, while the back of the tongue best responds to bitter tastes.

A higher sense is that of smell, and its mechanism is the delicate mucous membrane which lines the upper portion of the nasal chambers. In this area the mucous membrane differs from the ordinary mucous membrane of the nasal cavities through the nature of its constituent cells; and in the circumstance that it is the recipient of a generous nervous supply from the olfactory nerves, as also by its possession of a number of nerve filaments.

Each nostril leads into a spacious nasal cavity, and the two nostrils are separated one from the other by a partition. This partition is termed the septum, and is formed both by cartilage and bone. In the upper section of the nose resides the olfactory apparatus. This region is the seat of the sense of smell, and is provided with a thick mucous membrane of a dark brown colour. The nerve of smell—the olfactory nerve—ends in the olfactory mucous membrane. From the brain it enters into the nasal chamber in the form of several small branches,

and these spread out in the delicate mucous membrane and terminate in tiny fibres which are prolonged into epithelial cells projecting into the surface of the nose. These cells are the olfactory cells, and they are exceedingly sensitive to the impact of odorous particles, and the stimulus thus generated travels to the brain along the ramifications of the olfactory nerve.

So wonderful is the sense of smell that perfumed particles of inconceivable minuteness are able to produce most powerful sensations. A grain of musk will scent a room for many months, and as there can be no perfume apart from a constant discharge of odorous particles these particles must be almost infinitely small. Where the particles are few they may fail to reach the olfactory membrane, but when the perfume is delicate we may displace the odourless air which circulates round it by snuffing up the air, and then we are able to perceive distinctly the perfume of what seemed a scentless flower. In the event of a severe cold the loss of smell which arises is, probably, occasioned by the swollen condition of the mucous membrane which then obstructs the passage of scent-laden air into the olfactory cavity.

The sense of hearing must now be considered, and a much more elaborate mechanism ministers to acoustic impressions than those previously outlined. We have seen that in cutaneous sensation the skin functions in different ways. The auditory organ also performs distinct functions. In addition to its hearing powers, the ear serves to acquaint the brain with the head's position, or alteration of position in relation to surrounding things. These separate functions reside in two different regions of the inner ear. This inner ear lies well within the skull, and between this internal organ and the external ear is found the middle ear. The external and middle ear may be regarded as accessory—the internal ear is the essential hearing apparatus. We hear through the medium of impressions arising from the vibrations of elastic bodies which, as sound waves, are mainly conveyed by the atmosphere. These vibrations are communicated through the complex hearing apparatus to the auditory nerves, and are transmitted from them to the sensorium. All the essential parts of the organ of sound must function properly if we are to hear distinctly. The sense is dulled when injuries or inflammation of the delicate and elaborate mechanism occur.

Remarkable variations in the range of hearing power exist. Many people are wholly insensible to sounds which are distinctly heard by others. Wollaston considers that the normal range of human hearing embraces nine octaves. That is to say, the average ear perceives vibrations of musical notes ranging from sixteen vibrations per second up to about 32,500.

As we have noted, the nerves of smell cannot transmit the tremors of light, nor can the nerves of taste convey to the brain the sensation of smell. So in the case of sonorous vibrations a special nerve is requisite which emerges from the brain into one of the ear cavities, and there ramifies into a number of filaments. This nerve is the auditory nerve, and the sonorous vibrations which reach this from outside are translated by the brain into the sensation of sound. Sound is a mode of motion of the atmosphere, and when the sound waves impart their motion to the tympanic membrane, which is stretched across the ear passage leading to the brain, this membrane which closes the ear drum is made to vibrate. The motion passes to the terminals of the auditory nerve, travels along the nerve to the brain, and there awakens the consciousness of sound.

The drum or tympanum, together with the long canal (meatus) which opens into the external visible ear, constitute the middle ear. The external meatus and the eardrum would form a single cavity were they not

separated by a membrane, the delicate tympanic membrane, which is firmly spread in a slanting direction over the passage, and thus divides the relatively small cavity of the drum from the meatus.

The tympanic membrane in this manner prevents any communication through the meatus between the external air and the drum. Means for this conveyance, however, are available in a roundabout way by the Eustachian tube which proceeds directly from the fore part of the drum inwards to the pharynx—a muscular sac near the upper part of the gullet—at the roof of which it opens. There are many other structures of the middle ear, but the function of each and all is to secure by means of modified touch the translation of atmospheric vibrations into the various sensations of sound.

The inner ear has been compared to "a very peculiarly formed membranous bag." In early stages of the ear's development this "bag" is a simple circular sac, but as it grows it assumes a very complicated form, and separates into several parts. The inner ear is lodged in an intricate cavity, imbedded in a hard mass of bone, and is situated at the base of the skull. The auditory sac, however, does not quite fill the cavity, thus permitting a space between the osseous walls and the ear sac. This space is interrupted at certain spots where the sac is in contact with its bony receptacle, and at these points of junction a fluid termed perilymph is found. The essential organ of hearing is enclosed within this sac, and consists of a single canal which is coiled in the form of a spiral shell. This wonderful mechanism is the *canalis cochlearis*, which, with the bony cavity which surrounds it, constitutes the cochlea, the chief organ of hearing. The structure of this organ is too elaborate for brief description. Full details of this and the other organs which build up our knowledge of the external world, and of which they are, indeed, the sole vehicles of communication, may be studied in any standard physiological text-book, while a brilliant exposition of the subject is contained in Huxley's *Physiology*, the sixth edition, 1915, enlarged and revised by that eminent authority, Dr. Barcroft, F.R.S.

All bodies that evolve sound are in motion, and they transfer their vibrations to the air which is thus thrown into waves. These aerial pulses pass into the external auditory passage and influence the outer ear and the surface of the skull. Some of these waves may reach the organs of hearing through the solid cranium, but such waves are too slight to be appreciable in normal conditions. We are mainly indebted for our powers of hearing to the pulses propagated along the meatus, across the channel of which lies spread the tympanic membrane or drumhead. A chain of small bones stretches from the drumhead to the internal ear, and these bones form the instruments of transmission for the movements of the membrane to the cochlea—the spiral organ previously mentioned. Thus we realize that the harmonies and melodies of musical genius, the beauties of human and avian song, the splendours of oratory, and all the countless advantages we derive from aural intercourse, arise from our ability to translate aerial pulses into sensations of sound by means of the bodily instruments now briefly described.

T. F. PALMER.

(To be continued.)

The Cairn.

SCOTLAND, at least half of it, and comparatively speaking, is a land of mountains. Pimples, Ingersoll has called them, also speaking comparatively. Every cock crows best on its ain midden. There is a mental exaltation and

a physical elasticity to be found on the hill-tops. The wind blows free, and cool, and pure. The bleached grasses and brown heath make shaggy but delightful footing for the occasional mountaineer. Narrow sheep tracks lead him anywhere and everywhere; but the cairn is his objective, and the far surrounding view. Some thoughtful soul has placed in a cleft of the cairn—not a Bible, not a bottle of whisky—but a book and pencil in a Kodak tin. We note the names in this "Visitors' Book," and, well pleased, inscribe our own, and again and again, as we revisit the delectable wilderness. The poet has been here, the humanist, Atheist, nature lover, philosopher—many in one—the pietist, too, perhaps, but so far unconfessed. Not so the others. We read:

Age with approval sees, and youth should learn
To venerate and guard the mountain cairn ;
A lonely throne—the dignities of kings
Compared with this are feeble paltry things.
Respect the cairn, roll not a fragrant down,
But add your tribute to the mountain's crown ;
'Tis Nature's shrine, the human family
Of many faiths here all in *one* agree.

Another describes the objective scene:—

Clear as a bell, and crisp and cold with snow
On Arran's length, the solemn sea below,
And, round, the sober landscape spreading wide,
While snowy clouds on far horizons rise ;
'Tis coldly bright, but snugly in the lee
I smiling sit to pen these lines to thee,
Excelsior ! unknown, unknowing friend,
Hail, and farewell ! again I must descend.

And one remembers absent friends and writes:—

Also with me in spirit (though I am no Spiritualist)
are, and, and, and, and, and—; all great men, if you
only knew them ; and four *little* men—

Sandy, and Andy, and Hughie, and Will,
All of them here on the top of the hill ;
Not spirits, or ghosts, or shadows of fear,
But living, and loving, and ever most dear.

And one in those "regions, consecrate to oldest time," celebrates in verse the birthday of his old friend and fellow—"sinner":—

Up here once more with Wisdom by my side—
My ancient, trusty comrade John Macbride ;
Still hale and hearty, very much alive,
Although to-day he reaches sixty-five.

And John himself, with laborious pencil, leaves this thought in the cairn:—

Who said "do good to them that hate you ?"
Who but the God that did create you ;
But surely His is cur'ous teaching
Who damns in *practice* His own preaching.

After reading—and writing—my share of the above, like a certain "sacred" person, I "went apart" for a space, and in a moment of rare and happy inspiration came upon a broken, half-sunken boulder that almost spoke to me. This hill-top, it is said, had once been flattened for a Roman fort. Talk of moving the stones of Rome! This stone moved me with its ancient, inarticulate tale. Older than the Elgin marbles, in their sculptured shape at least; and chiselled, too, with the quaint, weird artistry of Nature—the pitted eyes; the broken nose, on which a rock-crystal, like a drop of petrified mucous, lay; the imaginary context of mouth and chin; the flat and hoary-lichened scalp; semblance sufficient for the mind touched to sympathy and awe; epitome of all the years, all the dead of time and eternity; pensive, patient; conscious, unconscious; supplicating, resigned—but who will fathom, much less describe, the ancient mysteries of inanimate things? Ah! I have been away *down there*. For the moment I am fay, I am seer, I am interpreter. It is revelation, but to myself alone. It is the exquisite psychological moment. I am loth to, but I *must*, return. Shelley's living lark is soaring in the azure. The wind is hissing in the heath. For me, now,

the mountain is a Mecca. It has a monument. There is grander music in the cairn. I return to my old friend, who pockets his spectacles and his *Freethinker* to come and see my prodigy.

ANDREW MILLAR.

Acid Drops.

Want of space last week prevented our noting the attempt of the Bognor Council to enforce the Sunday closing of cinema shows. The attempt was made on an application for a renewal of the licence, and the opposition was led off by the Vicar. He confessed that he had no fault to find with the performances, but he thought it was a wrong time for us to go in for a "continental Sunday," especially as "our Allies are trying to get rid of it." We are afraid the Vicar of Bognor is not over scrupulous about the truth. The notion that the French have any intention of copying our English Sunday, in the maintenance of which a visit to a picture palace is treated as a giddy dissipation, is the reverse of the truth. Our Sunday is peculiarly English, and it will remain so—until the British people are sufficiently civilized to kill it.

The professional nature of the opposition was frankly avowed by several clergymen, and was also brought out by a question addressed to the Vicar. "Does it interfere with your Sunday-schools?" the Vicar was asked. "Yes," he admitted; "it did make a considerable difference." Rev. D. G. Evans, Congregationalist, found the "great difficulty, particularly among the elder boys of the school, was the fact that they preferred to go to the cinema rather than to the Sunday-school." Rev. T. Ross, Wesleyan, objected because "the Sunday-schools of England had been depleted by millions" on account of the cinemas. Quite frankly the man of God said that the children "had better die than grow up godless and without such training as we can give them in the Sunday-schools." That is candid. Better have corpses than Freethinkers; and we have no doubt that in other days Mr. Ross would have been ready to enforce the alternative. However, the police raised no objection; they said that the cinemas had taken "rowdiness off the streets"—a thing the Churches had been unable to do; and the Bench renewed the licence. So the thinning of the Bognor Sunday-schools will go on, and the Rev. T. Ross will find neither the death-roll increased nor the people made more unhappy in the interests of his miserable creed.

The Woman Suffrage victory in the House of Commons is a tribute to Freethought, for Freethinkers have advocated the equality of the sexes for generations. It is significant that Mary Wollstonecraft pleaded for the rights of woman over a century ago, and that to-day the Bishops of the Established Church are trying to make up their minds whether women are human beings.

The Bishop of London is in favour of the abolition of deans. Hear, hear! Now, we wonder if the deans are in favour of the abolition of bishops? If they are, we would support both sides. The Bishop says he is of opinion the £70,000 paid to the deans is a waste of money. With that, too, we agree. But he goes on to say that "this money is more needed for the bishops," and with that we do not agree. If it is merely a scramble as to whether the bishops or the deans are to have the money, our interest in the matter ceases.

One of the chief papers concerned in the German plotting in Rome is *Il Bastone*, says the *Daily Chronicle*. This paper, it should be noted, was founded for the express purpose of fighting the famous Freethought periodical, *L'Asino*. The *Chronicle* thinks it deserved a better fate. Other people will have their doubts on that point.

The clergy, who have been exempted from military service, are making full use of their opportunities whilst the nation is engaged in the tremendous world-war, and there are grave suspicions that the Defence of the Realm Act, and

other legislative measures, are being worked in the interests of the Churches. Sunday recreations, cinemas, racing, the drink trade, have all been attacked. The fact remains that these things continue to be permitted in France and Germany, and both these countries have been harder hit by the War than we are ourselves.

A newspaper paragraph states that two Church Army huts have been erected in the Holy Land. Many people would wish that the entire organization would go to Jehrico.

Mr. Horatio Bottomley's conversion is not so complete as some of his Christian friends could wish. Speaking at Queen's Hall, London, he said: "There were people who thought the best way to welcome home the soldiers was to give a tea-party, a pleasant Sunday afternoon, and a Brotherhood meeting, but the boys at the Front wanted to come back to the England they had left." A palpable hit.

"A truth that is uttered once is apt to be prevailed over by a lie that is well advertized," said Sir Herbert Tree. Luke-warm Freethinkers should remember that the Christian superstition has 50,000 professional advertising agents in this country alone.

The Prime Minister is in a most perilous position. Sir William Robertson Nicoll tells us, in the leading article of the *British Weekly* for June 28, that "he possesses almost unlimited power," that "he has for the first time had his own way," and that "he ranks with President Wilson as one of the two outstanding figures among the Allies." After this fulsome praise, however, the reverend knight warns him against grave dangers which threaten him. He is on the point, possibly he is actually in the process, of going astray on several vital questions, chief among which is that of the drink traffic; but his downfall may yet be averted if, before it is too late, he will but follow Sir William's advice.

The editor of the *British Weekly* has prohibition on the brain. For months it has been the main subject dealt with in his weekly "War Notes." If prohibition is not adopted the War will be indefinitely prolonged, and the British Empire may utterly collapse, while its adoption would result in speedy victory for the Allies. It never seems to occur to Sir William and his friends that they are guilty of a flagrant and wicked exploitation of the War to promote the interests of a highly debatable, partizan cause. The mischief lies in the fact that these faddists pretend to represent the nation, for they ominously remind the Prime Minister "that it is of capital importance that the dictator of the nation in war time should have the general support and good will of the people." "We use no threats," they say, "and we make no prophecies; but we believe that this hateful measure (State Purchase), if passed, will long postpone any end of the War."

It is worth noting that the Swedish statesman, M. Brantling, about whom so much has lately appeared in the press, has had the experience of being sent to prison for three months for blasphemy. Like so many continental leaders of opinion, he is a Freethinker. Public men develop more courage abroad than they do in this country.

The Freemasons' gathering at the Albert Hall, to mark the bi-centenary of the English Grand Lodge, was followed by a special religious service at which the Bishop of Birmingham preached. The presence of the bishop shows the peculiar position of English Masonry, for Continental Freemasons are Freethinkers, and anathema to the Catholic Church. Moreover, Masonic ritual is not Christian at all, and should a Continental Mason meet an English brother they are as likely to be as fraternal as Kilkenny cats.

At the Albert Hall meeting, amongst the prayers offered was the following from an unnamed speaker:—

For those also, O Lord, the humble beasts, who with us bear the heat and burden of the day and offer their guileless lives for the well-being of their countries, we ask Thy pity;

for Thou hast promised to save both man and beast, and great is Thy lovingkindness, O God, Creator of the World.

We are quite in sympathy with the feeling that prompted the prayer, although we do not think there is any doctrinal authority for it. Animals have no "souls," according to the Christian theology, and, therefore, nothing to save. We rather fancy the gentleman who offered the prayer confused some lines from Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* with Christian teaching. He might have recalled, as a corrective, St. Paul's contemptuous "Doth God care for oxen!"

The Rev. Dr. Hutton, of Glasgow, cherishes an amazingly highflown, bombastic, notion of the greatness and dignity of the Christian Church. In an article in the *Christian World* for June 28, he describes it as "that body to which our Lord committed the immense responsibility of creating the moral conscience of the human race." As a matter of simple fact, the Church has had no share whatever in creating "the moral conscience" of the race. In the course of its history it has created many false values for not recognizing which it has sent millions of men and women to the stake, the gallows, and the block. If the Church boasts that the present conscience of Christendom is of its moulding, then we pride ourselves upon our disbelief in both.

Even Dr. Hutton himself admits that the Church has lamentably failed to fulfil its Divinely appointed mission. Ideally, the Church "must be free to summon the entire secular society of the world to its bar." It did once, alas, both possess and practise that awful power; but the base use it made of it will redound to its everlasting disgrace. Morally rotten at its own core, it summoned men and women to its bar, not to be judged on ethical issues, but to be brutally tortured and put to death for daring to think for themselves, or for deviating in the slightest degree from the belief that happened to be dominant at the time.

Presbyterianism anywhere seems a lovely creed, and breeds a lovely character. But the Irish variety seems specially attractive. At Castlecaulfield, Co. Tyrone, the Session decided on introducing a little instrumental music into the service. This was done, but the opposition became so pronounced that it was decided to screen the organ down to the floor. The reply to this took the form of a number of the congregation wresting the organ away from its fastenings and putting it outside the church. It was restored to its place; and then one Sunday morning, prior to the service, it was again seized, taken outside, and smashed to pieces. It seems that no legal offence has been committed, as no disturbance of the service took place; so the Castlecaulfield Presbyterians may go on smashing up organs just so long as they please. But what a delightfully happy place the world would be if Christians could only remould it to their heart's desire! It would make even hell attractive by contrast.

In the *Saltcoats Herald*, "Dumb Man," while thanking Socialists for "varying the sameness of the Sabbath Day," strikes a sound note in the following:—

One thing the Socialist is mortally afraid of—the Church-mum's word there, and the "hush" is passed along, and the fiercest speaker falters on that ancient threshold. Kings and Prime Ministers come in for scathing rebuke, but the Church remains sacrosanct, and "the Nazarene" is spoken of with severest breath. It is not so much the Church objective and material the Socialist fears, but the Church subjective and psychological; the Church in the human breast; the shadow of the ancient caves of dread.

That is well said. And it is certain that if Socialists are sanely serious in their endeavour to reorganize society, they will have to deal with the question of religion in a different way from what they have done hitherto. Vague platitudes about Jesus, or about "genuine Christianity," with endeavours to capture the Churches, are all futile. The Churches may capture Socialism. Socialism will never capture the Churches.

Mr. Lloyd George, speaking at Castle Street Welsh Baptist Chapel, London, said the War was the greatest

catastrophe since the Deluge. It would be unkind to suggest that the speaker had water on the brain.

Slang has invaded the ecclesiastical vocabulary. At a meeting of the Actors' Church Union, at Wyndham's Theatre, the Bishop of Willesden, finding the footlights embarrassing, asked the stage-hands to "douse the glin." That sort of talk is better left to the comedians of the Salvation Army.

The *Times Literary Supplement*, in a note on Mr. Archer's *God and Mr. Wells*, complains that his treatment of the subject is "by no means devoid of an inopportune flippancy," which is one of those curious expressions that writers permit themselves. Why should a writer not be "flippant," if he pleases, when dealing with "God"? It is sheer presumption to demand that because one man chooses to talk about "God" with bated breath, that everyone else shall deal with it as though the subject was too great for ordinary human speech to handle. People write flippantly of marriage, mother-in-laws—even of the Food Controller, the Press Censor, and Mr. Lloyd George. And any of these are of vastly more importance than "God." One can get along very well, and ignore "God" altogether. But your attitude towards any of the parties named is of considerable importance. When Christians can be brought to realize that to a Freethinker "God" means nothing, he will cease to make the foolish demand that it shall be treated with all the deference and solemnity properly accorded to the most important of subjects.

Mr. Noah Bailey, a Christian Evidence lecturer, was summoned at Marlborough Street Police Court on Monday last, charged with using language at a meeting in Hyde Park calculated to provoke a breach of the peace. Mr. Freke Palmer defended, and the Rev. M. Drawbridge, with others of the C.E.S., appeared as witnesses on behalf of Mr. Bailey. In the end the Christian Evidence speaker was fined £10, and bound over to be of good behaviour for six months. We congratulate the police on having at last taken notice of the scurrilous and offensive speech of these witnesses for Christ, and we hope their attention will not stop at Mr. Bailey.

The Right Rev. Herbert Bury, Bishop for North and Central Europe, has been unpacking his heart with words concerning the erection of a solitary church at the Belgian headquarters. Had the bishop not better devote his energies to bettering the condition of his diocese, which is as much concerned with homicide as holiness?

Our Great Push.

FOR several weeks we have been inviting the co-operation of our friends in securing new readers for the *Freethinker*. We are pleased to report that this effort is bearing fruit. For two weeks we ran right out of print, and last week we were forced to increase our printing order. We shall not complain if we have to increase it every week.

One reader has managed to secure ten new subscribers. He has, further, undertaken their distribution, having his copies sent direct from this office. That is really splendid help, and we hope others will emulate this achievement. What one can do, others can do. It is a matter of taking a hand in our great push. There are thousands of potential *Freethinker* readers in the country. Let us have as many of them as possible, and as speedily as possible.

There has never been a better time than the present in which to make potential readers into actual ones. Thousands of people have had their minds unsettled in relation to religion. It should be for all of us to see that their minds are settled in the direction of Freethought.

We thank heartily all those who have helped. And we hope they and others will continue the good work.

To Correspondents.

- H. T. BURGESS.—We should like to see other Freethinkers in Johannesburg joining with you in conducting a regular movement. Perhaps this note may cause some of them to think seriously on the matter. Thanks for compliments. We shall "pull through." We have no doubt of that, hard though the struggle may be.
- A. M.—Always pleased to hear from you. We regret that your pen has been absent from our pages of late, but the fault has not been yours, and in the future we hope to see you better represented in our columns.
- P. A.—A grasp of real principles will give strength to even a weak character. And where one is not weak it becomes a pleasure to carry them into practice.
- F. COLLS.—Very pleased to hear from a three years' reader who has now induced four others to become regular subscribers. Your letter cheers one on one's way. We are obliged for the names and addresses sent.
- D. DENTITH, 27828, C/79 Brigade, R.F.A., B.E.F., will be obliged if some reader will send him his back numbers of the *Freethinker* for use among his comrades.
- J. BURRELL (Lanark).—Your capture of ten new readers for the *Freethinker* is splendid. It is still more commendable for you to undertake the distribution of these copies among them. That is a plan that might be adopted by others with profit to the Cause. If in each town one or two Freethinkers would take the matter up in this spirit, we should soon find things moving.
- T. FOWLER writes, as a note to Mr. Mann's articles, that there is a very misleading citation of a passage, Draper's "Conflict," in a work on *The Rise and Progress of Modern Spiritualism in England*, by J. Robertson. Readers who possess the work would do well, therefore, to check the reference.
- S. ROBINSON.—We presume you refer to the persecutions that took place under the early Protestant leader, or with their sanction? The handiest work for you to consult will be Lecky's *Rise of Rationalism*. There is a cheap edition published at 2s. 6d. Shall be pleased to help the work in Belfast in any way we can.
- K. F. TURVIE.—There is a "Comic Bible" published by the American Truthseeker Company, and also a French one (*La Bible Amusante*). Both are profusely illustrated.
- F. F.—We agree that the statements published in Dr. Crauford's *Reality of Psychic Phenomena* are "amazing," but the allegation concerning table-tilting is of the customary kind, and is fairly well known. We regret that want of space prevents our publishing the whole of your letter.
- C. W. W.—Naturally, the editor of the *Daily Express* would not insert your letter. Unconsciously, he paid it a compliment by refusing insertion. If you had written praising the clergy, the result might have been different. Will bear suggestion in mind, but you know our difficulty in that direction.
- THOSE interested in the National Secular Society, and desirous of helping to revive the propaganda in Belfast, are requested to communicate with Mr. Richard Stubbs, 6 Artana Street, Ormeau Road, Belfast.
- H. DENIS (Stewartstown).—Affirmation in a court of law follows the form of the oath with the excision of the religious words. It is only necessary to ask to affirm, and if the question is put "On what ground?" the reply should be "On the ground of having no religious belief." No further question ought to be asked or need be answered.
- J. MARTINSON.—Next week.
- J. A. REID.—Yes, quite possible, but not very likely.
- W. BROMLEY.—We can hardly deal with your question in this column. It requires an article.
- J. BRISTER (Bloemfontein).—Received and instructions carried out. Story will prove useful.
- E. B.—We should have been pleased to reprint portions of Lord Harcourt's speech, could we have spared the space. It is good to find some of our public men alive to the dangers of the present position.
- 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. 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.

Letters for the Editor of the "Freethinker" should be addressed to 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4.

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.

At the request of the N. S. S. Executive and a number of our readers, Mr. Cohen's article on "The Massacre of the Innocents," in last week's *Freethinker*, is being reprinted as a propagandist leaflet. We hope to have it ready in time for an announcement as to terms of distribution to be made in our next issue.

We were over sanguine in our anticipation of the result of the L.C.C. summonses against Mr. Neate for selling the *Freethinker* without a permit. But when the case was adjourned, its collapse seemed almost a certainty. Several strange things happened at the second hearing. The L.C.C. solicitor who appeared at the first hearing was, fortunately, too ill to attend the second time. The Council, fortunately, was able to say that it had sent Mr. Neate notice of the revocation of the permit, although Mr. Neate had never received it. And the postal clerk was away in the Army—an absence which excuses a mountain of faults. So the magistrate found for the Council, refused costs, which were asked for, and fined Mr. Neate the almost nominal sum of 20s. on each summons.

At the outset the Committee never expected to win in the Police Court, so there is nothing to be alarmed at in the result. It was entirely owing to the way the case for the Council was presented at the first hearing that it looked like breaking down. And now that the originally expected has happened, the Protest Committee will proceed with its work. As we said last week, we are at the opening of a campaign. It is a fight against the "Prussianism" of Spring Gardens, and this initial skirmish is no more an indication of the final result than the German overrunning of Belgium was an indication of the ultimate defeat of the Allies.

In order to celebrate the centenary of the birth of Henry D. Thoreau, it has been arranged to hold a meeting at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, on the evening of July 12. The Chair will be taken at 8 p.m. by Sir John L. Otter, J.P., and short addresses will be given by various speakers. Admirers of Thoreau's writings are invited to be present.

Referring to some recent notes on the effect of war on morals, a correspondent writes:—

Kant, in his *Perpetual Peace*, appx. 1, mentions the "wise saying of the ancient Greek, 'War is an evil, inasmuch as it makes more wicked men than it removes out of the way.'"

As a modern commentary on that, the *Albany Law Journal* quoted a New York State judge in 1870 as saying from the bench: "This court will have to be in almost continuous session until such times as this generation shall have passed away, so that the vast majority of men now engaged in the commission of crime shall either be incarcerated, run away, or dead. I use the word generation, because history tells us that after every great war it requires a generation to clear out the bad men that have grown bad as camp followers, swindlers, and robbers."

Whether the after consequences of the present War reverse the experience of other times remains to be seen.

Dean Inge, preaching at All Saints' Church, Ennismore Gardens, referred to the wonderful triumphs of medical science, which he said had raised the duration of life, and extirpated a whole company of diseases. The dean did not mention that "Christian" science is altogether opposed to doctors.

Religion and the French Revolution.

THE authority of the family, the authority of the State, long synonymous with the will of the autocrat, and all authorities whatsoever, gradually assert themselves, one and all, upon a still higher authority, the authority of religion. In it the principle of authority reaches the absolute stage. The will of God is the supreme authority, to which all must submit. Therefore the principle of authority in general stood or fell with the authority of the Church.

Consequently, when any authority was questioned or attacked, the authority of the Church was attacked, and this is what happened during the French Revolution.

As soon as the Estates assemble the clergy unanimously demand that the Catholic religion should be recognized as the State religion, with an exclusive monopoly of public worship. The revolutionary Abbe Fauchet, who blessed the uniforms of the citizen soldiers after the fall of the Bastille, maintained that those persons who belonged to no church ought not to be able to marry, since no one could consider those persons bound by their word.

When the Estates met as the National Assembly, the clergy were soon compelled to make concessions. For example, in 1790, a number of priests moved that the Catholic religion should be proclaimed as the national religion. This motion was timidly rejected, for men did not dare to say what they thought; thus an Assembly, the majority of which were Freethinkers, took part in Church processions and public worship.

One of the first acts of the Assembly was the "Declaration of the Rights of Man," Article 10, of which was as follows: "No one may be harassed on account of his opinions, not even of his religious opinions, provided that his expression of the same be not subversive of lawful order."

In 1791 all church property was declared to be State property. Voltaire had impressed upon his disciples, who were the Girondists, of the necessity of "écraser l'infame," that is, of "annihilating the infamous thing."

These times were the great days of the Girondists who followed the ideas of Voltaire, and, as such, were bitterly opposed to the Church.

Roland, as Minister of the Interior, stated: "Mutinous and hypocritical priests, in the sacred name of religion, are exciting fanaticism and arming their misguided fellow-citizens with the sword of intolerance." When the proposal for banishing the priests was under discussion, Verginand spoke of the evil that France might do by sending into another country the criminals of whom she desired to be rid. But he is comforted by the reflection that in Italy they will be received as saints, and that in this gift of *living* saints, the Pope will recognize a humble attempt to express gratitude for all the arms, legs, and other relics of *dead* saints, which he had sent into France during centuries past.

Things reached such a pitch that speakers on church matters began to excuse themselves. Francois de Nantes, as spokesman for a committee, began thus: "Our one consolation in having to take up your time on church matters, is the hope that the measures you will take will prevent the necessity of your ever hearing of them again."

The two great clubs of this period, the Cordeliers' and the Jacobins', perhaps the two most famous clubs in history, both met in chapels. Among the speakers at the former were Marat, Danton, and Camille Desmou- lins. Desmou- lins, in 1790, when he wished to marry

Lucille, one of the finest of the female revolutionary characters, found that no priest would marry him, because, in a newspaper article, he had written that the religion of Mahomet was as intelligible as the religion of Christ. He was obliged to recant and go to confession before he could be married. He now made some return for this treatment. In his famous newspaper, *Le Vieux Cordelier*, he wrote:—

The whole subject of priests and religion is disposed of when it is stated that they resemble each other in being absurd, and when it is known that the Tartars eat the excrement of the Grand Lama as the greatest delicacy. There is no fool too mad to be honoured as Jupiter's equal. The Mongolians worship a cow, which receives as much adoration as Apis, or any other god. We have no reason to be annoyed by such follies, we who, in our simplicity, have believed that it is possible to swallow a god as one swallows an oyster."

In the newspaper, *Les Revolution des Paris*, a number issued in Lent, 1792, contains the following concerning the shows and fairs of the day:—

At the time when we had a ruling religion, the tondured jugglers allowed no competition in Holy Week. When the ordinary conjurer comes upon the stage he wears a cloak, but as soon as the performance is over, he takes off his costume. The priest wears his all day long, and performs off, as well as on, the stage. When will they blush to play the role of the conjurers of humanity?

In April the same paper proposes that priests should be shut up in a house like prostitutes, where they can pray and preach as much as they want, to those that wish, but should be prevented from going out, so that they may not infect the population.

In 1792 the edict was passed which condemned to banishment all those priests that would not take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. In September of the same year was the slaughter of the prisoners, among whom the priests were the first to fall. About 1,500 human beings were killed. The number is great, but it is noteworthy that this number is not one-twentieth part of the number of men killed in one day during a battle at the present time; and the French people had far, far more to avenge than many of those fighting at the present time.

Lequino, a member of the Convention, writes as follows in a book entitled *Les Prejugés Detruits* (The Prejudices Destroyed): "Religion is a political chain invented for the purpose of fettering men; its only use has been to ensure the pleasures of a few individuals by holding all the others in check." Concerning the priests, he says: "When they are honest they are stupid or mad; as a rule they are audacious impostors, veritable assassins of the human race." Lequino is not at all an exception, although he carried his war against all in authority by inviting the public executioner to dine with him and his family for the purpose of destroying the prejudice against an official who was to an extent a public benefactor. In *Les Revolutions des Paris*, a number which appeared in December, 1792, concerning the celebration of midnight Mass in Paris, it says:—

There is no particular harm in holding exhibitions of dancing marionettes or conjurers' tricks in the public streets in the daytime, as it is quite permissible that children and nurses should be amused. But to meet in dark assembly halls at midnight for the purpose of singing hymns, lighting tapers, and burning incense in honour of an illegitimate child and an unfaithful wife is a scandal, an offence against public morality, which demands the attention of the police and strict repressive measures.

About this time the ravaging of the churches took place, and the reports are very interesting and instruc-

tive to those who hope that an English Revolution may take place. One report is as follows: "We have permitted 'brown Mary' (a miracle-working image) to retire, after all the hard work she has had in fooling the world for 1800 years." Another: "There are no longer any priests in the Nieone Dept. The altars have been despoiled of the piles of gold which ministered to priestly vanity." Another is in the sarcastic vein:—

I have been unjustly accused of an onslaught upon religion. The fact is that I asked most politely before I acted, and three or four hundred saints begged for permission to go to the Mint. I said to them, "Ye who have been the tools of fanaticism, ye saints and holy ones of all kinds, show now that ye are patriots, and help your country by marching to the Mint."

When a few churches were re-opened, the fact was announced in one paper under the heading of "Theatres and Amusements," as follows:—

On the 18th and 25th of this month a comedy was played in several parts of Paris. The chief character, in an absurd costume, performed a variety of foolish antics, at which the spectators did not laugh. As we are not in the habit of criticizing revived plays when they are neither useful nor instructive, we shall take no further notice of this one.

Such events as these show plainly how the Revolution was attacking the principle of authority. It is noteworthy that patents of nobility were burned in the same bonfire with the images of saints. From the moment when the authority of religion was overthrown, authority in other directions was threatened.

Chaumette, who secured many praiseworthy measures, persuaded the Convention to consecrate the cathedral of Notre Dame to the worship of Reason, and in this cathedral many performances were held. One church was turned into a public-house. Relics, Bibles, images, and other priestly paraphernalia were burnt in huge bonfires everywhere.

All this ended in the Festival of the Supreme Being and the bloody wars in La Vendee, and finally, under Napoleon, the restoration of the Catholic religion, to be finally abolished from the State in France a hundred years later.

The men of the Revolution had failed to comprehend that the great mass of the people were profoundly ignorant and superstitious, and were terrified by the acts of violence, the closing of the Churches, the abolition of the Sabbath, the banishment of the priests. They had been taught for centuries and generations that these things were invented by God himself, and they were prepared to give themselves over to the priests once more, as soon as opportunity presented itself. As was stated at the time, there are only two things that can, and ultimately will, kill the tyranny and vile superstition of religion: complete liberty of the press and complete, good, free, and entirely secular education—for both of which fine ideals the *Freethinker* and its readers stand.

HAROLD W. EDWARDS.

[The books used for the above are, *L'histoire des Girondists*, by Lamartine, in three vols., and *Histoire de la revolution francaise*, by Louis Blanc, in sixteen vols.—H. W. E.]

An old Scotch minister, who had been imbibing too freely, fell fast asleep on his way home one night. On of his parishioners, on his way to work next morning, wakened the minister out of a sound sleep. He said he was vexed to see his minister in such a state, especially after the fine sermon he preached the previous Sunday. The minister replied: "Haud on tae licht, Haud on tae licht, never mind the lantern."

Anthropomorphism and Science.

THE problem of philosophy hardly exists to what is called the plain man. He sees the world, and the world as he sees it is the world as it is. But to the philosopher the matter is not so simple nor so easy. The world we know is a world conditioned by both perception and conception. When we see a table we get the impression of something of a particular shape and colour, and we believe that if we touch it it will be hard. And yet science will demonstrate this shape and colour and hardness is not really in the table, it is in us. They are affections of our organs. Further, it can be shown that we do not really see all we think we see. To what we actually see at the moment we add our past experiences of exact measurements, etc., of tables and other things. And from the thing seen, perceptions, plus the recollections of things previously experienced, conceptions, we construct what we call the actual table. But what is the table apart from our perceptions and conceptions? What is the thing in itself like, apart from the effects it produces on us through our sense organs? —?

It is quite clear that the world as we know it is made up of (1) an assumed reality; (2) the contributions made by our sensations, present and past. Professor Kingdon Clifford was the first to propose the term "Eject," to denote the contribution made by our subjective experiences to the totality of our conception of the world or any part of it, and it stands opposed to "Object" as the external thing which affects consciousness. Exactly how much of an "object" is an "eject," or whether there is any "object" at all, is a question over which philosophers have wrangled, and will continue to wrangle. That there is an ejective element in all our thinking of the external world seems clear. This, at all events, is the subject-matter of an extremely able and interesting work, by Miss Oliver A. Wheeler, on *Anthropomorphism and Science; A Study of the Development of Ejective Cognition in the Individual and the Race* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). Miss Wheeler says that her main object is to determine the relation between the theological and the scientific interpretation of the world, and we may grant her that both science and theology are incurably anthropomorphic in the sense that neither can escape interpreting the universe in terms of human consciousness. So far, one has little fault to find with her examination and determination of the ejective element in physics, biology, and other sciences. Particularly well done are the chapters on "The Indiscriminate Ejection of the Savage," and "The Passage from Primitive to Discriminate Ejection," as marking the rise of science. But we quite dissent from her classification of science as "the direct descendant of the positive knowledge of the savage" with a function entirely utilitarian, and religion as "the descendant of anthropomorphic speculation" with a function wholly interpretive. Science is as interpretive as religion, and religion aims at being as utilitarian as science. Indeed, if the religious interpretation is accepted as true, its utilitarian character is at once admitted.

So, when Miss Wheeler sums up her suggestive work by saying that if science admits the use of ejection for obtaining a synthetic view of a group of data, it cannot consistently deny the use of religious ejection as a device for obtaining a synthetical view of the whole universe; the reply is that the two cases are not on all fours. The scientist may use his ejective symbols—Force, Atom, etc., realizing all the time that they are symbols, the value of which lies wholly in their making certain groups of data intelligible. The theologian having used his

symbol, God, forthwith disowns its symbolic character, and insists on it as a positive objective existence. Moreover, the religious method is gratuitous. All that can be done by religion may be, and is, done by science, or by that larger science, philosophy. Miss Wheeler's own chapters show that religion takes its rise in the "indiscriminate ejection"—in plain language, the unbounded tendency to personification—of the savage. Religion in civilized times represents what remains of this primitive tendency after science has occupied stretch after stretch of its territory. And it is too much to expect that when the victory is nearly complete, science will agree to an equal division of all that it has conquered.

CRITICUS.

Correspondence.

RELIGION IN THE ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—You have already had several letters from Freethinkers at the Front giving their impressions as to the state of religion in the Army. If I mistake not they have all been in agreement on one point—that religion has not gained anything of value as a result of the War. This is my own impression, and if Church parades are anything to go by, there is little room for doubt on the subject. Orders for Church parade bring forth a volume of oaths and foul language from our Christian soldiers, who go to Church by the hundreds when they are forced, but stay away by the hundreds if allowed to please themselves. On the other hand, I have known men to sit in their tents for an hour or so on a Sunday evening singing hymns on their own accord. But not infrequently the men who indulge themselves in this way have very little respect for women, and possess a large capacity for bad language and indecent yarns.

The truth of the matter seems to be, that the average soldier, like the average civilian, thinks very little about religious questions when he does attend a service, or sing hymns on his own, he is giving way to emotion that is neither guided nor checked by reason, and thus indulging in a social habit in a most unintelligent manner. There are, of course, exceptions. One man, in particular, I found to be well read and prepared to discuss religious subjects without bigotry. He has now left the company, so I am deprived of his intellectual companionship. I had two or three interesting talks with him. He called himself an English Catholic, and claimed for every man the right to think for himself on matters of doctrine and worship according to his own desires regarding ritual. He accepted a great deal of modern Biblical criticism, and believed in the theory of evolution, but with certain limitations. He thought good living more important than belief in a particular set of doctrines. I mention this as he claimed that while the number of Freethought followers will increase in future, the majority of thoughtful people will tend to accept a broadminded religious position. On the other hand, he pointed out, in a friendly way, a danger that he believed would beset the Freethought movement. It is one that I myself have thought of before, viz.: as it becomes more and more easy to openly profess Atheism, a large number of people will attach themselves to Freethought societies without understanding Atheism, and thus become a drag on the movement. I had to admit that this danger does present itself, especially as there are many Freethinkers to-day who have done little more than throw off Christianity and accept a few elements of Atheism. They do not seem to realize the necessity of trying to educate themselves by reading the best of Freethought literature and attending lectures as often as possible. I suggest, therefore, that all who take part in propagating Freethought should insist, as often as possible, on the importance of continual self-education. This may not do all, but it will do something in the way of saving the movement from the above-mentioned danger. I am afraid that a good many Freethinkers are under the impression that the future of our great cause is going to be an easy one. This is a very mistaken estimate. We need

all the knowledge and all the energy that we can muster for the future. I have been pleased to find men out here who say readily: "every man to his own ideas in matters of religion," but against this freedom from bigotry on the part of some, we have to place the ignorance and indifference of others. And these latter are the perpetual foes of Freethought.

54179 Pte. E. EGERTON STAFFORD,

B. E. F. France.

PROSPECTS OF REVOLUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—There are two articles in a recent issue of the *Sunday Times* which have a bearing on what is said in the *Freethinker* of June 24 on the probable inertness of the soldiers and their desire to avoid agitation and commotion when they return from the War. The first is by Lord Sydenham, and is entitled "Revolution or Reconstruction?" He points out that revolutions are made by determined minorities. He looks to the British Workers League to do work preventative of revolution. The other article, by H. Dennis Bradley, is entitled "The Sinister Unrest." One extract is as follows:—

What are we fighting for? The cause is the utter lack of psychology on the part of the few who are attempting to govern. Why is it, when Prussianism stinks in the nostrils of the world, the nation asks, What are we fighting for? That question, as the men who govern fail to understand, is ironical. In reality, it means we are in the third year of the War, and we have lost Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Press, Liberty of the Subject, Rights to Property, A Representative Government. What have we gained? Broken Pledges, Bureaucracy, Profiteering, Corruption.

In reading, I thought of the reactionaries' attempt to prevent the sale of Freethought literature, amongst the other results of the War.

A. J. MARRIOTT.

SPIRITUALISM AND SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I have thoroughly appreciated Mr. Mann's articles on "Spiritism," but I am rather surprised to find no reference to a splendid book published some years ago in America by a committee in connection with the Pennsylvania College, entitled *The Preliminary Report of the Sybright Commission*. I read it many years ago, and often wondered if there was ever another report issued by the Commission. I got the book through a London agency, and it cost 3s. 6d. Mr. J. N. Maskelyne put me on to it first. Perhaps some of your readers could tell us if there was ever a subsequent report. It is a most scathing and flaying account of interviews with all the great frauds of the spiritology cult.

ARTHUR SPENCER.

REPRISALS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Your concurrence with the Archbishop as to Reprisals—expressed in "Acid Drops," July 1—seems open to criticism. You distinguish between air raids and poison gas, etc. Now, if a distinction exists, it tells rather in favour of raids, the laws of war having ruled out poisonings, etc., and having not ruled out raids, as these had not come up for ruling.

On the other hand, there is precedent for inflicting suffering on populations: our blockade is primarily an attack on civilians, and incidentally on the fighting ranks.

You note the next war will commence at the point of brutality where this one leaves off. Just so; and most satisfactory too. Germany bombs, say, Colchester: down comes Cologne. Germany bombs London again: bang goes Berlin. Germany ceases bomb-dropping: England drops no more. That is where the next war would do well to start.

You contend reprisals would be ineffective: "the cheap psychology of an uninstructed mind" would alone look for effect. Now, is it cheap psychology that looks for the coward in the bully? Are these tales fictions—of the average

German soldier being infinitely more frightened of the Tanks than the average English civilian of the Zeppelin? of German officers foaming with rage because, when we out-Krupper Krupp, we are not fighting fair?

Is it a fact that, as you allege, the Germans support their Government in being ready to sacrifice millions of people? If it is, then the sooner the realities of modern war, as exemplified in air-raids, can *incidentally happen (as in reprisals) and be brought home to them* the better, for many think the German people will be the deciding factor.

RANDALL HENDON.

Obituary.

It is with the very deepest regret that we have to record the death, on active service, of yet another promising young Freethinker. Mr. J. G. Bartram is fairly well known, by name at least, among North Country Freethinkers, and every sympathy will be felt with Mr. Bartram and his wife on the death of their eldest son, Frank. At first reported, on April 16, "wounded and missing," hope struggled with fear against more serious news. This came to hand recently. He had been killed in action on the date named above. Frank Bartram was a lad of whom any parents might well feel proud. He had passed through his school career with considerable credit, and his bright disposition, associated as it was with an alertness of mind and body, held out the strongest hopes for his future. He took a keen interest in Freethought, and in France was active in discussion with his comrades and in the distribution of literature. His death, at the age of twenty, will be felt as a loss by all who knew him. Freethinkers everywhere will sympathize with the family on their loss.

L.C.C. Prosecution.

SALE OF LITERATURE IN PARKS.

At Old Street Police Court yesterday Mr. Clarke Hall resumed the hearing of three summonses issued at the instance of the London County Council against James Neate, of Bethnal Green Road, for unlawfully selling copies of the *Freethinker* without having first obtained in writing the consent of the clerk to the authority.

Last week, when the case was first before the Court, the defence was set up that the fact that a park-keeper had received notice of the withdrawal of permits was not sufficient withdrawal to create an offence unless it could be proved that defendant had also received such notice from the London County Council.

Mr. Greenwood, who now appeared to support the prosecution, explained that a colleague who conducted the case last week was unable to attend owing to indisposition.

Mr. Eldridge (for the defendant) said there was no denial of selling.

James Joseph Bradley, park-keeper at Victoria Park, was recalled, and said the evidence he gave last week referred to offences against the parks by-laws on May 13 and 20 and June 3.

Mr. Greenwood.—Were you in the park every day, and did you see Neate there on October 3, 1916?—Yes.

Was he selling the *Freethinker* then?—Yes.

What did you say to him?—I said, "You know the permit to sell literature is withdrawn," and he replied, "Yes. I can't help the regulations; I must go on selling." On October 29 I again saw him selling, and said to him, "You know the Council has withdrawn your permit to sell literature in the parks." He replied that he did, but that he insisted on selling.

Mr. Eldridge.—What authority had you for saying the Council had withdrawn the defendant's permit?—I had a notification from the Council to say it had been withdrawn.

Mr. Greenwood.—He (defendant) knew the notice had been withdrawn.

L.C.C. RESOLUTION AMBIGUOUS.

Mr. Eldridge.—What all the people in the parks knew—that there was some regulation before the Council, which I am going to draw your attention to if it is put in.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—If the Council as a body granted these permits, surely as a body they can revoke them.

Mr. Eldridge.—All I say is, he knew, as other people knew, as a matter of public knowledge, that there was something before the Council on the matter.

John William Ellis, Clerk to the L.C.C. Parks Committee, produced an official copy of the minutes of the Council for May 30, 1916.

Mr. Eldridge said it was here sought to make defendant guilty of a penal offence, and liable to all sorts of pains and penalties. If the prosecution proposed to do that they must proceed strictly in a clear and unambiguous manner. He contended that the resolution passed voided permission only in part. It said, "To sell literature in certain parks and open spaces." If the Council had intended that to apply to all parks and open spaces under their control it would have been a very simple matter for them to say so. They did not say that; they said "certain parts," thereby, counsel submitted, meaning "some" parts. There was nothing in the resolution to show that Victoria Park was one of the parks referred to. The resolution, he contended, was void by reason of its uncertainty.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—Some notice was necessary. Had defendant said, "I did know the permit had been withdrawn," that would be sufficient. Suppose no notice was sent, and his attention was called to the fact, he would be entitled to say to the park-keeper, "I have had no notice. I do not take it from you." Suppose he had said that, there would be something in the contention which has been raised.

Park-keeper Bradley, in answer to Mr. Eldridge, said he did not tell defendant the notice withdrawing the permits had been sent to all holders. He said, "You know the permit to sell has been withdrawn," and defendant answered "Yes." He did not tell him about the withdrawal of the permit in the terms of the resolution. He said that there was a permit to Miss Vance to sell literature, and that it had been withdrawn. He did not know that a permit had been granted to the defendant. He thought the permit was a general permit to the National Secular Society. He regarded Neate, when he went to him, as the agent of Miss Vance. Witness went to each person selling literature, and said if they had not permits he would have to summon them. He did not then know that defendant had a permit. The order he received said "all permits have been withdrawn," and that persons with permits had been notified.

PERMIT TO SELL HELD SINCE 1905.

Mr. Eldridge.—Do you know defendant had held a permit since 1905?—No.

You asked him if he knew the permits had been withdrawn, what did he say?—He said "Yes."

You did not refer to his permit?—I referred to permits in general, and to the one granted to the Secretary of the National Secular Society.

Witness produced a copy of the letter of instructions sent to him. It read: "Please note that the Council has decided that all permits shall be cancelled as from December 30. In the event of any person stating that he has not received any such communication his name and address should be taken and sent to the clerk of the Council.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—Why don't you, Mr. Greenwood, prove that these notices were sent?

Mr. Greenwood.—As a matter of fact, the officer who sent them is away on active service.

Mr. Ellis (recalled) read the notice, which ran: "I beg to inform you that the Council has decided that permits granted for the sale of literature in the parks and open spaces shall be determined as from December 30."

Mr. Eldridge.—Have you Neate's name anywhere as being one of the persons to whom that was sent?—I have the counterfoil here.

The magistrate, examining a book handed to him, said the name of Neate did appear, and then something appeared to have been torn out.

The Witness.—That is the permit.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—That only shows the issue of the permit.

Mr. Greenwood (to witness).—Did you yourself check the circular letter sent out with with the Council's authority?—Yes, I checked the letter, which had been previously marked by my assistant.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—I think that is sufficient.

Mr. Greenwood.—For what it is worth, so you produce a letter dated October 30, 1916, enclosing a resolution of protest against the Council's withdrawal of the permits?

Witness.—Yes, and the signature of Neate is attached to it.

INSUFFICIENT AUTHORIZATION.

Mr. Eldridge submitted that the resolution of the Council did not authorize with sufficient certainty the clerk to send out the notices withdrawing the permits.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—Oh, yes, I think so.

Mr. Eldridge.—Then I don't think I can discuss the matter further here, although it may be necessary to discuss it in some other form in the name of some other person. I submit that the case is not one for anything like a severe penalty.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—Oh, no.

Mr. Greenwood mentioned that in spite of those proceedings the defendant was still, or was on June 24, selling papers in the park. If that sort of thing was to be tolerated he did not know how many park constables it might become necessary to employ. Originally the Council had only intended to ask for a nominal penalty had the defendant admitted at the first hearing that he knew of the withdrawal of the permits and expressed regret for having made a mistake.

Mr. Clarke Hall.—But he is entitled to take advantage of any legal point.

The magistrate imposed a fine of 20s. on each of the three summonses, but refused costs.—*Morning Advertiser* (June 28).

Scenes and Portraits.

THE FRIEND OF PAUL.

OUR master, Epicurus, was a lover of children; he knew, no one better, their delicate and insinuating ways, the strange unreal world in which they play, their unconsciousness of time; and he seems to have taken them as patterns and exemplars of the life of pleasure, unsuspecting of the future, and forgetful of the past, but living always with a vivid intensity, in that little, shut-in pleasure-house of the senses, the moment. As I thought of my child, I remembered all his caresses, the soft touch of his flower-like hands upon my face, and the grave eyes that seemed to keep a wisdom older than the world; and beside that image in my dreams stooped another, Drusilla, her hands guiding him to me, she whose whole life was like some attenuated fragrance, difficult of apprehension, but inexpressibly sweet; her quiet brows with real bands of hair smoothed against the cool flesh; and the love that grew between us, first for what she revealed to me, and then for what she hid. When I thought of these two brief, beautiful creatures, I seemed to see in them the true fragility of life, as if it were no more than wind in the stops of a flute or sweet vibration from the strings of a lyre, aerial, elusive, never to be wholly imprisoned in any one form, but wandering, vocal, through the whole of creation, illuminating it to one exquisite moment, like light upon hill and sea, and then vanishing, fleeing away into darkness, never to be exactly repeated.

There are in reality only two religions on this little planet, and they perhaps begin and end with man. They are: the religion of the humble folk, whose life is a daily communion with natural forces, and a binding to them; and the religion of men like Protagoras, Lucretius, and Montaigne—a religion of doubt, of tolerance, of agnosticism. Between these two poles is nothing but a dreary waste of formalism, Pharaism, "perplexed subtleties about Instants, Formalities, Quiddities, and Relations," all that bewildering of brain which comes from being shut up in a narrow system, like an invalid in a poisoned and stifling room.

FREDERICK MANNING.

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): Thursday, July 12, at 7.30.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 6.15, R. Miller, a Lecture.

FINSBURY PARK N. S. S.: 11.15, E. Burke, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (corner of Ridley Road): 7, Mr. Shaller, "Christianity a Failure."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill): 6, H. V. Storey, a Lecture.

REGENT'S PARK N. S. S.: 3.15, Percy S. Wilde, a Lecture.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, G. Rule, a Lecture.

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

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

YOUNG Married Couple (Freethinkers) wish to Share a House in district S.E. (Herne Hill or Camberwell) with another young couple holding similar views.—Letters to BUSINESS MANAGER, c/o *Freethinker*, 61 Farringdon Street, E.C. 4.

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. *Christianity a Stupendous Failure*, J. T. Lloyd; 2. *Bible and Tectotalism*, 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 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

OVER 1,000,000 VOLUMES IN STOCK

on all subjects, including:

FREETHOUGHT, RATIONALISM, ETC.

SECOND-HAND AT HALF PRICES.

NEW AT DISCOUNT PRICES.

Catalogue No. 324 free. State wants. Books bought.

Books sent on approval.

W. & G. FOYLE,

121-123 CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.

Books Every Freethinker should Possess.

HISTORY OF SACERDOTAL CELIBACY.

By H. C. LEA.

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

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

WHAT IS AGNOSTICISM? Price 1d., postage ½d.

ROME OR ATHEISM? Price 2d., postage ½d.

BIBLE AND BEER. Price 1d., postage ½d.

MRS. BESANT'S THEOSOPHY. Price 1d., postage ½d.

MY RESURRECTION. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 THE ATHEIST SHOEMAKER. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE. Price 3d., postage 1d.

BY COLONEL INGERSOLL.

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? Price 1d., postage ½d.
 MISTAKES OF MOSES. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM. Price 3d., postage 1d.
 WOODEN GOD. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 DO I BLASPHEME? Price 1d., postage ½d.
 HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 IS SUICIDE A SIN? AND LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 THE GODS. Price 2d., postage 1d.
 LIVE TOPICS. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 ABRAHAM LINCOLN. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 LIMITS OF TOLERATION. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 ROME OR REASON. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED? Price 1d., postage ½d.
 CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 SOCIAL SALVATION. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY CHAPMAN COHEN.

SOCIALISM, ATHEISM, AND CHRISTIANITY. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ETHICS. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY WALTER MANN.

THE RELIGION OF FAMOUS MEN. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY J. BENTHAM.

UTILITARIANISM. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY LORD BACON.

PAGAN MYTHOLOGY. Price 3d., postage 1½d.

BY D. HUME.

ESSAY ON SUICIDE. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 MORTALITY OF SOUL. Price 1d., postage ½d.
 LIBERTY AND NECESSITY. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY M. MANGASARIAN.

MARTYRDOM OF HYPATIA. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY DIDEROT AND HOLBACH.

CODE OF NATURE. Price 1d., postage ½d.

BY ANTHONY COLLINS.

FREEWILL AND NECESSITY. Price 3d., postage 1d.

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

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, 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 ½d.

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

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 ½d.

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

Freethought and Literature.

BY

MIMNERMUS.

The Freethinking beliefs of the world's greatest writers demonstrated by their own works.

Price One Penny. 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.

Prayer: Its Origin, History, and Futility.

BY

J. T. LLOYD.

Price TWOPENCE.

(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.

Printed and Published by THE PIONEER PRESS (G. W. FOOTE AND CO., LTD.), 61, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4.