

The FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

VOL. XL.—No. 19

SUNDAY, MAY 9, 1920

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page.
<i>Spencer and Sociology.—The Editor</i>	289
<i>The Government of God.—J. T. Lloyd</i>	291
<i>Modern Medicine—Men.—Mimnermus</i>	292
<i>Does Man Survive Death: Is the Belief Reasonable?</i>	293
<i>Sheep and Socialists.—Ignotus</i>	294
<i>The Atonement Humbug.—George Scott</i>	298
<i>Spiritualism, A Temporary Symbol.—G. E. Fussell</i>	299
<i>Pages from Voltaire.—George Underwood</i>	300
<i>The Church and the Cinema.—J. Driscoll</i>	301
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions.

Spencer and Sociology.

The growth of Socialism has of late years been so great, and the legitimacy of State action has become such an accepted axiom of political thinking, that it is rather difficult for the younger generation to conceive a time when Individualism versus Socialism formed a keen and stormy subject of controversy. It is, too, unfortunate, in a measure, that Herbert Spencer became identified, in the minds of many, as the representative of the extreme school of individualism, and that those who now become acquainted with him, chiefly through the writings of others, should regard him as the mouthpiece of a vanished order. Those who have a more intimate knowledge of Spencer will not treat him in so casual a manner. They are quite aware that much of what he wrote in relation to current political life needs very careful revision, and that some of his conclusions are indefensible, yet in very many cases the corrective is given by Spencer himself—particularly in his monumental "Principles of Psychology"—and are, therefore, not inclined to overlook the fact that no man of his generation did so much to popularise the conception of society as a developing organic structure which illustrated in its growth the same general evolutionary laws that are observable elsewhere in nature. And those who now talk so easily and so freely about the Social Organism, the Social Medium, the laws of social life, etc., would do well to bear in mind that to no one—unless a claim be put in on behalf of Auguste Comte—do we owe a greater debt for the popularisation of these ideas than to Herbert Spencer.

* * *

The Evolution of Society.

When Spencer wrote his "Principles of Sociology" he commenced the work in a manner that marked a new era in the treatment of social evolution. Special stress is laid upon the emotional and intellectual qualities of man as among the most potent of factors in the shaping of the social structure. And a large part of the first volume, over 400 pages, is taken up with describing how early social

institutions have their form determined by the superstitious beliefs of primitive mankind. The true line is indicated that the distinguishing feature between human and animal societies is the possession of a psychological medium to which adjustment is necessary. Man is under the domination of his ideas from the outset of his existence as a member of a social group. I lay stress upon this because it brings up in greater relief the inconsequence of his opposition to State action, as such. The same may be illustrated from another point of view. When Spencer traces the growth of animal structures and shows how there goes on a differentiation of parts, leading to a closer integration and interdependence, which involves a subordination of the whole to the control of a centralised nervous structure, one looked for him to find in society an organ that would have answered to the growth of the brain in the animal organism. And if this organ were to be found in what we roughly understand by the State, it would fall into line with the teachings of the "Principles of Psychology," and also with the principle indicated in the "Sociology" of the predominance of the psychological factor. What we do find is an affirmation of the survival of the fittest, and a consideration of "fitness" in terms of biology alone. Survival of the fittest is, he reminds us, the most "beneficent" arrangement that the conditions admit. But this overlooks two points. First, what is it that constitutes fitness? and, second, does natural selection really bring forth the highest type of life when we take into account man's power to manipulate both the purely biological and the social forces? A mere biological fitness to live does not ensure survival in the human group. What we may call social selection sets in here, and operates by giving a much enhanced value to certain psychological qualities which gives to the possessor a social value. Due attention to these points would have prevented much of what has brought Spencer's socio-political writings into disfavour, and would have placed the whole of his sociology upon a quite sound basis.

* * *

From Muscle to Mind.

When Spencer cried out against State action as interfering with the operation of the law of survival of the fittest, it may easily be shown that what he had in mind was biological fitness alone, and that he was thinking of society in terms of biology. But an important feature of social evolution is that the forces against which society must protect itself change their form with the growth of society itself. Spencer does point out that it is the duty of the State to prevent "aggressive" actions between its members, but does not realise that in the course of evolution the aggressive actions of man towards man change from a physical to a psychological form, and

that these may be even more disastrous in their new form than they were in their old one. Broadly speaking, it is no longer possible for a man to enrich himself at the expense of others in virtue of greater physical strength. But aggression, and personal enrichment at the expense of others are possible in virtue of the possession of greater mental strength—of a kind—and are practised. And what is this but the predatory instinct of a ruder age expressing itself in a more "civilised" form? If it is anti-social for a man to hold the highway by force, and compel all to pay tribute, and if in that case it is legitimate for the State to restrain him, in what respect does this differ from the State restraining a man from putting certain mental powers into operation, cornering a commodity, and holding the whole of the community to ransom? There is nothing bad in itself in physical strength, neither is there in mental strength, but either may become a social danger, and call for social control. In one age the man of muscle threatens social welfare, in another age it is the man of mind with his mental powers uncorrected by an adequate sense of social duty. And socially there is no distinction between them. To use an expression of Ruskin's, the crag baron becomes the bag baron, and society must deal with the one as it has dealt with the other. Mind may become as tyrannous as muscle, in fact, it has become so, and it is one of the peculiarities of the present situation that those who are most opposed to mind correcting the abuse of mind in social affairs are encouraging the use of physical force by those who feel themselves aggrieved by the present conditions, and so calling in the lower factor in order to redress the anti-social action of the higher one.

* * *

Survival of the Fittest.

But there is a still more drastic criticism to be passed when dealing with the application of natural selection to human society. It is true that natural selection *may* develop a *higher* type. It is not true that it does ever develop the *highest* type. Indeed, natural selection may as well lead to a lower type as to a higher one. For this confusion, it must be admitted that biologists have themselves to thank, and many popularisers are to blame, but it nevertheless leads to a sad misunderstanding of the subject. What is the effect of the survival of the fittest? Other things equal, it favours the survival of any variation which brings its possessor into a closer harmony with the environment. But it does this without the slightest reference to whether the favoured specimen comes nearer to an ideally higher type or not. All natural selection does is to favour, or register, the survival of a type that fits the environment. Whether it is a higher type or not does not enter into the case. And, as a matter of fact, the highest types of anything known to us are produced, not by the operation of natural selection, but by man himself controlling the operation of the biological and other forces. Natural selection, for example, did not produce the cultivated rose from the five petalled wild one. And the same is true of every really high type that we may care to select. Natural selection is a conservative force rather than a progressive one. What occurs with plants and animals is that man selects a variation that promises to give him what he has in mind. And he gradually does get it, not by depending upon natural selec-

tion as it exists in nature, but by acting upon his knowledge of those forces and conditions that govern the existence of living beings. And ultimately what man has done for the dog, the horse, the rose, and a thousand and one other things he learns to do for his own kind. The problem of breeding a better race is ultimately a problem of knowledge—that is, it is a question of applying our knowledge of the laws of evolution to the development of social life. And the basic principle to bear in mind here is this, the whole effect of biologic competition and struggle is to prevent development beyond a certain point. The aim of social co-operation is to raise this development to the highest conceivable level.

* * *

A Great Exemplar.

Yet when all qualifications are made, and want of space has prevented my saying all that may be said in praise of Spencer's work, our debt, and the debt of all future generations to him, is a large one. Those whose intellectual adolescence goes back thirty years will best appreciate his immense stimulative force. He offered them a chart over what was then an unmapped country. There are few thinkers in the history of the world who have taken a more comprehensive view of nature than did Spencer, and none have shown greater and more sustained power of analysis and synthesis. And for those who are unacquainted with Spencer's writings, no other single work will so readily show the sweep of his mind, with its vast generalising power, than the small volume on the "Study of Sociology." If that does not impress them nothing else will. Of late, it has become a fashion to belittle Spencer, and to speak of him as spent force. But from a generation that can take Bergson as a profound philosopher that is not surprising. Those whose opinions are better worth having know him to be one of the world's seminal minds, the influence of which is seen in the very impulse that enables a later generation to see beyond them. And when all necessary qualifications are made it is in that group that Spencer's name will stand. His forty years of hard work reduced to order a field over which, till his day, very little order reigned. And all that time he held a commanding place in the world of European thinkers. Without special biological training he gave direction to many important lines of development; he gave us the first evolutionary psychology that was ever attempted, and he practically established the science of Sociology in this country. He was a Darwinian before Darwin, and the leader of the all-conquering doctrine of all evolution, which embraces in its sweep all changes from atom to planet and from protoplasm to man. And the man who played this part, in spite of indifferent health, in spite of financial and other discouragements, can never cease to hold a high place in the estimation of all who value truth and appreciate unflinching devotion to an ideal.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Religion, with whatever of Art and of contemplative thought it has allied itself, is born not of man's strength but of his weakness.....The understanding and sympathy which it brings is born of the loneliness of the lonely; the balm which it pours into the wounds is made of their smarting; as in Browning's poem, the strength which crows the tyrant is but his victim's weakness.—Vernon Lee, "Vital Lies," 1., p. 246.

The Government of God.

THE Christian claim is that God governs the world, and that his government is absolute. We contend, on the contrary, that the very existence of the Divine Governor and his government is wholly incapable of verification. In fact, there are irrefutable proofs of the non-existence of a just and omnipotent Ruler of the world. The Very Rev. Dr. Baillie, Dean of Windsor, admits the seeming failure of God and of Christ, but asserts the real triumph of both. In a sermon, preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, and published in the *Christian World Pulpit* for April 28, he attempts to demonstrate the reality of the Divine government of the world. At the very outset he makes the following curious statement:—

It is not too much to say that there has been no man who, looking back on the course of his life, can say that he has seen the purposes which he set before himself carried out as he meant them to be carried out. Failure is written across the page of all human effort which has been directed by human wisdom.

Assuming the truth of that proposition as laid down in the first of those two sentences, we can see in it no evidence whatever of supernatural interference; but the second sentence, proclaiming the failure of all human effort directed by human wisdom, is so utterly and so patently false that it is impossible to treat it seriously. Whatever purposes a man may set before himself, he can carry them out only in conjunction with others under whose influence they will certainly undergo some modification. It is perfectly true that Alexander the Great and Napoleon did not realize their ideal of a world-empire, but their failure was due, not to Divine intervention, but to the pressure of political and social forces at work in the minds of the majority of the people. Beyond all doubt the Reform Bill of 1832 has had consequences never dreamed of by the statesmen who drafted and piloted it through Parliament; but the Reform Bill was in its very nature calculated to produce the mighty changes that have come out of it. But this is Dean Baillie's explanation:—

In all these instances, and in all the instances we can name in public life, you see written the great warning, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons," because the Father is and always will be the Governor; he keeps in his own hand the government of the world. Men strive and struggle, they make schemes, they formulate plans: they fail: but God works on steadily, turning even their failures and their sins and their ignorance into the means of carrying on his great purpose. And he not only has done so in the past, but he will do so until all things are set under his feet.

What evidence is there that God "keeps in his own hand the government of the world"? The Dean does not know even that the God in whom he believes exists, nor can he single out one historical event and say, "This could have been brought about only by supernatural power." Nothing has ever happened in human history that transcended human capacity. Dr. Baillie probably believes in miracles, of which the Bible is full; it would be a miracle if he did not; but the curious thing is that, according to the teaching of the discourse under review, all events are either supernaturally directed, or supernaturally over-ruled. Failure crowns all human effort directed by human wisdom, but God converts the failure into means of fulfilling his own purpose. Moses, we are told, was a failure, and so was John the Baptist, though they were both God's servants. Never were the Jews to be what Moses had longed they might be; but never did the Jews become what Jehovah himself had designed them to be. Jehovah, too, was a failure, and so is the Christian Heavenly Father, for neither Jews nor Chris-

tians have ever reached the standard laid down for them. Christ is said to have appeared in the flesh in order to redeem the world from all its evils and wrongs; but he also was a failure:—

No failure was ever equal to his failure. He left no scheme for reconstructing society. He left no philosophy to guide men's intellect. He left no scheme of morality to govern their conduct. He left no organization. He left eleven men—bewildered, disheartened, conscious of failure, ignorant of the meaning of his life.

That is a true account of the Gospel Jesus, whether he ever lived or not. He was indeed a failure, and continues so to this day. It is amazingly easy to declare from a cathedral pulpit that Jesus is now "on the throne of God governing the world"; but if that is true, there is no possible escape from the conclusion that the world could not have a worse, or more incompetent, governor. The Dean waxes eloquent as he describes what Christ has done and does for his followers, how he gives them strength to face trial, persecution, and failure; but is he not aware that non-Christians exhibit like strength when tried, persecuted, and put to death for their views? Giordano Bruno was a Freethinker whom the Church cruelly maligned and at last burnt at the stake. He was ideally bold, facing his innumerable trials without flinching. Many attempts were made to secure from him a recantation of his heresies; he was in prison for seven years, untried; and when at last sentence of death was pronounced against him, he courageously addressed his judges, "With greater fear do you pass this sentence upon me than I receive it." Tens of thousands of unbelievers have been murdered by the Church. Most of them were offered life and liberty if they would recant, but they heroically preferred death as honest men to life and liberty as cowards. Unbelief has had its martyrs as well as belief, and the former, to say the least, were no less brave than the latter; but they did not pretend to derive their courage from above.

On the subject of over-ruled purposes, Dr. Baillie makes the following reference to the ex-Emperor of Germany:—

We have seen a man working with a constructive purpose, with great gifts and great opportunities, trying to establish a particular form of civilization and to make it universal as the world, and the fruit has been to disintegrate the whole civilization of the world, and leave us looking into the unknown future, a future which we can in no way gauge, with all kinds of forces at work which we cannot estimate or control.

Who over-ruled the ex-Kaiser's ambitious purpose? The preacher does not openly tell us; but from the whole drift of his sermon we are bound to infer that it was God, the King of kings. No other inference is possible. But how did God frustrate the proud designs of the Pan-Germans? By causing to be butchered several millions of young men belonging to about a dozen different nations. Has the Dean the temerity to believe in and worship a God who would do that, addressing him as the God of love? And the world-war was not a solitary instance of such interference on the part of the Deity. If he exists at all, that is how he has been acting from the beginning until now. History heaps infinite disgrace upon him. Dr. Baillie admits that in this twentieth Christian century the whole foundation of the world is shaken. The conditions of life are unspeakably bad, and "forces are at work which we cannot estimate or control." Does he imagine that the existing situation is creditable to the Supreme Being? He charges us with entertaining "an extraordinary confidence—a confidence which has no support in the experience of history—in what men are able to do in regulating human society"; but is it not

a fact that he himself cherishes "an extraordinary confidence—a confidence which has no support in the experience of history"—in what God is able to but does not do, in regulating human society? If Atheism is true, the history of the world is intelligible, and the present situation not in the least mysterious; but if Christian Theism is a reality, it is completely impossible to justify the ways of God with mankind. To say that he "sitteth as king for ever" is the worst blasphemy conceivable. Therefore to deny his existence is the most logical and honourable thing to do. It is an incontrovertible fact that, prior to the War, official Germany was distinguished for its deep-rooted piety. The Emperor was an orthodox and most enthusiastic Christian, and regarded himself as an instrument in God's hand. Is it conceivable that, if God existed, he would have allowed his servant to lead his people so far astray, and then turned round to punish both in so heartless and brutal a manner? The Great War is explicable only on the assumption that there is no God, and the same thing is true of the Peace Treaty also.

We know how the belief in God originated, and we can trace its evolution down to the present age; and we have no hesitation in characterizing it as a misleading, mischievous possession. It has been the cause of more strife, persecution, and bloodshed than all other factors combined. It is a source of great consolation, however, to know that it is rapidly losing its hold upon the human mind, and that Atheism is becoming the ruling creed of a constantly growing number of people.

J. T. LLOYD.

Modern Medicine-Men.

Stuffing the ears of men with false reports.—*Shakespeare.*

The services of the clergy are imaginary, and their payment should be of the same description.—*G. W. Foote.*

If asked, the average British citizen would agree cheerfully that Spain, Italy, and Ireland are priest-ridden countries; but he would deny vigorously that his native land was so afflicted. Yet there are about fifty thousand men in this country, each bearing the title of "reverend," who were exempted from military service, and who form a caste apart from their fellow-citizens. Who are they? What do they do to entitle them to be revered? In what way are they superior to other men who are ordinary citizens? These are questions which, in this crisis in the world's affairs, are worth the consideration of democrats.

It may be contended that this reverence is paid to these men because they have chosen as their business the religious supervision and direction of the British people. In reality they are medicine-men engaged in similar work to their coloured prototypes in savage nations. They tell us of "gods" who get angry with us; of a "devil" who must be guarded against; of "angels" who fly from heaven to earth; of "saints" who can assist if supplicated. Nearly fifty thousand quaintly attired gentlemen are engaged in this business, to say nothing of their tens of thousands of assistants and satellites. This, be it remembered, is in this country alone. If we include Continental countries and America, there are hundreds of thousands of them, maintained at a cost of hundreds of millions of money yearly. And their profession is no more honest than fortune-telling. Many a poor woman has been fined for taking money from an ignorant servant-girl, after promising her a handsome husband and six fine children,

but these reverend gentlemen are allowed to take large sums of money for promises of good fortune in the "beautiful land above."

Everyone knows that the average "reverend" enjoys a comfortable livelihood, and lives in a nice house. He has just as much, or as little, work as he likes to do, and if he chooses to spend three-fourths of each week-day reading or visiting, there is no one to say him nay. He can count on invitations to dinner and other hospitality all the year round, which is no small saving in the household expenses. And the higher clergy do better than that. Thirty-nine archbishops and bishops share £180,700 yearly, and the bachelor Bishop of London enjoys a salary of £300 weekly, a sum sufficient to keep fifty ordinary families in comfort.

Seeing that little merit attaches to the clerical profession, are we to assume that reverence is due to the exemplary lives led by those belonging to this specially favoured class of the community? The unbiased records of the Divorce and Police Courts show that the clerical character in no wise differs from any other class. They may retort that there are black sheep in every fold. True, but architects, lawyers, doctors, and other professional men do not pretend to be a sacred class apart from their fellows. They do not ask to be known as "reverend." It is because the clergy expect others to look up to them that we are compelled to compare their behaviour with their boastings. When they come down from their pedestals we will make the same allowance for them that we make for other men.

It appears, also, that these "reverend gentlemen," who were too proud to fight for their country, are many of them perjurers. The Anglican clergy, for example, subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. These articles include the belief that Adam was the first man; that Christ went down bodily to "hell"; that a spirit can be at one and the same time a father and also a son, and can further proceed from itself as a ghost; that Roman Catholic doctrine is a vain invention; that an Oriental book is the Word of God; and that the Monarch is the head of the Church of Christ. To these Articles of Faith, among others, every Church of England parson signs his name. And we know that numbers of them do not believe in them, nor observe them; and that their main reasons for remaining in the Church are "purple, palaces, patronage, profit, and power," as a former cheerful Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral expresses it. And the right to appoint clergymen to benefices is sold for money in the open market, as if it were so much coal, or a desirable villa residence.

We are told from countless pulpits that, now the world-war is over, the national religion is to be different from what we have known before. There is plenty of room for improvement. An occasional "labour service," the inclusion in the hymn-books of a couple of songs for the workers, and the suggestion that Christ was a labour leader, are simple humbug. And the word "reverend," as applied to the clergy, is also humbug. To apply it to the common clergyman, or to the purse-proud prelate, is as absurd as to apply the terms "All Highest" or "Imperial Majesty" to the pious decadent who brought disaster to the unfortunate Teutonic people.

MIMNERMUS.

Does Man Survive Death: Is the Belief Reasonable?

A Debate between Mr. Horace Leaf and Mr. Chapman Cohen, in the St. Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, Thursday, February 26, 1920. Chairman, Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell, LL.B.

IV.

(Concluded from p. 285.)

MR. LEAF'S THIRD SPEECH.

MR. HORACE LEAF: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Chapman Cohen is an unconscious humourist. (Laughter). And he is very serious while he does it. Another thing, he is a very learned man (hear, hear), on some things. (Laughter and Applause). He is the first man to know what hypnotism is. I happen to be well up in the theory, and I have in this particular town, on more than one occasion, given different lectures and demonstrations of it, and for the last ten years it has been more than a hobby of mine. I have made money out of it, and so I think I know something about it. Undoubtedly, auto-suggestion enters into it sometimes, but it is not yet decided whether there is fluid or magnetism. If Mr. Cohen had read closely Myer's work, he would find that Frederick Myers demonstrated the fact that a fluid must have been there; and there was the case in France of scientific men who hypnotized a person who did not know she was being hypnotized on the other side of a wall by making passes. (Applause). Another thing which he quickly dismissed shows that he is not well up in modern Spiritualism, for he said, "Why don't the spirits use a typewriter?" Dr. Crawford, of Queen's University, will inform him that they used it three years ago. (Applause). Do you notice how Spiritualists, he says, are deteriorating? They were much more clever twenty years ago, because they were saner; and everyone *he* agrees with is top-hole. If they do not agree with him, there is something wrong with them, and if they are Spiritualists he does not say they are insane, but they have got mental and nervous pathology. For, when he says that, he means to say it is a mental or nervous disease. He said, "Look at the people who saw the Russian Army going through London." I live in London. I can speak for Spiritualists. I never knew a Spiritualist who saw them. Flammarion said he was looking for evidence and could not find it. I challenge Mr. Chapman Cohen to prove these words. If the evidence he speaks of, as I understand it, was psychic phenomena, then, if I read Flammarion rightly, he had ample evidence of it, and he produced a photograph under strictly scientific conditions, and Flammarion said, "It is the most remarkable photograph of the kind that there is." I may say I do not know everything, but I am a specialist in Spiritualism; and I know what most of these people have said, and I did not say, nor did I endeavour to infer, that every scientist who investigated Spiritualism believed in it. I told you, when I made the statement, that of the scientists who had investigated it, many of them admitted the phenomena, they had no explanation of them, but others had accepted the Spiritualist's explanation as adequate. Am I not right? No Spiritualist need deceive you. Why? Modern Spiritualism is a new science. We do not expect to convert the world in seventy years. Atheism, or rather Materialism, has been in existence for thousands of years, and it has not converted the world yet. And, so, we need not grumble since we are only seventy years old. I know that mediums have been accused of fraud. I have known some of them personally, my personal friends, and I know that most of those who have been

accused of fraud, have been accused of fraud by people who did not understand enough of psychic science. You must understand that in all these things there must be laws, and a person who does not study the laws, for as little as they may be known, is likely to fall into error with quite good intentions; and when a person comes with a conviction that certain things cannot happen, and they do happen, he begins to try to find out how they happened, and, when he cannot find it out he says, "The person was too clever for me; he is a clever trickster." When Dr. Harvey discovered the function of the heart, you know that the medical world of his time practically flung him out of his profession; and, when he went abroad to demonstrate it to one of the greatest anatomists of the time, the old man refused to see the facts and Harvey walked out of the theatre. But you cannot accuse every medium of fraud. There is a book written by Sir William Barrett, F.R.S. He tells you in that book that he makes no reference to professional mediums. Every medium there was found to be genuine; and there were children, sometimes. They were all amateurs, and some of them were so desirous of avoiding notoriety that they would not agree to make public their names. I ask Mr. Chapman Cohen to try and become acquainted with mediums in his own family. We say to you, from what we have been able to discover, people may have mediums in their own family. Go to your own home and experiment, and, if you can find facts which prove that Spiritualism is wrong, come out and tell us, but if you find facts which prove that it is right, all that we ask is that you will be as honest as we have been, and come out and tell the world. (Applause).

MR. COHEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

MR. CHAPMAN COHEN: Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I cannot conceive why Mr. Leaf should keep on insisting that I said all Spiritualists are suffering from mental disease. I do not know what the motive is. I think I repudiated that just about as strongly as I could, and, when a man has to pick up a repudiated statement, it strikes one that he must be rather short of argument. I explained what I meant when I said we were all subject to hallucinations, delusions, and illusions, and I mentioned the Russian army. Mr. Leaf said they were not Spiritualists who saw them. I do not know, and I do not care whether they were or not. I only say they were good material for Spiritualists, and I suggest that Mr. Leaf starts operating on them. When a man believes a thing he has not seen, and convinces himself he has seen it, it seems to me he is very good material. Mr. Leaf, instead of thanking me for my suggestion, feels angry about it. He says scientists have not made up their minds whether there is a hypnotic fluid or not. But every scientific investigator says he has. It may be all very well in a public lecture, where people do not trouble about what is meant by fluid, or anything does, as when people talk about electric fluids, and some other fluid, but it will hardly rank as a scientific contribution to the question. He said that Professor Crawford used a typewriter three years ago. But, was that typewriter used, as I suggested, under test conditions, surrounded by a glass case? (Applause.) It is very easy using one phrase and forgetting the rest. Mr. Leaf said that those who were accused of fraud were accused by those ignorant of psychical laws. Now, really, Mr. Leaf, do you mean that when the professor's man caught hold of the woman's foot when masquerading as a spirit that it was a psychical law that she had to do it? When the medium in Professor Cook's case was found with a whole paraphernalia of deception, was that a psychical law? When a piece of the dress of the supposed materialized spirit was found and taken to a shop,

and found to be a piece of ordinary China silk, was that a psychical law? When another was found using slates for messages already written on them, when others are found with black beards and other things in a box, are they psychical laws? Does Mr. Leaf mean that psychical law is a fraud? That seems to be what he means. I know a little about Spiritualism. (Applause.) Mr. Leaf said that he does not expect to convert the world yet. He says you are getting fashionable. I daresay you are. But compared with about 250 years ago, you are not nearly so fashionable as witchcraft was. I am in Scotland, and I say that Spiritualism is not nearly so fashionable as witchcraft was then. These manias, or delusions, rise up and die away. Sooner or later they die. About 250 years ago you could have got some of the best educated men in Britain, Lord Chief Justices, doctors, lawyers, and, of course, parsons—they are always there. (Hisses and laughter.) Do not hiss the parsons. They could not help it. They were creatures of the time. You could have got all these men testifying to witchcraft, telling you of old women who went through the air on a broomstick, bewitched cows, who made children ill. I repeat—I am in Scotland, and the rage for Spiritualism is nothing to the other. In this country, and in most countries, if you get a number of men of acknowledged publicity to come forward and say a thing is true, you will always get a lot of support. Delusions rise up and die away, and how long they last and when they die depends entirely upon the mental environment and the culture of the people who encourage them. (Applause.) If you go into the depths of Africa, you can get various kinds of superstition that have lasted longer than any of the religions of the civilized world, longer than any Spiritualism has done. It is very curious that millions of people are being born and dying every year, and we are now just discovering the future life. Why! does it not strike you that if spirit communication were real, it ought to have been known to people long ago? Does it not strike you as very curious that, when all these spirits come back, they talk such absolute triviality, and never anything of value? It was not a spirit that told us about radium, but Madame Curie. What has become of these dead and gone chemists who only go over there to grow and realize themselves? They not only get littler and littler, but they forget all they learned here. Mr. Leaf says he is not discussing what the future life is like. But that is one of the tests. If you go abroad, a large number of the mediums say that you have reincarnation as a fact. In England, where it is not believed in, the spirits never tell you about reincarnation. All these messages come in terms of the environment. A Mohammedan medium would not tell you anything about Christianity, and a Christian medium would not tell you about Mohammedanism. Look at it broadly, and you have got at least the main lines of a rational explanation. Mr. Leaf said Materialism is older than Spiritualism, and yet we are only a few. I suppose we are. The sensible ones in a community are always the few. (Applause.) If common sense were as catching as stupidity, would the world be like what it is? (Applause.) A great historian of Materialism said that Materialism is as old as philosophy, but no older. It began when man began to think clearly and scientifically about the world. It went on, and took the terrors and superstitions that man had clustered around the stars and killed them, and gave laws of force and motion in place of spirits. It took the earth, which was supposed to be moulded in the hollow of God's hand, and you got geology, and step by step the terrors and the forces that superstition have woven into the human mind get dissipated. Some are still there. We have behind us and

in us generations of fear and superstition, terror and credulity, which cannot always be killed off, but may be reawakened in popular fashion; but step by step the fears disappear and the superstitions vanish, and ultimately man will be left erect where he once knelt, a monarch where he was once a slave, a master of the forces which he once feared, and, above all, king of his own destiny. (Applause.)

A vote of thanks to the Chairman, moved by Mr. Leaf, and seconded by Mr. Cohen, closed the proceedings.

Sheep and Socialists.

IN the social life of less educated British people the clergy still occupy a place of very considerable influence. There is no tyranny like the tyranny of superstition. People who prefer to take the easier course of "only believing," to the more difficult one of learning to know, necessarily proclaim themselves mentally dependents and parasites. People who have learned to think for themselves are able to tolerate many follies and eccentricities in human beings—many foibles, failings, and weakness. What does "get their goat" is to see so many men and women who are sheep!

If you can afford to advertise—to set a new catching fashion or boom a fancy religion—you are assured a following, if you just keep up an air of solemn superiority and knowing impressiveness. The public that is caught by your new stunt is one that likes to have its "daily thrill," so you must be in a position to cater for sensationalism. The staid old Calvinists are getting the go-by nowadays. The milk-and-watery Unitarian parsons who speak on "Socialist" platforms are thunderously applauded when they appear, and they are hailed from the chair as living proof of the sympathy that the "intellectual" professions have for the Socialist movement! Of course, if people are to be captured mentally and held to ransom on the captors' terms, it would be the height of stupidity to enlighten the general ignorance as to what Socialism really means and really is. Our twentieth-century Kingsleys and Maurices are living contradictions enough to make their antetypes turn in their graves. Christian Socialism has always been and is still a contradiction in terms. The genuine Socialist who has read his history knows perfectly well that there can be no genuine Socialism that is not godless. And men like Mr. Lloyd George know it too. That is why Mr. Lloyd George claims for his particular political party that it is a bulwark against what he chooses to call the menace and danger of Socialism. The "resources of civilization" are not exhausted, nor are the shots in the locker of Mr. Lloyd George all spent. We may depend upon it that when Socialism has cast off the encumbrances and impediments with which its "dear Christian friends" have loaded it, and there arises some great issue upon which Socialism will be placed upon trial, much will be heard about the irreligion, Atheism, and infidelity of Socialism.

It is popularly believed by many ignorant people that it is possible to be a Christian and a Socialist, and it pays the Churches to encourage the belief. Many "Christian Socialists" have no doubt been disturbed by Mr. Lloyd George's reference to Socialism as a menace and a danger—the writer does not believe it is either the one thing or the other—and now they are childishly repeating the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount to show Mr. Lloyd George that he is wrong. But these vain mouthings do not affect the progress of ideas. If the reactionaries—powerful as they may be—have chosen to throw down the gage to the progressives,

shall it not be taken up? Is there any vitality or virility in the reformers of our day if a self-appointed dictator shall be allowed to play fast and loose with the fundamentals of British freedom as we have known it? Do not let us delude ourselves; the Great War put back the clock of progress at least fifty years—that is to say, we were better off politically and socially in 1890 than we are now in 1920.

IGNOTUS.

Acid Drops.

Definite steps, says the newspapers, have been taken towards the formation of a trades union for clergymen. It is to be known as the National Clerical Union. That is very promising, and is a practical comment on the value of prayer. But a trade union is nothing without the strike, and we wonder if the clergy will attempt that? If they do how many will bother? Will people be seriously disturbed because they learn that the clergy at a special church have gone on strike for shorter hours or larger pay? Will they not be just as likely to regard it as a relief, and urge them to keep it up? They may even convert the strike into a lockout. We see very great possibilities in this National Clerical Union. Jesus said that where his disciples went they were to take neither purse nor script. The new rule will be, "But don't forget your trade union card."

The dear Christians are past masters at using fair words to make converts, but the following quotation from the *Torch*, the organ of the Industrial Christian Fellowship, is hard to beat: "Our Holy Redeemer was Himself a skilled workman, and, be sure, tables and chairs and window-frames never had sounder workmanship put into them than in the shop in Nazareth." "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" From the Egyptian Isis to the Ever-Blessed-Wielder-of-the-Jack-Plane, religious history is indeed a comedy of errors.

The Bishop of London adds gaiety to a dull nation. "There is many a man in England who has never seen a parson face to face," declares his lordship. Does this mean that the men of God usually call whilst the men are at work?

The *Church Times* is surprised that, while many of the Labour leaders are sincere Christians, "many thousands of the rank and file.....would indignantly repudiate the name of Christian." Perhaps the secret of the situation is that the rank and file are less concerned with pleasing certain outsiders and groups of outsiders, and so can afford to display more courage than many of the leaders. The *Church Times* consoles itself with printing a resolution passed by a "Labour Assembly" in the Ohio Valley, affirming the belief that the teachings of Christ afford a platform upon which all men can agree, and that they can be applied to the industrial problem. Well, they have been applied to the industrial problem. The people have been told that it was their duty to pay no thought to the morrow, that they were to turn one cheek when the other was smitten, that the poor were blessed, that the powers that be must be obeyed, etc. We have had the teachings of Christ applied to the industrial problem, and those who are most concerned in its application don't like it. Hence the trouble, in spite of the Ohio Valley resolution—which has rather too much of a chapel taste to be genuine.

The *Daily Express* notes that some sixty years ago, when British troops were engaged in civilizing the Maoris, the Maori chief heard that General Cameron and his troops were short of food. So they sent him down some potatoes and milch goats. They said there was no glory in fighting starving men. Of course, they were uncivilized heathens. Had they been civilized Christians, they would have established an economic blockade, and, by starving the women and children, forced the men to submit. Then they would have repaired to church to thank God for having given them so glorious a victory. Presumably, the Maoris have got over

their foolish habits, and have now learned to fight in a "civilized" manner.

A madman shot and instantly killed a member of the congregation at St. George's Episcopal Church, New York. After his capture, he said that the minister had made an urgent appeal to the people, and he himself wanted to help him wake them up. With this idea he shot the man who was an entire stranger to him. This is almost as good as the story of the organist in a far western church in the days of the gold rush. He had a placard hung prominently over the organ-loft bearing the words: "Please do not shoot, the organist is doing his best."

Reporting the utterances of a Portsmouth parson on "suicide," the *Evening News* (London) commented: "The vicar may be speaking the truth; but it is not the truth that he should speak." A Yellow Press penman ought to be an authority on handling the truth.

A Hindoo temple and a Mohammedan mosque are to be erected on the French battlefields in memory of Indian soldiers who died in the War. A gentle reminder that Christians are not the only pebbles on the beach.

The National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (New York) issues a ghastly account of the treatment of the negroes in the United States. In thirty years, it is stated, from 1889 to 1919, lynching mobs murdered 3,224 persons, of whom 2,522 were negroes. Last year seventy-eight negroes were lynched—eleven being burned alive. The report says that the "time of lynching was announced in advance in papers, and men and women and children flocked to take part in these 'lynching bees.'" From a Memphis paper the following is cited: "They fought and screamed and crowded to get a glimpse of him, and the mob closed in and struggled around the fire as the flames flared high and the smoke rolled over their heads. Two of them hacked off his ears as he burned." The horror of such scenes is almost unbelievable. We know from our own correspondence that it is a calumny on the American people to believe that public opinion supports this kind of brutality, it is nothing but the expression of spasmodic mob rule. All the same it exists, it has for its basis the egotism of the white race—which Christianity has done so much to encourage, and it is a comment on the humanitarian character of the American Churches. How many of them have spoken out plainly and persistently against the perpetuation of this horror?

The Matrimonial Causes Bill is pursuing its way in the (comparatively) advanced House of Lords, in spite of the hostile resolution of the (relatively) backward House of Commons. And it is interesting to note how the most unfeeling comments on the measure come from the Bishops and their supporters. Thus, it would seem that a clear and undeniable case for divorce is where one of the parties is insane. But the pious Duke of Northumberland opposed this provision in the Bill. He argued that such a provision—the party must be in confinement as a lunatic for five years before a divorce will be granted—would dangerously weaken the solemn and binding character of the marriage ceremony, and the Archbishop of York said that they ought not to inflict upon the insane person the "additional misfortune of divorce." That is about as fine a piece of cock-eyed reasoning as one could get. And the significant thing is that all that prevents these men taking a sensible view of the matter is their religion. When religion operates there is nothing too absurd for men to champion.

The bottom truth is that we are up against a type of mind developed by a religion that is fundamentally in opposition to all marriage, and which only admits it in order, as St. Paul pointed out, to avoid a worse state of things. And until the influence of Christianity is reduced to impotence, not alone in relation to marriage but in relation to the whole of social life, shall we have paved the way for a reasonable consideration and a just settlement of the marriage and other

social questions. The poison must be eradicated before a state of complete health is possible.

The English Church Union is, of course, against Lord Buckmaster's Bill, and, equally of course, it says some very idiotic things in connection with its opposition. Thus, at the meeting of the Scarborough Branch of the League, the Rev. W. F. Ramsden said that the Bill would legalize polygamy—which is absolute nonsense. Polygamy is the legal marrying of more than one wife at a time. To divorce one wife and marry another cannot by any possibility be called polygamy. And the statement is just one more illustration of how impossible it is to get a real Christian to give an honest statement of any position to which he is opposed. To those who can read the situation aright, there is in such a case an illustration of the socially evil consequences of the prevalence of the type of mind encouraged by Christianity.

Mrs. Bramwell Booth, in an article in a daily paper, tells a story of a Salvation Army officer who conducted a service at a South African prison. The organist was a murderer, and the remainder of the congregation were charming people undergoing life-sentences. The story goes that "of the number present, over sixty definitely decided for Christ." Comment would be cruel.

In a leading article, one of the Yellow Press publications speaks of the "Salvation Army's great record of spiritual salvage among the fallen." We suppose editors are usually kind to advertisers, but they need not lay the flattery on with a trowel.

A very interesting article appears in the April issue of *Discovery* on "The Date of the Nativity." The article is by Prof. W. M. Calder, and the conclusion is that the date must be taken as 6, 7, 8, or 9, B.C. But the article commences with the remark: "It is well known that Christ was born before the date of the 'birth of Christ' which forms the starting-point of the Christian Era." "Well known" is rather amusing in view of the fact that there are very grave doubts whether he was ever born at all. The probability is that the character is quite mythical, and, therefore, is without a birthday, save so far as a myth can be said to have a beginning. All it means is that as some date must be found, and as the New Testament date is wrong on the evidence available—that is that no such person as the Gospel Jesus can be shown to have existed, the next thing is to try and find some other date that does not admit of clear disproof.

Dr. Mary Carmichael Stopes, in protesting against the lumping together of the husband's and wife's income for purpose of income tax, says that "the first business of a moral country basing its social life on Christian marriage is to stop the direct marriage tax." We do not like to be rude to a lady, but this is sheer twaddle. Are we a moral country? Do we really base our social life on Christian marriage? Dr. Stopes professes to deal with marriage and the relationship of the sexes on a rationalistic basis, and she really ought to be above such childish comments. Our marriage laws and our social life are both influenced by Christianity, but neither are based upon it. To say they are is to merely echo the verbiage of the pulpit. And wherever that influence is clearly traceable, it can be shown to have an influence that is anything but beneficial. There can be no real reform until reformers muster up courage enough to tell the truth about the prevailing superstition.

A large illustration of the Prince of Wales attending a Church service on board the *Renown* appeared in the *Daily News* the other day. The letterpress informed the readers that nothing could be more impressive than a service at sea with the sailors joining heartily in the singing. The letterpress should have added that it is part of the Prince of Wales's business to attend the service, and that the sailors are forced to attend whether they will or no. And it would have been still more illuminating had the *Daily News* pub-

lished the words that the sailors often sing so heartily to the hymn tunes, and also given some of the sailors' comments when the crew is ordered to attend. Apparently the whole point of the illustration is to satisfy the idiotic craving of a section of the public to look upon a picture of a human being with the magic name of "Prince" underneath. No wonder that people are so easily fooled.

One finds the truth in the most unexpected places. The *Modern Churchman* says, "The clergy seem to feel that the one hope is to get the child confirmed at the earliest possible age, and before he is old enough to think for himself." That is, of course, the exact state of affairs. And it is the bottom reason why there is all the outcry about keeping religion in the schools. The child must be captured if there is to be any prospect to replenish the company of the Churches. You may convert a man from Christianity, you never convert a man to it. It is the child or nothing. Religion altogether is an infantile complaint. It began in the infancy of the race, and it can only be inculcated during the infancy of the individual.

"The price of one tyre—for God!" So ran the heading to an advertisement in the *Christian World*, and, at first sight, we wondered if they had taken to motoring in heaven, and the Lord was feeling the high cost of rubber. But it turned out to be only an appeal on behalf of the London Missionary Society that people should give the price of a tyre to—not God, but to the missionaries, and most people will hardly take the two as synonymous. Why on earth God can't do as he wishes without we poor humans making a collection on his behalf is more than most of us can understand.

The Vicar of Leeds has, we see, invited a "well-known Labour man" to occupy the Parish Church pulpit on a forthcoming Sunday. Some people may regard this as a change on the part of the clergy. But it is not. The clergy never change. And the more they alter, the more they remain the same. They are simply opportunists, and they will take up with almost anything that suits their game. Just now Labour is booming, and the clergy are trying to make use of it. Many Labour men seem to think that they are advancing their cause in playing to the clergy. Some think, we suspect, that they are advancing themselves. And we respect most the intelligence of the latter. For the man who thinks that he can help the cause of Labour by allying himself with the clergy is, as Voltaire said of Habbakuk, capable of anything.

In a leading article, the *Daily Mail* referred to "social and religious science." We have heard of "Christian Science," but this appears to be a Carmelite Street novelty.

"Teachers are treated meanly, overworked, underpaid, and insufficiently respected," says Mr. H. G. Wells. The distinguished novelist would use stronger language if he knew the conditions of the teachers in Church schools.

The *Daily News* has been supplying sketches of some of the Labour Mayors in London. One of them remarked to the interviewer: "I've been a Socialist and an Agnostic all my life, but I've nothing against the Church. We all went officially to church on Mayor's Sunday, but we didn't have any ridiculous procession." We hope that most of the new Mayors are of a little better mental type than is indicated by this interview, or perhaps the interviewer has got things mixed up. But an Agnostic who has nothing against the Church, who goes to church on Mayor's Sunday, and assumes that it is all right because they had no procession, is a curious figure. A Socialist and an Agnostic might ask himself by what right he sanctions the association of a civic office with a religious ceremony, and whether it is not incumbent upon him to do what he can to disestablish religion in civic life. But some people seem to spend their time in considering how far they can sink their own principles in order to please those who show little right to consideration. One day, when all Freethinkers act as though they had principles that were of value, Christians will respect their rights. They will not do so before.

To Correspondents.

"FREETHINKER" SUSTENTATION FUND.—Mrs Alice Lee, 10s.

W. LAURIE writes to inform us that he some time ago set himself the task of seeing that those who lived near him and wished to have the *Freethinker* weekly, got it. He now takes five copies to readers who did not take it before. He suggests that if someone could be found in every locality to adopt the same policy, an appreciable increase in circulation would be soon effected. We pass on the suggestion for the consideration of our readers.

F. S. KEEBLE.—Pleased that you are receiving your paper regularly, and that new readers are coming along. We can do with all we can get. The matter can be left as you suggest; it is quite satisfactory to us.

J. McILVAINE (Dublin).—We are always ready to consider articles for publication, but we cannot promise immediate insertion, even if we approve the article sent. But we quite agree with the general tenor of your letter.

H. MARTIN.—We don't see what we can do unless some local friends are willing to help with local arrangements. We are always, granting that condition, ready to give a hand to any Freethought work that may be undertaken.

C. HARPUR.—Our comment on the Carmelite convent was not concerned with avoidance of meat eating, but with the unnatural sequestration of the nuns from intercourse with the world of men and women, and the unwholesome dwelling upon religious dogmas. Under these conditions almost anything is possible.

CAN any of our readers give the reference to a poem in which the lines—

"So here's to you, my brave Hussar,
My exquisite old soldier,"

occur? One of our readers is anxious to get the information.

A. RUSSELL.—We are obliged for a glance at the correspondence. We quite agree with you that unless the Labour Movement deals with religion, religion will deal with the Labour Movement. At present most of its leaders appear to be in a mortal funk lest they should offend the clergy, who are bluffing them with the profound attachment the people have for religion. And that is best part bunkum.

L. SOMERTON LOVE.—Glad to get your letter. We are sending out the copies weekly as you suggest. We have many readers in India, but not nearly so many as we might have.

H. MOSLEY.—You may tell your informant that he is either lying or repeating a lie. We never in our life told a Christian Evidence lecturer to go to hell. Why should we? The people there have done us no particular injury that we know of.

C. T. SHAW.—Shall be pleased to meet you at the Birmingham Conference. We are looking forward to a good gathering of friends on that occasion. We have often pointed out the careful way in which our press avoids saying anything about the Atheism of noted foreign statesmen and others. They sometimes venture on calling them Agnostics, although that is a term the men themselves never used. Why not use Bradlaugh's own motto of "Thorough"? We haven't a copy of Bradlaugh's pamphlet on the Land Question, or would send it.

H. BLACK.—Thanks for cuttings. As we expected very little notice was taken of Spencer's anniversary by the general press. And much of what was said was very ill informed. Had Spencer adopted the verbiage of the theologian or metaphysician, he would have been better treated. It was the definite nature of his ideas that did the greatest service to his contemporaries, which enabled his successors to improve upon his position in certain instances.

J. BACKHOUSE.—We note that *John Bull* is opposed to clerical influence in the schools. But in our opinion there is only one way of securing that it shall not be there, and that is by the complete abolition of religious instruction in all State schools. What is usually meant by the abolition of clerical influence means no official influence. But it will always be there, exerted by either parson or minister, so long as religion is there.

Mrs. J. H. HINDLEY.—Thanks. See "Acid Drops."

J. F. AUST AND H. R. WRIGHT.—Next week.

J. RATCLIFFE.—There is no question of the Darwinian Theory being disproved; it is only a question of how far it is alone adequate to account for the development of new species, or granting that, is it the sole mode of production? The writings of both Darwin and Haeckel on that topic need to be read in conjunction with recent scientific work.

C. LEWIS.—See "Sugar Plums."

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.

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.

All Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed "London, City and Midland Bank, Clerkenwell Branch."

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

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

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, 15s.; half year, 7s. 6d.; three months, 3s. 9d.

Sugar Plums.

We hope that N.S.S. Branches and others are making their preparations for the Annual Conference at Birmingham on Whit Sunday, May 23. The conference is open to all members of the N.S.S., who should bring their membership cards with them. The meetings will be held in the Repertory Theatre. The morning and afternoon meetings will be of a business character. In the evening there will be a demonstration, addressed by Messrs. Cohen, Lloyd, Moss, Williams, and others. This will be an excellent chance for Freethinkers to introduce Christian friends.

On the Monday there will be an excursion to Stratford-on-Avon. Visitors who intend joining in the pilgrimage to Shakespeare's birthplace should send in their names as early as possible. They should also write—without delay—saying what hotel accommodation they require. The Local Secretary is Mr. J. Partridge, 245 Shenstone Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham.

The Secretary of the National Union of Journalists (Manchester Branch) reminds us that we are not correct in saying as we did that the increased expense in bringing out this paper has nothing to do with payment to editor and contributors as they have no trade union. There is a Union of Journalists. We confess our error, but it doesn't affect the substantial truth of the statement. We are quite sure that neither the editor nor the contributors will ever go on strike for more money, and we are equally certain that if they did they couldn't have it. For not even a trade union can get what doesn't exist. And, up to the present, we don't think that the quality of the paper has suffered on that account. There is a saying that what one gets for nothing is worth exactly what is paid for it; and it may be true in some directions. On the other hand, it is very often the case that the best work in the world, and the work in which one takes the greatest interest, is that which one does from the sheer love of the work.

The most pathetic sufferers from the "Great" War, in our opinion, are the blinded soldiers. And it is a national disgrace that these men should be left with a grievance rankling in their minds. But the grievance is there, and some 250 men recently marched 200 miles to bring home to the people the fact. The march was followed by a demonstration in Trafalgar Square, to ventilate the general question of the treatment of the blind by the Government. As a meeting, the gathering was a successful one, but the *Daily Herald* noted that there was not a single minister of religion who figured in the proceedings. We note that our old friend Mr. Wilson, who has so often placed his brakes at the disposal of the N.S.S. for demonstrations, was as generous as ever in this direction, and a brakeful of blind men and women, collected by Miss Vance from the workhouse, formed a part of the gathering. We trust that the demonstration

will effect what it aims at. Blindness is the one thing about which there can be no deception, and the care of the blind should be one of the first charges on the community.

One of our readers, Mr. T. C. Shaw, of 64 Worcester Street, Wolverhampton, has issued a postcard bearing on one side a well-executed portrait of Thomas Paine. He is supplying them, post free, at 8 for 6d., 45 for 2s. 6d., and 100 for 5s. They are very suitable for correspondence, and calculated to do a quiet propaganda on their own account.

Among the publications that were suspended owing to War conditions was the *Venture*, which now makes its reappearance as a literary and sociological monthly. The *Venture* offers a pleasing blend of prose and verse, combined with independent views of life and its happenings. It is now issued at the price of sixpence, and we wish it a prosperous and useful career. We notice that among its writers—although they do not appear in this issue—are Messrs. A. F. Thorn, W. Repton, and G. E. Fussell. The publishing office is 6 Nelson Street, Bristol, but it may be ordered through any newsagent.

The Atonement Humbug.

The doctrine of the atonement, which is an inseparable concomitant of the Christian religion, is one of those numerous constituent follies which, taken in the gross, form the one gigantic folly called Christianity. Presumably the atonement is one of those religious and moral truths that man could never have hit upon for himself, and for which, consequently, a divine revelation was necessary. As, however, the doctrine of the atonement is a very absurd, irrational, and monstrously unjust belief, those who think it impossible for man to have conceived it must have a higher opinion of the general rationality of mankind than seems at all warranted by a study of the history of the human race. It seems highly probable, to say the least, that such a very puzzle-headed doctrine as the atonement *did* have its origin in the poor puzzled and puzzling brain of man. Not that it originated fully formed in the mind of any one individual. No dogma or doctrine ever did that. Every religious doctrine and dogma in its modern shape is the outcome of generations of human thought and speculation playing upon the central germ of the particular doctrine or dogma. Christians who absurdly and unnecessarily tell us that no one could have "invented" the teaching of Christianity or the figure of the Christ are only betraying their ignorance of the fact that there is evolution in the realm of ideas as well as in the world of matter. The doctrine of the atonement of Christ is but the modernized, refined and sublimated survival of the primitive savage's sacrifice to his gods or to the spirits of his ancestors. The belief—like all other beliefs—had a perfectly natural origin in the dim and distant past. To-day it is reminiscent of a barbarism that assorts ill with our more highly-developed sense of justice.

There are various explanations of the Christian doctrine of the atonement. Common to all the explanations is the central idea that an innocent person can form an acceptable and adequate substitute for a guilty one. Such a theory is utterly abhorrent to our sense of what is just and right. Waiving for the present any consideration of whether man has any need to seek reconciliation with God

or to endeavour to ward off his vengeance, the ends of justice can never be served by the suffering of the innocent. That is a rule to which we can admit of no exception, if we are to retain a clear and consistent conception of the principles of justice. That the innocent *do* suffer owing to the conduct of others over whom they have no vestige of control, is a truth sufficiently obvious to any observer, but we accept this as part of the order of nature. Certain actions lead to certain consequences, and nature is supremely indifferent as to the moral guilt or innocence of the sufferers. But it is quite another matter to ascribe an expiatory virtue to the sufferings of the innocent. There is no warrant whatever for such ascription.

Curiously enough, it is from the critical standpoint of the freethinker and not from that of the Christian that the immolation of Christ on Calvary for the sins of men can be made to square with the principle of justice. Because if Christ were God, and if God made the world and all it contains, then He is responsible for mankind and for all the evil that man has perpetrated since his creation. So that the execution of God on Calvary was really the execution of the guilty party in the whole business. Though as one of the results of the crucifixion was to send God expeditiously back to the joys of that heaven which he had left only for the short space of thirty years or thereabouts, it seems scarcely a case of making the punishment fit the crime. But at any rate there is here furnished a slight basis of justification for the death of Christ; a basis of justification that is absolutely inconceivable on the Christian hypothesis that he was an *innocent* victim. As God, He was responsible for all that has happened, and may therefore be adjudged guilty. The foregoing suggestion has been offered more than once to such Christians as find a difficulty in reconciling the atonement with a strict conception of justice, but they have not welcomed the hint with any indication of profound gratitude.

So good a religious authority as Cardinal Newman confessed his complete inability to conceive how the justice and anger of God could be appeased by the sacrifice of an innocent victim. Of course he believed the doctrine—as he was bound to do—nevertheless. The only superficially plausible excuse made by the orthodox believer is that God's standpoint is different from ours, and His standard of justice not as ours is. This plea—though it satisfies countless thousands—is really arrant nonsense. Its acceptance tacitly implies the negation of all sane reasoning and argument. Because if God's justice is something different from our ideal of justice, then it is idle to talk of justice at all. We do not know what justice is. When we ascribe the attributes justice, mercy, and love, to God, we attach the same meaning to those attributes as we do when we say a human being is just and merciful and loving. Otherwise, our words are meaningless and our ideas chaotic.

There has been uttered a tremendous amount of cant, bathos and false sentiment in connection with the alleged sufferings and death of Christ. The oceans of tears and cheap rhetoric that have been poured forth over the fate of Jesus, during the last eighteen hundred years, are appalling to contemplate. Yet when you come to think upon it calmly, thousands of men and women (one should rather say millions) since the race of man appeared on

our planet, have endured ever so much more than Christ is reported to have suffered, and have died much more cruel and horrible deaths than that of the cross. Not only so, but a great proportion of the human beings who have been tortured and done to death in the world's history have had their pains and torments inflicted on them in the name of Christ and Christianity, and for the glory of God. This is one of the reasons that induce us to love Christianity and Christ and the churches with a love that passes all understanding.

In any case, what was this much-vaunted sacrifice on the part of Christ? There seems **nothing** stupendously praiseworthy or remarkable about it. In the circumstances it is difficult to see how Christ, as the son of God, or God, could do less than He did. Surely he could afford to leave his eternity of bliss for a few brief years in order to redeem a world which He had allowed to go wrong, and to save the souls of countless millions of men, women, and children from eternal hell fire. Especially as He knew He was going right back to heaven as soon as He had accomplished His task. Why, so far from falling down in worship of Christ because of what He did for the world, it should seem—since He was the only one who could do it—that He would have been an infernal monster if He had not done it. As for the reputed magnitude of His sufferings, there have been mere ordinary men who have faced and suffered far more than Christ did for just the love of a woman or for the sake of truth and honour; and without the assurance of eternal happiness He is supposed to have possessed. When I think of the inane drivel which I have read and to which I have listened in connection with this so-called supreme sacrifice of Calvary, I am inclined either to be angry or to laugh. Perhaps it is better to do the latter, though it is not easy to regard Christian absurdities with patience.

Christians have spoiled any sweetness or pathos that might otherwise have attached to the figure of Christ by making a God of Him. A crucified man we could contemplate with sympathy and sorrow, but why should we weep for a crucified god? And if we consider Him solely as a man, He was only one amongst untold millions. The figure of Bruno, murdered by the Church of Rome in one of the most cruel fashions, is a much more pathetic picture than that of the Christ. Bruno went in calm and lonely grandeur to his awful doom without any consoling belief in the supernatural, or hope of a glorious resurrection, or expectation of eternal bliss as the reward of a few hours constancy. His sole source of strength lay in his belief in the truth of his opinions.

Unlimited exaggeration has characterised the conception of Jesus fostered by the Christian Church throughout the centuries. In particular the Roman Catholic Church still does everything possible to intensify in her adherents sympathy and pity for Christ in his death and passion. All sorts of legends have been grafted on the gospel story. Children are gravely taught that Jesus was so peculiarly constituted physically that he was more susceptible to pain than any other man who ever lived. They are informed that the palm of Christ's hand was as tender as the surface of an ordinary person's eyeball. Other nonsense of a similar description is put forward with a view to magnifying the extent of his suffering. It was

revealed to Saint Bridget (so we are assured) that during his scourging he received over 5,000 stripes. One wonders how he survived the ordeal if his body were such a delicate organism as is alleged. Doubtless God, His Father, gave him strength to endure it, just as he requires to enable the damned in hell to support *their* torment. It all seems very funny to any one who can view it from a detached standpoint. If Roman Catholics would only bring to bear upon their religious beliefs the sense of humour they employ in other directions what a mighty change we should witness!

GEORGE SCOTT.

Spiritualism, A Temporary Symbol.

II.

(Concluded from p. 268.)

Before he became conscious, man was, just like the animals, a bundle of reactions to his environment, which were not consciously controlled, but were efficient. These reactions have been left to him since he became conscious, but they have been superseded by his conscious intelligence, which is an instrument enabling him to rise above his environment, and to overcome any disadvantage to his existence it may present. At the same time the muscular reactions which are the heritage of his earlier life, are still exceedingly useful, and are consequently used. An instance is the flicker of an eyelid which covers the delicate eye quite spontaneously, without any volitional action, when a fly approaches. Naturally this spontaneous muscular action is not always successful in its purpose of excluding the fly, but it very frequently is. Another is the unconscious clenching of fist and punch of arm, which almost inevitably follows immediately a blow is threatened. If the blow falls upon the body, the volition is called upon to direct reprisals, but the primary action will readily be admitted to belong to the class of unconscious reactions.

For the ordinary conduct of his life man is dependent to-day upon his conscious intelligence, and it is this part of the mind which has been most closely studied. By means of this intelligence, which is an instrument always available for use upon the work to which it is adapted, man directs his body and his industry. By it he has built up that structure, which he is pleased to call civilisation, and has produced all the ramifications and complexities of modern life.

But beyond this there is a part of mind to the complete comprehension of which man has not yet come. Out of this part of the mind, unknown, unusable, except when it cares to be useful, when a concatenation of circumstances arises which enables it to be used, come all the wondrous works of man which are grouped under the head of creative work, and regarded as the result of inspiration. This part of mind it is becoming increasingly usual to call the superconscious mind. It does not seem to be available, it does not seem yet to be an instrument in the hand of man as is the conscious mind, but it is in a sort of vacillating, occasional communication with the consciousness, which seems to be able to apprehend its assistance under the most exceptional circumstances only.

Yet it is possible in some sort to make appointments with this part of the mind, and to say that at such and such a time it shall be used on creative work, which shall be inspirational in its value. Such appointments are perhaps only possible to those exceptional human minds which are regarded as being endowed with the quality of genius, but it is in the extension of comprehension and use of this part of mind that man's evolution is bound to have its future.

At the same time, it is often the result of inspiration to feel that it is not received by virtue of the use of some little known part of self, but from some outside source. "There is a common term to be found in the three main types of emerging super-self: artistic genius, intellectual genius as found either in the engineer or the philosopher, and moral genius. Each is a kind of mediumship. I am not going to enter here upon a discussion of mediumship as it is understood or misunderstood, as the case may be, by spiritualists; but the genius of every type is familiar with the impression that he is being used in moments of semi-conscious exaltation, as a vehicle of something not himself, and very much greater than himself. According to the psychology we have been tracing, this something is the super-self; and it is not surprising that the super-self, which enters so little into the ordinary phases of consciousness, should give the impression of a personality distinct from and greater than one's own."

This impression, although it is perhaps more frequent in the case of genius, is not an uncommon one, and more especially is it that of what may be called the psychic type. And combined with this experience, the recent realisation of death, factitious though its immediacy was, has lent to the existing mentality of man a sort of evidence, based largely upon desire, to support his wish that the mind is not destroyed at death, and that if he can only find the way, he can communicate with the minds of those whose bodies are no longer living.

The position is very similar to that of just conscious man, who endowed each stock and stone with a separate and individual deity. Man to-day has no real comprehension of the power of the super-conscious mind to bring into the conscious realm under certain evocative conditions, resplendent and luminous memories, which shall have all the appearance of being received from without instead of being conjured from within by a means not grasped. And the character of inspiration is so widely divergent at different times that it is easy to believe that the external agents are plural. Moreover, since man's most potent emotion is love of his fellow—deny it who can—it is natural that he should believe that these agencies are those of his beloved friends or relatives who have passed away from him, but are, nevertheless still existing in some different and better circumstances.

In the course of the attempt to prove the truth of this assertion various mechanical devices are used, and the publicity which is being given to the results cannot fail to lead to the more complete exploration of the super-conscious mind. Those who believe now cannot fail to follow the path of the explorers, and with the widening comprehension and increasing use of that mysterious part of the mind, the psychic problems produced by spirit-

ualism, will be found to be problems not of communication with external agents of more power and more beautiful conceptions than man, but to be a symbol, which man, not understanding the range of his intelligence and the possible beauty of his ideas, has seen fit to set up for those qualities of his own mind, which he cannot at present fully use, and whose boundaries he is unable to conceive.

G. E. FUSSELL.

Pages from Voltaire.

A DRAMATIC MEDLEY.

A Jesuit (preaching to the Chinese).—My dear brethren, I say unto you that our Lord would have all men to be his chosen vessels; it is for you to say if you will be one of these vessels; all you need to do is to believe at once in what I tell you; you are the masters of your minds and your hearts, your thoughts and your feelings. Jesus Christ died on the cross for you, and grace is bestowed upon you all. If you have no contrition,¹ then you have attrition; if attrition be not in you, then you have your own spiritual strength, and mine.

A Jansenist comes along.—You lie, you son of Escobar—and of hell; you preach error and falsehood. No! although Jesus Christ died for all men, grace is bestowed only on a few; your attrition is rank stupidity; the spiritual strength of the Chinese is of no avail, and your prayers are worth nothing—for Augustine and Paul—

Jesuit.—Silence, you heretic! Run away, you enemy of St. Peter! Brethren, hear not this forger of new things, who quotes Augustine and Paul; come all to me, and be baptised.

Jansenist.—Beware, my brethren; be not baptised by the hands of a Molinist, for you will surely be damned to all eternity. I will baptise you in less than a year, as soon as I have taught you the true doctrine of grace.

A Quaker.—My friends, be ye not baptised with the paw of a fox or the claw of a tiger. Hear what I say to ye; it is better not to be baptised at all; such is the custom in our Western Church. Baptism may be good; but we can just as well do without it. All ye need is that the Spirit should be within ye. Wait patiently, and it will come to ye, and it will bring ye more blessings in one moment than a lifetime of words from the mouth of a charlatan.

An Anglican.—What wild beasts are these that have come to devour you, O my flock? My beloved sheep, you must know that the Anglican Church is the only true Church. Have you not been told these things by our missionaries who come to Canton to drink punch?

Jesuit.—Anglicans are schismatics; they have renounced our Pope, and the Pope is infallible.

A Lutheran.—Your pope is an ass, as Luther said, my beloved brethren. My brother Chinamen, you will be wise to laugh at these Anglicans, these Molinists, these Jansenists, and these Quakers, and believe only in the Lutherans. Say but these words, *in, cum, sub*; and drink of the best.

A Puritan.—My brethren, I grieve over the blindness of these men, and over yours too. But, God be praised! the eternal has ordained that I should come over here at the right moment, in order to confound these babblers; that you should hear me, and that you should celebrate Christ's last supper here this very morning: for you know that in the fourth century—

A Mussulman.—By the death of the Prophet what strange talk have we here! If one of these dogs should

¹ Sorrow for having committed sin, not because of the sin itself, but because of the punishment attached to it.

take to howling I shall clip off his ears; as for his prepuce, I would not give myself the trouble. It is you my brother Chinaman that I want to circumcize; I give him a week to prepare for it, and if he drinks a drop of wine after that operation he will reckon with me.

A Jew.—Ah, my children! if you want to be circumcized let me perform this operation for you; I will let you drink as much wine as you wish; but if you are wicked enough to eat the flesh of the hare, which, as you know, is a animal that chews the cud and has a cloven hoof, I will slay you with the sword if I happen to be the stronger, or, if you prefer it, I will stone you to death; for. —

Chinaman.—By Confucius and the Five Kings, surely all these folk must be stark mad! Come here, O Controller of our madhouses, and have these raving idiots shut up each in a separate cell.

Englished by GEORGE UNDERWOOD.

Correspondence.

THE ETHICAL CODE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—There are more laws than *one* for the rich and *one* for the poor. A legal enactment must necessarily bear upon different persons with as many different degrees of hardness as there are varieties of financial, family, and other circumstances, physical health, fortitude, sensitiveness, reputation to lose, etc.

But it is hardly with this phase of the question that I was trying to deal in the correspondence to which Mr. Fothergill and Mr. Fussell have replied. Nor was I discussing whether law-givers and law-maintainers are corrupt or incorruptible. I was rather endeavouring to convince readers of the *Freethinker* (1) that a majority vote cannot make a wrong thing right or a right thing wrong, (2) that majority rule is just as much a tyranny as any other form of government, and (3) that a moral right which does not inhere in any individual voter cannot be transferred to a "representative" by any body of such voters, no matter how great a majority they may constitute. You cannot transfer what you haven't got.

The theory of democracy is as absurd as that of the appleseller who declared that she lost money on every apple she sold, but it was the quantity that paid.

Thus a tax-collector, if he only knew it, poor fellow, is only a common thief. But it is we, with our childish theories of "rights of kings" and "rights of majorities," who have made him a thief, just as, with our fairy-tales about Gods and future lives, we have made the clergyman a talker of nonsense. If the people were not fools, the clergyman would have to talk usefully and rationally in order to live.

Of course, having duped the lender into lending, we are morally bound to discharge the terrible load of debt that the tax-collector represents. But that is no reason why we should borrow any more except in process of reduction.

ROBERT HARDING.

[This correspondence must now close.—ED.]

KINDNESS OR FORCE.

SIR,—I have found several of Mr. G. O. Warren's articles interesting, but his article "Kindness," which appeared in your issue of April 24, was more than amusing, especially this sentence: "But what can be done in the meantime by way of apology for the shame of a state of society that turns a thousand men into mere machines for grinding out superfluous wealth for one man? Only kindness," etc. Were he to walk into his house one day, and find a vigorous man thrashing his aged mother, would he use or procure force or be kind to make him desist? Frequently, to secure justice, force must be used against individuals or a collection of individuals who are responsible for a certain system of society. After a wrong has been righted, we can afford to forgive and be kind; but it would be immoral to be kind to those who *continue* to wrong us. For centuries the

workers have allowed themselves to be gulled by the Church and by property-owners. Had the workers risen in a body and used force to put an end to the private ownership of property, as they have in Russia, they would at the same time put an end to the evils generated by private ownership. The exploitation of society can never be "mitigated by courtesy and kindness" of the workers towards their bandit masters. Only force can end this exploitation.

In the old days of chattel slavery white masters could not love their slaves. If the masters entertained any love for their slaves, they would set them free. Evidently Mr. Warren wishes us to maintain the present evil system of society by patching it up and tinkering with it. Argument cannot set matters right. The Irish people have used argument for 700 years. He forgets a despotic censorship can silence argument. An argumentative speech delivered by Mr. Barton, Sinn Fein M.P., caused him to be sentenced to *ten years' imprisonment*.

RONA MAYO.

HERBERT SPENCER.

SIR,—It is a hundred years to-day since Herbert Spencer was born. I wrote some days ago to the editor of the *Daily Mail* pointing out the coming anniversary of "the greatest philosopher of the 19th century." However, when I opened my *Daily Mail* this morning, I could find no mention whatever of the anniversary, but I found a long article on Saint Joan, better known as Joan of Arc, also regretful references to the proposed pulling down of certain city churches.

The centenary of Mr. Herbert Spencer has, you see, in the case of this particular newspaper, been completely and purposely ignored. Yet in another journal, which I believe is under the same ownership, they pour out every Sunday the Rev. Vale Owen's drivel and nonsense.

J. G.

The Church and the Cinema.

To picture Scripture on the sheet
Our very latest phase is,
With Eve and apples all complete,
And hell as red as blazes.

Our little ones—their morals lax—
Shall captured be for heaven;
They'll see for fourpence, plus the tax,
The "ghost" appear at seven.

The range is great for our design;
We have some noble stories.
We'll quicken all their faith divine,
And show them all its glories.

For one week only—each evening twice—
We're showing "Pharaoh's Terrors";
The first-born slain, the plague, the lice—
And "Unbelievers' Errors."

And "Jonah's Whale" will make them rail
Against evicting lodgers;
And with the "twist" that's in this tale
Arm them 'gainst Artful Dodgers.

Each day at two we'll show the Zoo
As seen in Revelations;
No burglar crew safe breaking through
To lead them to temptations.

The Demons leaping from the swine
And plunging in real water!
Lot's daughters filling Pa with wine!
And Israelites' great slaughter.

The Housing Problem Solved, you'll see
By Noah inside the Ark.
And one thing certain—you'll agree
We'll keep the children in the Dark.

J. DRISCOLL.

Obituary.

Mr. John Easterbrook died at Southsea on Wednesday, April 21, in his eighty-second year, and was buried at Torquay on Monday, April 26. Mr. Easterbrook was born in the neighbourhood of Torquay, where he lived and worked until 1883. Then he moved to Southampton. Although he did not belong to any Freethought organization, he was a most independent and pronounced Freethinker. He arrived at his convictions by his own thought and work, and held them firmly to the last hour of conscious life. He died as he had lived, a convinced and zealous Secularist. He hated superstition and shams with all his heart. He was an honest and truthful man, a passionate lover of Nature, and a philanthropist who delighted in serving his fellow-beings. His children and grandchildren are following in his footsteps. In beautiful Torquay, Dartmouth, and Portsmouth they are sowing the good seed of Freethought, and there will be a rich harvest ere long.—J. T. L.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

INDOOR.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (South Place, Moorgate Street, E.C. 2): 11, S. K. Ratcliffe, "The Newspaper in the Commonwealth."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Stratford Engineers' Institute, 167 Romford Road, E.): 7, Mr. T. J. Thurlow, A Lecture.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 6.15, Mr. R. H. Rosetti, A Lecture.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, Mr. Burke, A Lecture.

HYDE PARK: 11.30, Mr. Samuels; 3.15, Messrs. Ansell, Dales, Ratcliffe, and Baker. Every Wednesday, 6.30, Mr. Saphin.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

LEEDS SECULAR SOCIETY (Youngman's Rooms, 19 Lowerhead Row, Leeds): Every Sunday at 6.30.

PLYMOUTH AND DISTRICT BRANCH N. S. S. (Room No. 7, Plymouth Chambers, Drake Circus): Thursday, May 13, at 8, "Religious Education and the Child." Plymouth Freethinkers please note.

SOUTH SHIELDS BRANCH N. S. S. (14 Hunter Terrace): 6.30, Local Lecture Campaign; Final Arrangements for Annual Conference.

YOUNG COUPLE, no children, require two or three rooms or half house. Ilford or Eastern District.—Y. C., c/o Freethinker Office, 61 Farringdon Street, E.C. 4.

BOOKS

ON ALL SUBJECTS
for every need, every
taste, & every pocket
Sent on Approval.

SECOND-HAND AND NEW. 1,000,000 Volumes in Stock.

Write to day for Catalogue. State wants.

Books Bought at Best Prices.

W. & G. FOYLE, Ltd., 121-5 Charing Cross Road, W.C. 2.
Phone: Gerrard 8180.

Flowers of Freethought.

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

First Series, 216 pp. Cloth. Price 3s. net, postage 6d.

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

Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

MY RESURRECTION. Price 1d., postage ½d.

CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS. Price 2d., postage 1d.

THE MOTHER OF GOD. With Preface. Price 2d., postage 1d.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM. Price 2d., postage ½d.

THE JEWISH LIFE OF CHRIST. Being the Sepher Toldoth Jeshu, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. With an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes. By G. W. FOOTE and J. M. WHEELER. Price 6d., postage 1d.

VOLTAIRE'S PHILOSOPHICAL DICTIONARY. Vol. I., 128 pp., with Fine Cover Portrait, and Preface by CHAPMAN COHEN. Price 1s. 3d., postage 1½d.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

DEITY AND DESIGN. Price 1d., postage ½d.

WAR AND CIVILIZATION. Price 1d., postage ½d.

RELIGION AND THE CHILD. Price 1d., postage ½d.

GOD AND MAN: An Essay in Common Sense and Natural Morality. Price 3d., postage ½d.

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY: With a Chapter on Christianity and the Labour Movement. Price 1s., postage 1½d.

WOMAN AND CHRISTIANITY: The Subjection and Exploitation of a Sex. Price 1s., postage 1½d.

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

SOCIALISM AND THE CHURCHES. Price 3d., postage 1d.

CREED AND CHARACTER. The Influence of Religion on Racial Life. Price 7d., postage 1½d.

By J. T. LLOYD.

PRAYER: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND FUTILITY. Price 2d., postage 1d.

By MIMNERMUS.

FREETHOUGHT AND LITERATURE. Price 1d., postage ½d.

By D. HUME.

ESSAY ON SUICIDE. Price 1d., postage ½d.

LIBERTY AND NECESSITY. Price 1d., postage 1d.

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

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

PIONEER LEAFLETS.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

No. 1. What Will You Put in Its Place?

No. 2. What is the Use of the Clergy?

No. 3. Dying Freethinkers.

No. 4. The Beliefs of Unbelievers.

No. 5. Are Christians Inferior to Freethinkers?

No. 6. Does Man Desire God?

Price 1s. 6d. per 100.

(Postage 3d.)

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

Population Question and Birth-Control.

POST FREE THREE HALFPENCE

MALTHUSIAN LEAGUE,
48 BROADWAY, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1.

A BOOK FOR ALL TO READ.

DETERMINISM

OR

FREE-WILL ?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

NEW EDITION Revised and Enlarged.

Some Press Opinions of the First Edition.

"Far and away the best exposition of the Determinist position in a small compass."—*Literary World*.

"Mr. Cohen's book is a masterpiece in its way, by reason of its conciseness and fine literary style."—*Birmingham Gazette*.

"The author states his case well."—*Athenæum*.

"A very able and clear discussion of a problem which calls for, but seldom gets, the most severely lucid handling. Mr. Cohen is careful to argue his definitions down to bedrock."

Morning Leader.

"A thoroughly sound and very able exposition of the Determinist, that is to say, the scientific position in this matter."

Positivist Review.

Well printed on good paper.

Price, Wrappers 1s. 9d., by post 1s. 11d.; or strongly bound in Half-Cloth 2s. 6d., by post 2s. 9d.

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

A Book that no Freethinker should Miss.

Religion and Sex.

Studies in the Pathology of Religious Development.

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN.

A Systematic and Comprehensive Survey of the relations between the sexual instinct and morbid and abnormal mental states and the sense of religious exaltation and illumination. The ground covered ranges from the primitive culture stage to present-day revivalism and mysticism. The work is scientific in tone, but written in a style that will make it quite acceptable to the general reader, and should prove of interest no less to the Sociologist than to the Student of religion. It is a work that should be in the hands of all interested in Sociology, Religion, or Psychology.

Large 8vo, well printed on superior paper, cloth bound, and gilt lettered.

Price Six Shillings.

(Postage 6d.)

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

The Parson and the Atheist.

A Friendly Discussion on
RELIGION AND LIFE.

BETWEEN

Rev. the Hon. EDWARD LYTTTELTON, D.D.
(Late Headmaster of Eton College)

AND

CHAPMAN COHEN
(President of the N. S. S.).

With Preface by Chapman Cohen and Appendix by Dr. Lyttelton.

The Discussion ranges over a number of different topics—Historical, Ethical, and Religious—and should prove both interesting and useful to Christians and Freethinkers alike.

Well printed on good paper, with Coloured Wrapper.
144 pages.

Price 1s. 6d., postage 2d.

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

Remainder Bargains for Freethinkers.

WAR AND THE IDEAL OF PEACE.

By G. H. RUTGERS MARSHALL.

Price 2s. 6d. Postage 6d.

ANTI-PRAGMATISM.

By A. SCHINZ

An Examination into the Respective Rights of Intellectual Aristocracy and Social Democracy.

Published at 6s. 6d. Price 2s. 6d. Postage 6d.

THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF FREETHOUGHT.

Being a New Edition of the "Philosophy of Morals."

By Sir T. C. MORGAN.

Published at 5s. Price 2s. 6d. Postage 5d.

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

Ladies Coats and Costumes

made to measure

In good TWEEDS and SERGES.

From 60s.

Direct from our Warehouse to the Customer.

Saving Middleman's Profits.

Self-Measure Forms, Patterns, and Catalogue on application.

S. HERSHCOVITCH & SONS,

6 Victoria Bridge St., Salford.

THREE GREAT BOOKS

Which have already run into several editions, and are still selling rapidly.

The World's Wonder Stories. By ADAM GOWANS WHYTE. xix + 272 pp.; cloth, gilt top, 8s. 6d. net (inland postage 6d.). With many Illustrations and 32 Plates.

In this "delightful book," as the *Times* describes it, the door is opened on a realm of knowledge, new to children, but as bright and enthralling as the kingdoms of fairy-tale and adventure. "The World's Wonder Stories" answers the eager curiosity of the child mind about the story of the universe, the unfolding of living things, the upward march of the human race, and the how and why of many quaint customs and traditions. With its admirable subject-matter and its vivid, simple style, it forms an ideal book for children.

Savage Survivals. By J. HOWARD MOORE. 160 pp., with many Illustrations; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.; paper cover, 1s. 6d. net, by post 1s. 9d.

Mr. Adam Gowans Whyte writes a Foreword to this book, which he ranks very highly. It contains a mass of information, conveyed in the simplest language and the brightest of styles; and it will be read with delight and profit by every one interested in the scientific study of human progress.

The Origin of the World. With Illustrations. By R. McMILLAN (author of "The Great Secret," etc.). New and Revised Edition. xvi + 140 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.; paper cover, 1s. 6d. net, by post 1s. 9d.

BISHOP W. M. BROWN, D.D., of Galion, Ohio, U.S.A., recently paid the following remarkable tribute to this fascinating work:—

"I regard this book as being worth many times its weight in gold. I have read it five times, and am expecting to re-read a chapter almost every week during the rest of my life. Its exceptional value consists in the fact that it covers a very important, extensive, and difficult field of a scientific character in language which is free from technical terms. I wish that I had read such a book when I was young. It would have had a great and beneficial influence upon my life."

This is the fourth edition of a delightfully written volume, of which 12,000 copies have already been sold.

LONDON: WATTS & CO., 17 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

ON SPIRITUALISM AND A LIFE BEYOND.

The Truth of Spiritualism. Being a Verbatim Report of the Great Debate between Sir ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE and JOSEPH McCABE. 64 pp. demy 8vo; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.; in paper cover, 1s. net, by post 1s. 2d.

Spiritualism and Sir Oliver Lodge. By CHARLES A. MERCIER, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., and some time Examiner in Psychology in the London University. 132 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.

A most trenchant criticism of the claims for Spiritualism made by the eminent scientist.

Spirit Experiences. By CHARLES A. MERCIER, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., etc. 56 pp.; cloth, 2s. net, by post, 2s. 3d.; paper cover, 9d. net, by post, 10d.

An account of some experiences which will prove even more startling to the believer than to the incredulous. This little work is exciting much controversy in Spiritualistic circles, and is proving a powerful counteractive to alleged psychic revelations.

The Follies and Frauds of Spiritualism. By WALTER MANN. 192 pp.; cloth, 5s. net, by post 5s. 5d.

A detailed and effective criticism of the methods and claims of Spiritualism, showing how one medium after another has been convicted of imposture in exploiting a debasing superstition.

Common-Sense Thoughts on a Life Beyond.

By F. J. GOULD. 96 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.; paper cover, 1s. 3d. net, by post 1s. 5d.

A beautiful and inspiring book, appealing to the common sense of all schools of thought, on lines quite different from the conventional idea of personal immortality.

Complete Catalogue and Copy of "Literary Guide" (16 pp. monthly, 3d.) free on receipt of post-card.

New Pamphlets.

SOCIETY and SUPERSTITION

By ROBERT ARCH.

CONTENTS: What is a Freethinker?—Freethought, Ethics, and Politics.—Religious Education.—The Philosophy of the Future.

Price 6d., Postage 1d.

MISTAKES OF MOSES.

By COLONEL INGERSOLL.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

32 pages. One Penny, postage ½d.

Should be circulated by the thousand. Issued for Propagandist purposes. 50 copies sent, post free, for 3s. 6d.

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

THE VENTURE.

A Literary Magazine issued Monthly, which will have an undoubted appeal to all "Freethinker" readers.

Among its contributors are: ARTHUR F. THORN, WILLIAM REPTON, G. E. FUSSELL.

Names so well known to *Freethinker* readers as these are a sufficient guarantee of interest.

First No. of the new issue appears in April. Place your order now, or forward subscription to—

THE PUBLISHERS, 6 Nelson Street, Bristol. 6d. Monthly, or 6s. 6d. Annually, from the Publishers.

Under the auspices of the Malthusian League

Mrs. MARGARET SANGER

(Editor of the American "Birth Control Review" and brave founder of the first Birth Control Clinic for poor women in America)

WILL ADDRESS A

PUBLIC MEETING

ON

"The Birth Control Campaign."

IN THE

CAXTON HALL, Westminster,

(Beside St. James's Park Underground Station)

ON

Wednesday, May 12, 1920

At 8 p.m.

ADMISSION FREE.

Fine Sepia-toned Photograph of

Mr. CHAPMAN COHEN.

Printed on Cream Carbon Bromide-de-Luxe.

Mounted on Art Mount, 11 by 8. A High Class Production.

Price 2s. 3d., post free.

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