

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. 48

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1920

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page.
<i>Eugenics and Christianity.—The Editor</i> - - - -	753
<i>God as Father.—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - - -	754
<i>Get Thee to a Monastery!—Mimmermus</i> - - - -	756
<i>The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ.—Gerald Massey</i>	756
<i>What Brahma Did Not Know.—F. J. Gould</i> - - - -	757
<i>"Freethinker" Sustentation Fund</i> - - - -	761
<i>Mr. Don't Care.—G. O. W.</i> - - - -	762
<i>Pages from Voltaire.—Englished by George Underwood</i>	763
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions.

Eugenics and Christianity.

A Freethinker may well experience a feeling of malicious satisfaction when a Christian preacher begins to talk about science. For one of two things is almost certain to follow. If he talks about science he will cease to be religious, and if he talks about religion he will cease to be scientific. Both things at the same time he simply cannot be. For with science, as the modern understands the term, religion has nothing to do. Once upon a time, in those far-off days when early man was feeling his way about the world, religion represented a sort of a scientific generalization. But as knowledge approached the positive stage, and man discovered and applied the great instrument of verification, religion lost the claim to be an embryonic science, and assumed the character of faith. So to-day one may say with a fair amount of confidence that when a preacher recommends his religious belief on the grounds of its scientific character, or because it is a kind of an aid to science, he either does not understand the nature of religion or science, or he is trying to pull wool over the eyes of his hearers. If one doubts that, he need only reflect that the essence of science is the careful collection of facts, the equally careful framing of generalizations that will cover the facts collected, and then a verification of the generalizations framed by a further appeal to the facts upon which it claims to be based. And what has religion to do with all this? Modern religion, or rather religion in modern times, consists mainly of a number of formulæ that are based upon beliefs that cannot be subjected to the test of facts. How can one test the question of whether man has a soul, or whether there is a God, or whether there is an after life? You may believe these things, and there the matter ends. But there is no compulsive power about them, such as attaches to a scientific formula. If you care to believe the religious formula, so much the better for some Church or other. But if you do not care to believe, there is no power in religion that will force it on a reluctant mind.

Nothing Like—Cheek.

Dean Inge was lecturing the other day before the Eugenic Education Society, and, for reasons not very

difficult to discern, was anxious to prove that his religion was quite able to offer some contribution to the removal of the troubles that are now afflicting us. It was not part of the Christian religion, he told his audience, to believe that any supernatural power would intervene to save them from the consequences of breaking natural laws. And one thought of the faith that would move mountains, prevent poisons hurting, and of the prayer that would cure the sick. Christianity, he said, had no quarrel with science, and one thought of the long list of men and women who had suffered at the hands of the Christian Church for their scientific work. One thought of Roger Bacon in his cell, of Galileo in his prison, of Bruno at the stake, of the opposition to Newton and his theory of gravitation, to the rise of scientific astronomy, to the theory of uniformity in geology, and of evolution in biology. All a mistake, the Dean would doubtless reply; but the mistake was made by Christians, and they kept on making the "mistake" so long as they were able to do so. And the fact that a man refrains from stealing purses while he is serving a term of imprisonment is not usually considered a very good guarantee of honesty. The Dean also reminded his hearers that the Sermon on the Mount contained some excellent Eugenic precepts in such teachings as a corrupt tree could not bring forth good fruit. But that really was not worthy of Dean Inge. He has ability, and it is almost inconceivable that he could have said that without his tongue in his cheek. For he must know quite well that the statement had no possible connection with what is called Eugenics. It involved no more than the not very profound observation that bad men do not usually perform good actions, and that rather shallow observation has been made at all times and by all sorts of people. Strangest of all was the statement that Eugenics might find in religion a potent ally. And as by religion Dean Inge means the Christian religion, we are able to bring that claim to the test of actual fact.

* * *

Cleanliness and Godliness.

Let us commence with the fact that the breeding of strong, healthy children is not a desideratum which belongs to modern times alone. Readers of the Platonic dialogues will know quite well that this was one of the topics that occupied the minds of the ancient Greeks, and that many of their customs were devised to promote this object. And in the ancient Roman world particular attention was paid to cleanliness and hygiene, themselves of no small importance in developing a healthy people—particularly as in human society natural selection appears, not to be non-existent, as certain cocksure but shallow thinkers inform us, but to operate mainly through the action of disease. In both directions the Christian Church found the world well prepared for the study of this subject. And with what result? Starting with the teaching that the care of the body was a neglect of the culture of the "spirit," it effectively discouraged the hygiene of the ancient world on the one side, and its sanitative provisions on the other. And whatever apology may be put in to excuse this decay under Christian influences, the

fact that the decay occurred is undeniable. Christian cities became centres of disease mainly because they were places where cleanliness was more or less unknown. As I have pointed out elsewhere, the mere fact that when the old Roman bath was reintroduced into Christian Europe, centuries after the establishment of the Church, it was under the name of the Turkish bath, is itself proof of how thoroughly the world under Christian rule had forgotten this important sanitative provision of the ancient world. And the lives of the saints show how completely the gospel of the sanctity of dirt had gained control of the people.

* * *

Celibacy.

In my little work on *Creed and Character* I have examined at some length the fantastic claim that religion has had in the history of the race a Eugenic value. Those who wish to examine the subject in detail may be referred to that work, but I think it will not be out of place to run over a part of the case against Christianity from the point of view of race culture. Apart from the general teaching of the Christian Church as to the unworthiness of the body, a primary count against the Church by a Eugenicist lies in its commendation of celibacy. It placed celibacy among the highest of virtues, and permitted marriage only as a concession to the weakness of the flesh. And, as is the case with nearly all teaching, it affected exactly the class who were least in need of it. If the Christian Church had said to the brutal, the callous, the worthless in mind or body, "Thou shalt not procreate," some good from the point of view of race development might have been done. But it did not. It simply preached celibacy as an ideal, and it could not well do otherwise with Jesus as its figurehead, and Paul as one of its principal preachers. And who were the ones affected by the teaching? Not the better specimens of the species, but the worst. They who were likely to be affected by idealism of any sort gave themselves up to the ideal of celibacy. They who were too brutal in nature to be affected by preaching of any kind became parents. The consequence was a steady hardening and coarsening of character that the race has not yet outgrown. And Dean Inge should have remembered that one of the founders of the Eugenic movement in England, Francis Galton, placed the Christian teaching of celibacy among the most powerful causes that during the last fifteen centuries have made for the deterioration of the racial stock.

* * *

The Price of Persecution.

And having taken this step towards the physical deterioration of the race, the next move was to assault the race from the standpoint of its mental welfare. This it did by its attack on freedom of thought and freedom of speech. Again it was the better and not the worse that suffered. No heresy law that was ever devised, no persecution for open speech and fearless thinking that has occurred, ever troubled liars, cowards, hypocrites, or fools for a single instant. Such things can only affect those who have the ability to think, and the courage to say what they think. The better types of character are weeded out, the worse types are encouraged to perpetuate their kind. And, added to this, we have the creation of an environment which is fatal to honesty of character and to manliness of speech. In an environment in which it is dangerous to say what one thinks, certain subjects become taboo, and certain frames of mind too dangerous for cultivation. There goes on a practical survival of the socially undesirable. And no people can play that game generation after generation without paying a very heavy price in the end. That the world is not much worse than it is, is a matter for which we owe the Christian Church no thanks. What was possible for

it to do it did. That it did not act with a conscious desire to sap the quality of the race makes no difference as to the result. The facts remain, and they are damning enough in themselves, without there being added the charge of conscious villainy.

* * *

What the World Owes to the Church.

To a small extent we have an example of what this process means in the experience of the last five years. Dean Inge is oppressed by the thought of the present state of the country. He sees nothing but disaster before us. I do not share his gloom. That the world is at present in a bad state only a fool would deny. But what can one expect? For five years in all the countries at war the people have been systematically brutalized by what has been going on. People were taught to regard the slaughter of thousands of their fellows as good, so long as they happened to belong to the country against which they were fighting. The inevitable consequence of all this has been a hardening of character which has made things possible to-day that would not have been possible five years ago. Ireland is a case in point. It is certain that before the war the present state of things in Ireland would not have been tolerated for a week. The whole nation would have been horrified. To-day it is apparently accepted by the British public as quite a matter of course. But I do not think that this hardening of character will continue. We shall get the better of that, as we have got the better of other after-war consequences. But let anyone think of what only five years of intensive cultivation of brutality has done, and then imagine the process spread over something like fifteen or sixteen centuries. Let them think of nearly fifty generations brought up in an environment in which the best are encouraged to lead a life of celibacy, and the worst are allowed to breed freely; an environment in which the thinker is suppressed and the credulous fool lauded as a spiritual hero; where a premium is placed upon cowardice and hypocrisy, and a tax upon straightforwardness and independence. Let them add to that the fact that every attempt to place the question of race breeding on a sensible footing has been banned by the Churches, which has also made the whole question of marriage and procreation suggestively indecent by its own radically unclean teaching. And when they have summed up all these things, they will have some notion of the colossal impertinence of a dignitary of the Church who can say to a society formed for the purpose of Eugenic study, that it has a powerful supporter in a religion that right through its history has made for both mental demoralization and physical emasculation.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

God as Father.

THE REV. W. GARRETT HORDER has been Congregational minister at Ealing since 1896, and is regarded as a specially good preacher, whose sermons sometimes appear in the local press. In a recent issue of the *Middlesex County Times* there was a report of a discourse in which he discussed the question, "Does God act in a fatherly way?" The correspondent who supplied the report described it as "the utterance of a man who stands before his people with no second-hand message, but with the truth alone he has made his own, an integral part of his being." To say the very least, that description is extravagant and insusceptible of verification. We are quite willing to admit that Mr. Horder gives his people what he verily believes to be the truth, but what we characterize as a mere figment. Not only we do not share his belief in God's fatherly conduct, we even go so far as to deny the very existence of a Heavenly Father. It is perfectly true, as Mr.

Horder says, that the Fatherhood of God forms the very core of the message of the Gospel Jesus; and the preacher takes the Gospel Jesus, a legendary person, at his word. Mr. Horder adds:—

There are many who say: "The Divine Fatherhood is asserted in the Gospels. That we readily admit; but does God act in a Fatherly way? Looking out over the past history of the world, or looking out on the world to-day, do we discover proof of his Fatherly action in relation to men? In other words, is the declaration by Christ of this Fatherhood ratified by the facts of history in the past, or of the world to-day?"

Mr. Horder grants that there are things which God does not do, and he accuses doubters of losing sight of "what he is always doing," or of being on the outlook for his extraordinary, while blind to his ordinary, working. What is it that God is always doing? Amazing beyond measure is the preacher's answer to this question. He declares that God's care is shown in the world where man is set to live. He holds that it is utterly immaterial how the world came to be what it is, or how many ages the process took. What matters is that it is here, with its air and light, its day for work and night for rest; with "its capacity for growing things, so that the seed put therein brings forth harvests for food," and with its wealth of beauty and order for our enjoyment. Having enumerated all the precious things on and under the earth, Mr. Horder comes to a climax:—

And then, beyond these, there is the mind of man, by which all these are utilized, developed, enjoyed. It matters not how mind came—by conferment or by slow development. Here is mind, without which all would be in vain. And then, beyond this, there is what, in common phrase, we call the heart, which knits us together in families, societies, nations. Love, the greatest, most vital of all our endowments.

Now, we ask in all seriousness, where does God come in? Mr. Horder thinks that if we look at the things he has mentioned, "it must be admitted that the world spells the word 'good,' and that 'good' points to care in the source from which it has come." Unfortunately, there are heaps of things which he has not mentioned, such as earthquakes, volcanoes, famine, pestilence, and plague, by which countless millions of men, women, and children have been destroyed. With these awful calamities in mind, does Mr. Horder still maintain that the world spells the word "good"? Ingersoll tells the following interesting and instructive story:—

A devout clergyman sought every opportunity to impress upon the mind of his son the fact that God takes care of all his creatures; that the falling sparrow attracts his attention, and that his loving kindness is over all his works. Happening, one day, to see a crane wading in quest of food, the good man pointed out to his son the perfect adaptation of the crane to get his living in that manner. "See," said he, "how his legs are formed for wading. What a long, slender bill he has! Observe how nicely he folds his feet when putting them in or drawing them out of the water! He does not cause the slightest ripple. He is thus enabled to approach the fish without giving them any notice of his arrival." "My son," said he, "it is impossible to look at that bird without recognizing the design, as well as the goodness of God in thus providing the means of subsistence." "Yes," replied the boy, "I think I see the goodness of God, at least so far as the crane is concerned; but, after all, father, don't you think the arrangement a little rough on the fish?" (Vol. 1, 41, 42).

Mr. Horder is stated to have dealt powerfully with the problem of the destructive forces of Nature, and with poverty and pain in the human realm; but all that has been left out of the report. The question of vital importance, in this connection, is, can any convincing evidence be adduced of supernatural intervention in human affairs? Has God ever done anything for man which man has not the power of doing for himself?

We challenge Mr. Horder to cite a single instance of such an action. As a matter of fact, the reverend gentleman is persuaded that God does not intervene in a direct, or visible, or tangible way in human affairs. Of such intervention he has never succeeded in discovering the slightest trace in any department of life. God's "method does not seem to be one of intervention. That would place us under a Theocracy. And the world, as it is to-day, would be no credit to such a Theos. The best men have been made so not by a rest-and-be-thankful, but by a strenuous life." Is not this one way of saying that God has never done for man what man cannot do for himself? But if God's method is not one of intervention, wherein does it consist? Is non-intervention a characteristic of fatherhood? If God never intervenes in human affairs, how does his care for men manifest itself? How can he love the world if he never steps in to prevent it from going wrong and to set its feet in the path of righteousness? Is there a human father worthy of the name who never enters into the lives of his children for correction, guidance, and inspiration? If they quarrel and fight with one another or with outsiders, does he stand aloof, doing nothing? That is what our Heavenly Father is said to have done during the late war.

If God does not intervene in human affairs, what does he do? How does he occupy his time, and where? Of what use is his omnipresence if he does nothing at all? In the earlier part of his discourse Mr. Horder speaks of the ordinary working of God, of what he is always doing; but, surely, if he never intervenes in human affairs, what on earth can he be always doing? Are we to infer that he does intervene in the physical universe? Is he the author of the beauty of the world, and of all its ugliness, too? Science tells us that all the evolutionary processes which have been going on for millions of years are under the control of physical and chemical laws which never vary. If science is right, theology is wrong; and the only conclusion possible is, not only that God does not act in a fatherly way, but that he does not act at all, a fact which necessarily implies his non-existence.

Curiously enough, while emphasizing the fact of his non-interference in human affairs, Mr. Horder says:—

No one believes more fully than I do, in the closeness of God's contact with men—that he is not merely near to us, but that he is in us, and that in him we live, move, and have our being; that, whilst he does not intervene from outside, he is always working from within our hearts. But that he intervenes in a direct, or visible, or tangible way in human affairs, of that I see no trace, either in history, or in the world to-day.

After all, according to the Healing divine, whilst God does not intervene from outside, he does so from within. What conceivable difference is there between these two methods of intervention? The truth is, however, that both methods are equally unreal. When investigated in the light of the facts of the world, the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood is utterly discredited. Indeed, all that Mr. Horder himself can claim is that "the method of God has not been quite a failure." It is doubtless true that, "with all our troubles, the world probably stands on a higher plane ethically and spiritually, certainly scientifically, than it ever did before"; but this is due, not to Divine intervention, either from outside or from inside, but to the ever-growing intelligence and social instinct of mankind.

J. T. LLOYD.

We live in deeds, not years, in thoughts, not breaths, In actions, not in figures on a dial, He lives most who thinks most, plans the noblest, acts the best.

—Bailey's "Festus."

Get Thee to a Monastery!

I do not like your great men who beckon me to them, call me their begotten, their dear child, and their entrails; and, if I happen to say on any occasion, "I beg leave, sir, to dissent a little from you," stamp and cry, "The devil you do!" and whistle to the executioner.—
Walter Savage Landor, "Imaginary Conversations."

In the autumn of his days the Bishop of London is even more notorious than famous, and it may truly be said of him that he has worked for notoriety as others are content to work for fame. All through his career he has had a keen eye for the picturesque, and all his life he has been thrusting forward wherever applause was easiest and not to be conspicuous was merely impossible. In him an enormous assurance is coupled with a reverence canine in quality and unsurpassable in degree. He possesses, too, an uncanny incapacity to see more than one thing at a time, and that one thing in a wrong perspective. By one of the ironies of fate he considers himself one of the finest products of a Christian civilization, but he is really a survival from the old Pagan world he is so fond of deriding. He believes himself a moralist of the first magnitude, and he is simply a man with a bias towards a certain order of facts, and a passion for the study of a certain set of social phenomena. The result of all which fatuousness is that his utterances on ethical matters are as uncommon, peculiar, extravagant, and ecstatic as those of the early fathers of the Christian Church, whose books should have been edited by their keepers and medical attendants.

Years ago, the bishop boasted that it took him just a week to stop the exhibition of "living statues" at the British music-halls. Only the other day he was beseeching an audience to try and put down bad plays, to consider the problem of the dusky hours in parks and open spaces; to prevent seductive scenes in films, and the publication of improper novels. "I cannot understand," he continued, "why you do not take more interest in the Public Morality Councils."

It will be seen that the moral question, in the bishop's saintly eyes, is the question of the morality of the music-halls, and of matters concerning the relation of the sexes. When he talks of morality and ethics, he has in his mind certain immodesties, indecencies, and hectic vulgarities. He is out to guard the innocent, but apparently frail, young and old maids who form the majority of Christian congregations.

But, as Shakespeare says, "Soft, awhile!" When we have covered up all dancers' legs in men's trousers; eliminated the unseemly portions from Holy Writ and the Prayer Book; taken the innuendoes out of some popular songs; burned divorced persons to the music of the Church Army band; put up large electric-light standards in all parks and public places, shall we then have solved the moral question, and shall we be entitled to consider this the best of all possible worlds? I trow not.

What is morality? Is it moral to draw rents for overcrowded and insanitary hovels? Is it moral to derive extraordinary profits from adulterating the nation's food? Is it moral to pay starvation wages to vergers, choristers, church workers, and teachers in Church schools? Is it moral to expose railwaymen, colliers, and sailors to danger of death and mutilation in order to increase the profits of the owners of railways, coal mines, and ships? Ought not the question of the low wages of poor curates to shock the bishop and his colleagues more than the exhibition of a handsome woman's ankles? I have been to places of amusement for over forty years, and have never seen anything so unseemly and out-of-place as the ecclesiastical millinery and petticoats which the bishop himself wears on high days and holy days. Places of amusement are already subject to censorship, and they are

also under the keen eyes of the experienced police officials. There is no further need of saintly spies and prudes on the prowl to keep such places bright and clean.

The plain truth is that the Bishop of London does not want to know about the things I have mentioned. There are really serious matters which ought to be altered, which should have been altered years ago, but they still exist because the Bishop of London and the leading clergy do not wish to see them. Fashionable women of the upper classes display more of their persons than stage dancers, but the bishop does not boast that he will alter this in a week. But is it not playing it a little low down on the Christian congregations, thus to take advantage of their ignorance of life and their lack of experience. When the Education Act has run a little longer, even Christians, perhaps, will cease to hunger for sawdust, and do themselves the honour of telling the bishop to mind his own business.

MIMNERMUS.

The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ.

II.

(Continued from p. 749.)

[Older Freethinkers will well recall the slashing onslaught made on the Christian superstition by the late Gerald Massey. By arrangements with his daughter, who holds the copyright of his works, we purpose republishing at an early date the most striking of his anti-Christian essays. Meanwhile, we feel certain that our readers will appreciate having the opportunity of reading those portions of the essay on *The Historical Jesus and the Mythical Christ*. It will serve to whet their appetite for the complete work when it appears.]

In their mysteries the Sarraceni celebrated the Birth of the babe in the Cave or Subterranean Sanctuary, from which the Priest issued, and cried:—"The Virgin hath brought forth: The Light is about to begin to grow again!"—on the Mother-night of the year. And the Sarraceni were *not* supporters of Historic Christianity.

The birthplace of the Egyptian Messiah at the Vernal Equinox was figured in Apt, or Apta, the corner; but Apta is also the name of the Crib and the Manger; hence the Child born in Apta was said to be born in a manger; and this Apta as Crib or Manger is the hieroglyphic sign of the Solar birthplace. Hence the Egyptians exhibited the Babe in the Crib or Manger in the streets of Alexandria. The birthplace was indicated by the colure of the Equinox, as it passed from sign to sign. It was also pointed out by the Star in the East. When the birthplace was in the sign of the Bull, Orion was the Star that rose in the East to tell where the young Sun-God was re-born. Hence it is called the "Star of Horus." That was then the Star of the "Three Kings" who greeted the Babe; for the "Three Kings" is still a name of the three stars in Orion's Belt. Here we learn that the legend of the "Three Kings" is at least 6,000 years old.

* * * * *

The Christian religion was not founded on a man, but on a divinity; that is, a mythical character. So far from being derived from the model man, the typical Christ was made up from the features of various Gods, after a fashion somewhat like those "pictorial averages" portrayed by Mr. Galton, in which the traits of several persons are photographed and fused in a portrait of a dozen different persons, merged into one that it not anybody. And as fast as the composite Christ falls to pieces, each feature is claimed, each character is gathered up by the original owner, as with the grasp of gravitation.

It is not I that deny the divinity of Jesus the Christ; I assert it! He never was, and never could be, any

other than a divinity; that is, a character non-human, and entirely mythical, who had been the pagan divinity of various pagan myths, that had been pagan during thousands of years before our Era.

Nothing is more certain, according to honest evidence, than that the Christian scheme of redemption is founded on a fable misinterpreted; that the prophecy of fulfilment was solely astronomical, and the Coming One as the Christ who came in the end of an age, or of the world, was but a metaphorical figure, a type of time, from the first, which never could take form in historic personality, any more than Time in Person could come out of a clock-case when the hour strikes; that no Jesus could become a Nazarene by being born at, or taken to, Nazareth; and that the history in our Gospels is from beginning to end the identifiable story of the Sun-God, and the Gnostic Christ who never could be made flesh. When we did not know the one it was possible to believe the other; but when once we truly know, then the false belief is no longer possible.

The mythical Messiah was Horus in the Osirian Mythos; Har-Khuti in the Sut-Typhonian; Khunsu in that of Amen-Ra; Iu in the cult of Atum-Ra; and the Christ of the Gospels is an amalgam of all these characters.

The Christ is the Good Shepherd!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Lamb of God!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Bread of Life!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Truth and the Life!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Fan-bearer!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Lord!

So was Horus.

Christ is the Way and the Door of Life!

Horus was the path by which they travelled out of the Sepulchre. He is the God whose name is written with the hieroglyphic sign of the Road or Way.

* * * *

The character and teachings of the Canonical Christ are composed of contradictions which cannot be harmonized as those of a human being, whereas they are always true to the Mythos.

He is the Prince of Peace, and yet he asserts that he came not to bring peace: "I came not to send peace, but a sword," and not only is Iu-em-hept the Bringer of Peace by name in one character; he is the Sword personified in the other. In this he says, "I am the living image of Atum, proceeding from him as a sword." Both characters belong to the mythical Messiah in the Ritual, who also calls himself the "Great Disturber," and the "Great Tranquilizer"—the "God Contention," and the "God Peace." The Christ of the Canonical Gospels has several prototypes, and sometimes the copy is derived or the trait is caught from one original, and sometimes from the other. The Christ of Luke's Gospel has a character entirely distinct from that of John's Gospel. Here he is the Great Exorciser, and caster-out of demons. John's Gospel contains no case of possession or obsession: no certain man who "had devils this long time"; no child possessed with a devil; no blind and dumb man possessed with a devil.

Other miracles are performed by the Christ of John, but not these; because John's is a different type of the Christ. And the original of the Great Healer in Luke's Gospel may be found in the God Khunsu, who was the Divine Healer, the supreme one amongst all the other healers and saviours, especially as the caster-out of demons, and the expeller of possessing spirits. He is called in the texts the "Great God, the driver away of possession."

In the Stele of the "Possessed Princess," this God

in his effigy is sent for by the chief of Bakhten, that he may come and cast out a possessing spirit from the king's daughter, who has an evil movement in her limbs. The demon recognises the divinity just as the devil recognises Jesus, the expeller of evil spirits. Also the God Khunsu is Lord over the pig—a type of Sut. He is portrayed in the disk of the full moon of Easter, in the act of offering the pig as a sacrifice. Moreover, in the judgment scenes, when the wicked spirits are condemned and sent back into the abyss, their mode of return to the lake of primordial matter is by entering the bodies of swine. Says Horus to the Gods, speaking of the condemned one: "When I sent him to his place he went, and he has been transformed into a black pig." So when the Exorcist in Luke's Gospel casts out Legion, the devils ask permission of the Lord of the pig to be allowed to enter the swine, and he gives them leave. This, and much more that might be adduced, tends to differentiate the Christ of Luke, and to identify him with Khunsu, rather than with Iu-em-hept, the Egyptian Jesus, who is reproduced in the Gospel according to John. In this way it can be proved that the history of Christ in the Gospels is one long and complete catalogue of likenesses to the Mythical Messiah, the Solar or Luni-Solar God.

The "Litany of Ra," for example, is addressed to the Sun-God in a variety of characters, many of which are assigned to the Christ of the Gospels. Ra is the Supreme Power, the Beetle that rests in the Empyrean, who is born as his own son. This, as already said, is the God in John's Gospel, who says:—"I and the Father are one," and who is the father born as his own son; for he says, in knowing and seeing the son, "from henceforth ye know him and have seen him"; i.e., the Father.

Ra is designated the "Soul that speaks." Christ is the Word. Ra is the destroyer of venom. Jesus says:—"In my name they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them." In one character Ra is the outcast. So Jesus had not where to lay his head.

* * * *

In Egypt the year began soon after the Summer Solstice, when the sun descended from its midsummer height, lost its force, and lessened in its size. This represented Osiris, who was born of the Virgin Mother as the child Horus, the diminished infantile sun of Autumn; the suffering, wounded, bleeding Messiah, as he was represented. He descended into hell or hades, where he was transformed into the virile Horus, and rose again as the sun of the resurrection at Easter. In these two characters of Horus on the two horizons, Osiris furnished the dual type for the Canonical Christ, which shows very satisfactorily how the mythical prescribes the boundaries beyond which the historical does not, dare not, go. The first was the child Horus, who always remained a child. In Egypt the boy or girl wore the Horus-lock of childhood until 12 years of age. Thus childhood ended about the twelfth year. But although adulthood was then entered upon by the youth, and the transformation of the boy into manhood began, the full adulthood was not attained until 30 years of age. The man of 30 years was the typical adult. The age of adulthood was 30 years, as it was in Rome under the *Lex Pappia*. The *homme fait* is the man whose years are triaded by tens, and who is *Khemt*. As with the man, so it is with the God; and the second Horus, the same God in his second character, is the *Khemt* or *Khem-Horus*, the typical adult of 30 years. The God up to twelve years was Horus, the child of Isis, the mother's child, the weakling. The virile Horus (the sun in its vernal strength), the adult of 30 years, was representative of the Fatherhood, and this Horus is the anointed son of Osiris. These two characters of Horus the child, and Horus the adult of

30 years, are reproduced in the only two phases of the life of Jesus in the Gospels. John furnishes no historic dates for the time when the *Word* was incarnated and became flesh; nor for the childhood of Jesus; nor for the transformation into the Messiah. But Luke tells us that *the child of twelve years* was the wonderful youth, and that he increased in wisdom and stature. This is the length of years assigned to Horus the child; and this phase of the child-Christ's life is followed by the baptism and anointing, the descent of the pubescent spirit with the consecration of the Messiah in Jordan, when Jesus "*began to be about 30 years of age.*"

The earliest anointing was the consecration of puberty; and here at the full age of the typical adult, the Christ, who was previously a child, the child of the Virgin Mother, is suddenly made into the Messiah, as the Lord's anointed. And just as the second Horus was regenerated, and this time begotten of the father, so in the transformation scene of the baptism in Jordan, the father authenticates the change into full adulthood, with the voice from heaven saying:—"This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased"; the spirit of pubescence, or the *Ruach*, being represented by the descending dove, called the spirit of God. Thus from the time when the child-Christ was about twelve years of age, until that of the typical *homme fait* of Egypt, which was the age assigned to Horus when he became the adult God, there is no history. This is in exact accordance with the Kamite allegory of the double-Horus. And the Mythos alone will account for the chasm, which is wide and deep enough to engulf a supposed history of eighteen years. Childhood cannot be carried beyond the twelfth year, and the child-Horus always remained a child; just as the child-Christ does in Italy, and in German folk-tales. The mythical record founded on nature went no further, and there the history consequently halts within the prescribed limits, to begin with the anointed and regenerated Christ at the age of Khem-Horus, the adult of thirty years.

* * * *

The scene between the Christ and the Woman at the Well may likewise be found in the Ritual. Here the woman is the lady with the long hair, that is Nu, the consort of Seb—and the five husbands can be paralleled by her five star-gods born of Seb. Osiris drinks out of the well "to take away his thirst." He also says: "I am creating the water. I make way in the valley, in the Pool of the Great One. Make-road (or road-maker) expresses what I am." "I am the Path by which they traverse out of the sepulchre of Osiris."

So the Messiah reveals himself as the source of living water, "that springeth up unto Everlasting Life." Later on he says, "I am the way, the truth, the life." "I am creating the water, discriminating the seat," says Horus. Jesus says, "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father." Jesus claims that this well of life was given to him by the Father. In the Ritual it says, "He is thine, O Osiris! A well, or flow, comes out of thy mouth to him!" Also, the paternal source is acknowledged in another text. "I am the Father, inundating when there is thirst, guarding the water. Behold me at it." Moreover, in another chapter the well of living water becomes the Pool of Peace. The speaker says, "The well has come through me. I wash in the Pool of Peace."

* * * *

An epitome of a considerable portion of John's Gospel may be found in another brief chapter of the Ritual—"Ye Gods come to be my servants, I am the son of your Lord. Ye are mine through my Father, who gave you to me. I have been among the servants of Hathor or Meri. I have been washed by thee, O

attendant!" Compare the washing of Jesus' feet by Mary.

The Osiris exclaims, "I have welcomed the chief spirits in the service of the Lord of things! I am the Lord of the fields when they are white," *i.e.*, for the reapers and the harvest. So the Christ now says to the disciples, "Behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that are white already unto the harvest."

"Then said he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send forth labourers into his harvest. And he called unto him his twelve disciples." Now, if we turn to the Egyptian "Book of Hades," the harvest, the Lord of the harvest, and the reapers of the harvest are all portrayed: the twelve are also there. In one scene they are preceded by a God leaning on a staff, who is designated the Master of Joy—a surname of the Messiah Horus when assimilated to the Soli-Lunar Khunsu; the twelve are "they who labour at the harvest in the plains of Neter-Kar." A bearer of a sickle shows the inscription: "These are the Reapers." The twelve are divided into two groups of five and seven—the original seven of the Aahenu; these seven are the reapers. The other five are bending towards an enormous ear of corn, the image of the harvest, ripe and ready for the sickles of the seven. The total twelve are called the "Happy Ones," the bearers of food. Another title of the twelve is that of the "Just Ones." The God says to the reapers, "Take your sickles! Reap your grain! Honour to you, reapers." Offerings are made to them on earth, as bearers of sickles in the fields of Hades. On the other hand, the tares or the wicked are to be cast out and destroyed for ever. These twelve are the apostles in their Egyptian phase.

GERALD MASSEY.

(To be concluded.)

What Brahma Did Not Know.

It is well known that the Indian teacher, Buddha, threw the whole weight of his religious energy into the moral issues of life as against questions of theology. In effect, he kept the Gods out of his philosophy of life and conduct, and sought to dissuade his disciples both from worrying about the Gods, or attempting to work miracles in the God-like manner.

One day, according to an old tradition,¹ Buddha conversed with an inquirer, who apparently hankered after theological and useless speculations, and gently tried to draw him away from so vain a quest by telling him of a visit paid by a certain Bhikku, or monk, to the realm of the Gods.

This Bhikku, said Buddha (who, no doubt, invented the tale in irony), was very much exercised in mind over the problem—"What finally becomes of earth, water, fire, and wind?"

He could get no rest for thinking of the possible destiny of these four material things. What happened to them when they were worn out? Where did they go to? In other words, what is to be the ultimate fate of the universe?

The poor fellow, in a fit of dreamy ecstasy, was whisked off into the supernatural region where divinities reside, and, to the first Gods he met, he said:

"My friends, where do earth, water, fire, and wind go to at last?"

"We don't know," said the Gods, politely; but, if you pass on to the Four Great Kings, who are more

¹ In *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, edited by Max Mueller, vol. ii., translated by Rhys Davids.

potent and glorious than ourselves, they will, of course, be able to inform you."

The Four Potent Kings very courteously replied that they had no idea what the end of the world meant, but the Bhikku might possibly receive satisfaction if he applied to the Thirty-three Gods.

Away he hastened to the Thirty-three.

"Sorry," answered the Thirty-three, "but we really don't know. Try the Yama Gods."

No success came of the Yama Gods, who, in turn, despatched the perplexed monk to the Suyama Gods, who sent him on to the Santusita Gods, who circumlocuted him to the Nimmanarati Gods, who referred him to the Para-nimmita Vasavatti Gods, who, in a most obliging manner, moved him on to the highest of all worlds, namely, the Heaven of Brahma.

In this kingdom the Bhikku seeker after truth encountered the retinue, or courtiers, of the Supreme.

"My lords," said he, "can you tell me where the earth, water, fire, and wind go to finally?"

"We don't know, sir," they responded, "but the Supreme One and All-knowing One, the Creator and Ancient of Days, knows."

"Where is he?"

"We don't know," said the Celestial People, "but if you happen to see a blaze of light, you will then apprehend Brahma."

Not long afterwards, a magnificent radiance was manifested, and the Buddhist monk drew near to God the Highest, and asked—

"Lord, will you reveal to me what becomes finally of earth, water, fire, and wind?"

"I," said God, "am the great Brahma, the Supreme, the Mighty, the All-seeing, the Ruler, the Lord of All, the Creator."

"I believe it," humbly pursued the Bhikku, "but, dear Lord, I did not ask your name. I wished to know where the earth, water, fire, and wind depart to at the end of all things?"

"I," declared Brahma, "am the great Brahma, the Supreme, the Mighty, the All-seeing, the Ruler, the Lord of All, the Creator."

"True," murmured the Bhikku, and, the third time, he asked the same persistent question.

God took the monk by the arm, and led him aside into a quiet corner of Heaven, and whispered—

"These Gods, my courtiers, think there is nothing I cannot see or understand, so I gave you no straight answer in their presence. But I don't know, brother, where those four elements go to, and where they cease to be. Go back, and ask Buddha, the Exalted One."

Thereupon the monk, all in a flurry of research, rushed down to the world of men, and bowed to Buddha, and put the same question.

"Your quest," replied Buddha, "is useless. You get nothing by asking such questions. To the wise man these problems about material things, such as earth, water, fire, and wind, are unimportant. His attention is rather fixed on the noble path of virtue, the subduing of evil feelings, the elimination of passion, and the attainment of the purity and calm of the *Arahat*—the wise and saintly soul."

In 1920, and in Europe, we may not express the conclusion in terms such as Buddha employed in India, and in the fifth century B.C. We can, however, agree with his general wisdom, and come to the same essential decision—to abandon the search for First Causes and to concentrate on the human fellowship and social order and the betterment of our race.

F. J. GOULD.

As your virtues have been made costly to you by the clergyman, so your vices have been made costly to you by the lawyers; and you have one entire learned profession living on your sins, and the other on your repentance.—*Ruskin*.

Acid Drops.

The preacher at Westminster Abbey the other Sunday was the Rector of Wolverhampton, and he is a very funny gentleman—not perhaps intentionally, but none the less funny. For instance, he said that it was Secularism, godlessness, that had brought the world to its present pass. One would really imagine that there were very few Christians in the world, and that all the power and influence were in the possession of Secularists. We wish that were true. If it were, we are quite certain that the condition of the world would be much better than it is. The unfortunate fact is that the majority of those who have had control of the world have been very religious, and therein lay the trouble. For it is just religion that enables these men to blind themselves to what they are doing and to help to blind other people also. Look at the world before the war. The Emperor of Germany was a victim to religious mania, and was convinced that God meant Germany to be the leader of the world. King George is the head of the Church of England, and Mr. Bottomley declared that Germany could not be right because God had meant Great Britain to head the world. And who should be better able to explain the ways of God to man than he? The Emperor of Austria was a fervent Christian, and the Emperor of Russia had all the ignorant superstition of a Russian peasant. The world was saturated in religion, and the war came.

And look at the world after the war? Religion is, even though considerably weakened, still to the fore. It is raising large sums of money to "evangelize the world," in other words, to "dope" the people. It controls many of the main educational avenues, and is able to buy plenty of paid advocacy. And when it cannot buy advocacy, it can make it such a costly business for public men to oppose it that very many of them refrain from doing so. For let us make no mistake. It is not because all our public men believe in religion that they are quiet concerning it. It is because they find it a costly business to oppose it. They know that if they let their real opinions be known they may as well retire from public life. In private life they speak more freely, but in public they are content to play the hypocrite. Religion is still in power, and it is a shallow trick this pretence that the world is in a bad way because the people are given over to Secularism. The only fault we have to find with the statement is that it is not true. We wish it were.

There is, of course, no absolute guarantee that the non-Christian will always do right, but there is less chance of his doing wrong, and no chance whatever as to his deliberately blinding himself as to what he is doing. The distinction was well put by George Bernard Shaw in the preface to *Androcles and the Lion* :—

The "saved" thief experiences an ecstatic happiness which can never come to the honest Atheist; he is tempted to steal again to repeat the glorious sensation. But if the Atheist steals he has no such happiness. He is a thief, and knows that he is a thief. Nothing can rub that off him. He may try to soothe his shame by some sort of restitution or equivalent act of benevolence; but that does not alter the fact that he did steal; and his conscience will not be easy until he has conquered his will to steal, and changed himself into an honest man.

That really touches the essentially immoral influence of Christianity. It blinds men to the consequences of what they are doing. It enables them to disguise from themselves the nature of the rascality in which they may happen to be engaged. And it provides an outlet for whatever moral energy they possess by offering religious work as an equivalent for healthy social work.

At Carlisle, a man who called himself an Assyrian astrologer was sentenced to six months' hard labour for telling fortunes. No one sentences the clergy to anything hard for informing people where they will spend eternity. But people are so "soft" wherever religion is concerned.

Sunday cricket is to be allowed at Beaconsfield, Bucks, the Bishop and the Rector having approved. But why should Englishmen have to wait for the approval of petti-

coated priests? All over the Continent people enjoy theatres, music-halls, cinemas, and all the fun of the fair on Sundays, but "God's own Englishmen" have to get permission to enjoy themselves in the meekest and mildest fashion.

At the National Assembly of the Church of England a resolution was moved that marriage "must ever be based on the eternal foundations proclaimed by our Lord Jesus Christ." Unhappily, the Founder of the Christian religion was an unmarried man, so the "foundations" are a bit wobbly.

The World's Evangelical Alliance is asking for £23,000 as a thanksgiving fund. We do not know what we have to be thankful for, but in any case we should think that people could make better use of their money than spend it on sending Christianity all over the world. We have no doubt that the money will be forthcoming, it always is for Christianity. There are too many interests dependent upon the maintenance of the Christian religion for it be left wanting funds.

The *Church Times* is annoyed and disappointed that on the grave of the "Unknown Warrior" in Westminster Abbey it is not stated that he died for God, as well as for King and Country. We are not sure, as it stands, the first part of the inscription is correct, but the addition of God would certainly suggest more doubt than anything else. Why on earth should anyone die for God? What good can it do God for anyone to die for him? He is not in want of anything that we know of, and if there is a God it is surely part of his business to see that men do not die needlessly. We wonder whether the *Church Times* means that God having got things, or allowed things to get, into such a holy mess, people are doing the deity a favour if they risk their lives and lose them in the attempt to correct some of his blunders? There is a gleam of common sense in that view, but we dare not think that it is what our pious contemporary has in view.

A New York press telegram states that poison gas equipment is to be carried by every American soldier in the future. Fifty prominent chemists have been appointed to develop the art of killing by chemicals as much as is possible, and our own Government, as was stated last week, are proceeding on the same lines. That is all that the professed horror at the use of poison gas has amounted to. The peace without victory having been rejected, the victory without peace is having some curious results. In all the victorious countries militarism is being more firmly established than ever. In Germany the manufacturing of poison gas is prohibited, as is military drill in schools, the affiliation of educational establishments to any kind of military organization, and the army is kept down to the point of preserving civil order. So that, if the present state of things continue, that is, if the Allies go on developing their military and naval strengths, and Germany is kept where it is, and compelled to divert its energies into peaceful and industrial channels, the consequence will be that the victorious Allies will force Germany to become one of the most really civilized countries in the world, while those who won the war will, in order to make her so, continue to be in a relatively uncivilized state. And that is what winning a war means nowadays! And in a world so mad as this one some people are surprised at absurd beliefs maintaining their hold on the general public.

On November 18, in the Tottenham Police Court, H. W. Evans, a missionary, was found guilty of "offences" against two boys, and sentenced to six months in the second division. The man was given the character of a "devout Christian," and we presume that accounts for the second division. When the late editor of this journal was sentenced for "blasphemy" he was given twelve months as a common criminal, which proves that you had better commit an indecent assault on boys than speak disrespectfully of the Deity—particularly if you have been a devout Christian up to the point of being found out committing the former offence. The Christian is nothing if he is not moral, and he is often not much then.

The magistrate before whom the case came was Major Malone, M.P., who said that the man had brought discredit upon his family and upon the religion he represented. "That was most serious. There were carpens outside always ready to throw stones at religion," hence, we presume, the gravity of the situation. But suppose it had been a Freethought lecturer who had been brought before Major Malone, charged with a similar offence. We do not doubt but that we should then have been treated to a sermon on the horrible consequences of certain beliefs, and the man would have been sent to prison—not in the second division. And in this case we suggest to the Major, assuming that he will settle himself to a few minutes' serious and careful thinking in the intervals that occur between the discharge of his judicial duties, that it is quite clear that this man's religion was not powerful enough to keep him from doing the wrong. And it is with that type of man that religion should operate. The better balanced character doesn't need it. And it is clear, therefore, that religion is inoperative exactly where it ought to be most effective. And if the Major will look into the matter he will find that this class of sexual offence has always been common in religious circles, and during periods of religious excitement. If we thought that the Major would read it, we would send him, with pleasure, a copy of our work on *Religion and Sex*, where he would find proof of what we have said. But he would probably treat us as one who is always ready to throw stones at religion. And it is evidently wrong to do that.

The Mayor and the councillors of Llanelly formed their annual pantomimic procession on Sunday last, and marched to chapel to be preached at by the Mayor's chaplain. (To require a whole chaplain to oneself assumes a horrible degree of depravity, as we are assured by the New Testament that it is not the whole, but the sick that need a physician.) And having got them there the chaplain said that public-houses and picture theatres should be swept away in order to make the burghesses purer. But would that make the burghesses purer? Are the people purer in those remote parts of Wales where picture houses are unknown? We commend the preacher to the sketches of Welsh character as drawn by Caradoc Evans, and dealing with those portions of Wales where the chapel reigns without a serious rival. And even if the Chaplain were right, the only conclusion we could draw would be that Christianity makes, or leaves, people so morally weak-kneed that the poor devils can't go to a picture palace without their being hopelessly corrupted. That may be true of many Christians, and if the Chaplain really thinks that he and the Mayor and the Councillors are made of such poor stuff that visits to the picture palace would corrupt them, then in the name of everything that is effective let them keep away. But we fancy non-Christians are made of better material. They can go without the least risk.

A friend sends us a cutting from the *Nationalist and Leinster News* which contains some brief notes on the state of affairs in Baltingglass. We gather from these that there are numerous complaints of potatoes getting "pinched," that it is dangerous "to walk in certain portions of Baltingglass after dark," that there are other cases of serious misbehaviour, and then comes the following delightful comment:—"Hundreds received Holy Communion at Mass on Saturday and Sunday morning in Baltingglass. In the adjoining parishes a similar spirit of religious faith and devotion was displayed." Perhaps the state of the district and the spirit of devotion are not altogether unconnected. But the association of the paragraphs are certainly suggestive.

An American doctor, injured in a motor-car accident, told a chapel audience that while he was ill he had a vision. He saw God's throne with a man with white hair and white whiskers. He also heard some wonderful singing. Well, that is quite as good as any other description of heaven we have come across, and we are quite sure that it is as reliable. And we see no reason why believers should "jib" at white hair and whiskers. If God exists, he must look like something. And he may as well have whiskers as anything else so far as we can see.

"Freethinker" Sustentation Fund.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Previously acknowledged, £547 5s. 10d. A. W. Coleman, £5; D. W. Coleman, £1; L. W. M., 2s.; H. Taylor, 5s.; W. M., 5s.; T. C. Riglin, 4s.; A. Rawlinson, 3s.; Athos Zeno, 2s. 6d.; Valentine Caunter, £1 1s.; A. Davis, £2 2s.; R. W. Black, 5s.; J. R. Black, £1; E. Lechmere, 5s.; W. S. Leason, £1; J. W. Hudson, £1; G. Garratt, 5s.; J. Thelsey, 3s.; C. S. Knight, £3; B. Lee, 5s.; F. Ferney, 10s.; C. and K. Holmes, 5s.; J. McMillan, 5s.; R. B. Fowler (third subscription), 10s.; J. O'Connor, £1; "Ernest," 2s.

Per W. Jude—E. Hayes, 10s.; H. Timms, 2s. 6d.; G. Cleaver, 2s. 6d.; W. Judd, 10s.; H. Jackson, 2s. 6d.

Per Mrs. L. Gair—J. Harris, 5s.; Mr. and Mrs. Goddard, 5s.; D. Cameron, 5s.; Andrew Forest, 5s.; Rose Gair, 2s. 6d.; Mr. Walsh, 2s. 6d.; Owen Hughes, 2s. 6d.; Mr. Pugh (second subscription), 5s.

Per E. Pinder—R. Wheatley, 2s. 6d.; G. Martin, 2s. 6d.; E. Pinder, 5s.; H. H. Woolley, 10s.; F. Letts, 10s.; T. Standley, 5s.; W. Hopkins, 3s.; C. Pell, 2s. 6d.; G. H. Folwell, 4s.

Total, £572 os. 10d.

PROMISED, provided the total sum raised reaches £1,000, including the amounts promised:—"Medical," £25; "In Memory of the late Sir Hiram Maxim," £50; Mr. J. B. Middleton, £10; "A Friend," £100; "Working Journalist," £3; X. Y. Z., £10; J. Morton, 10s.; R. Proctor, £1; National Secular Society, £25; F. Collins, 10s.; H. Black, £1 1s.; T. Sharpe, £1 1s.; Mr. and Mrs. S. Clowes, £1 1s.; J. Breese, £3; "Ex-Soldier," £1; A. Davis, £2 2s.; J. W. Hudson, £1.

Total promises, £235 5s.

To Correspondents.

R. J. WILSON.—Pleased to hear from one who has taken in the paper for a year, and finds it so much to his taste. We are never much afraid of that, however, once we can get the paper into new hands. The difficulty is to bring it before new folk. For that reason we are obliged for the way in which you bring it before the notice of likely people. One must not expect a rush, as the *Freethinker* makes no appeal to fools, or to sensation lovers. But for those who like good, healthy mental diet, we have usually something for them.

S. J. SCHNEIDER.—If you have recently gained two new subscribers to the paper, you are helping us in the very best way. If a small percentage of our readers would do likewise, we should feel much easier than we do.

ATHOS ZENO.—Do you think that we are in the miracle business that you ask us if we know of a house you could get? We are only hanging on where we are by the skin of our teeth. We are not losing sight of the "*Freethinker* Fellowship," and either before, or just after Christmas, will see what can be done. We are quite all right now. It was only a temporary indisposition.

THOMAS ORR.—We hope your letter will have the desired effect. The rubbish published by the Sunday papers on the "Great Beyond" is puerile beyond description. Of course, the editors of such publications have no interest in these matters beyond that of pandering to morbidity and ignorance as a method of increasing sales, and it is well to let them know what some of their readers really think of the performances. There is all the more reason for those of us who do see the folly of it to keep on pegging away.

J. W. HUDSON.—Thanks for second subscription, and for promise of further contribution when the Fund reaches the £1,000. On the whole, we are inclined to agree with your criticism. The paper holds its own well in the matter of circulation. But we should much like to see the rise more rapid than it is. We feel sure that if many of our readers laid themselves out to get new subscribers, numbers would be forthcoming at once. Many do their best in that direction, and not without results.

S. LECHMERE.—Thanks for story. The criticisms of children on religious ideas would have an educative effect on adults, if they would only heed. It might be a good thing if parents recognised that the work of educating is not all one-sided. It is a pity that parents do not attend to the lessons their children so often read them.

WILL J. H. English please send his address to the Editor? We have a letter awaiting him.

W. JUDD.—To take an extra copy on the chance of finding a new reader is a very practical way of helping the permanent circulation. Thanks.

H. GOOD.—Sorry for blunder. It was yourself that appeared in the list of acknowledgments under the name of "Grod."

H. C. MELLOR.—So far as we know there is no report of the trial of Slade, the medium. We believe it was well reported at the time of the trial.

LANELLY READER.—When Charles I. was asked how he could explain the attraction a preacher of his days had for a certain class of people, he replied that his nonsense suited their nonsense. Doesn't that explain your Lanelly parson? So long as the people are foolish, they will behave in a foolish manner, and crave for foolish things.

E. PINDER.—It is very good of you to call on the faithful—but dilatory—in order to see that they subscribed to the Sustentation Fund. We appreciate your action, and reciprocate your good wishes.

DESIROUS.—We have no intention at present of republishing the articles.

F. W. LLOYD.—We are writing you. All copies of the *Freethinker* are sent to all wholesale agents, and to ordinary newsagents, on sale or return. There is, therefore, no reason whatever why your newsagent should not order extra copies if he cares to do so.

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:—

The United Kingdom.—One year, 17s. 6d.; half year, 8s. 9d.; three months, 4s. 6d.

Foreign and Colonial.—One year, 15s.; half year, 7s. 6d.; three months, 3s. 9d.

Sugar Plums.

Mr. A. W. Coleman, whose name has appeared on the list of promises for the £1,000, writes:—

It appears to my sister and myself that Freethinkers are going to manage it (the £1,000), and that promises must be made good at no distant date. So herewith cheques to the value of £6. All good wishes for the success of the Fund and the future of the *Freethinker*.

That is, at least, sending in good time, as the money was not really due until the full amount had been subscribed. But we have no doubt but that the rest of the money will be forthcoming. The whole sum is, after all, but little, provided that all those who can do their part. It will be noted that with promises and subscriptions there is now less than £200 to be raised. Perhaps that long-looked-for millionaire will romp in with a cheque for the whole amount, and so end the matter.

To-day (November 28) Mr. Cohen lectures in the Town Hall, Fulham Road, at 7.30, on the "Benefits of Unbelief." We hope that West London Freethinkers are doing their best to get the meeting well known. The meeting, if successful, may well be followed by others. A large gathering of Christians would be even more encouraging than a hall filled with Freethinkers. The hall is passed by several lines of 'buses, and the nearest railway station is Walham Green. There will be a pianoforte recital before the lecture by Miss Harrison.

There were two excellent audiences at Pontypridd on Sunday last to listen to Mr. Cohen's lectures. The hall was well filled on both occasions, and the addresses were received with obvious appreciation. Friends came in from many of the surrounding districts, and there was a record sale of literature. The supply of *Freethinkers* was exhausted in the early part of the proceedings, and many more might have been sold. The whole day was very encouraging to those who had arranged the meetings, and it is to be hoped that more meetings will be arranged before the season is over. The right man on the spot in South Wales would be able to do a tremendous amount of good.

Mr. R. H. Rosetti is not a very frequent visitor to provincial Branches, so Manchester friends will be the more interested to learn that he will be lecturing in the Co-operative Hall, Downing Street, this afternoon at 3, and in the evening at 6.30. We hope there will be good attendances on both occasions.

Will Freethinkers of Taff and Cynon district kindly communicate with me in order to arrange a meeting for organizing a local Branch of the N. S. S.? Address your communications to Myrddin Evans, 5 South View, Merthyr Vale.

It was quite an oversight that we omitted to mention in our last issue that Mr. Thresh was the lecturer at Friars Hall last Sunday. That, however, did not hinder the lecture being greatly enjoyed by those present. Mr. Lloyd winds up the present course to-day (November 28), and it is hoped that they will be renewed early in the New Year. We hope that the last audience of the present course will be a record one.

An advertising specialist, who sees no reason why Freethinkers, and others, should not use this journal as an advertising medium, writes:—

I will design, write, lay out, and make up rules, types, etc., for any advertisement for not less than two inches for four consecutive weeks absolutely free of charge, provided the advertiser has a three months' contract with the *Freethinker*.

This is a very generous offer, as all advertisers will perceive. The sole purpose is to benefit the paper, and he adds that the length of the contract is not arbitrary. He leaves that to us. And we feel inclined, to give the matter a trial, to make the period one month as a start. That is, of course, if we are not imposing on the generosity of our friend. But there is really no reason why, even from a business point of view, the *Freethinker* should not be used as an advertising medium more than is done now. It would help towards meeting some of the steadily mounting expenses.

The Glasgow Branch has moved to new quarters for its ordinary Sunday meetings. The hall is situated at 297 Argyle Street, and is thus in a very central position. A good list of local speakers has been arranged, who will discourse on a variety of subjects. The speaker to-day, at 12 o'clock, is Councillor G. Pettigrew, who will speak on "The Spy System in America." The subject sounds interesting, and should attract a large audience.

Revelation is a communication of something which the person to whom that thing is revealed did not know before. For if I have done a thing, or seen it done, it needs no revelation to tell me I have done it, or seen it, nor to enable me to tell it, or to write it. Revelation, therefore, cannot be applied to anything done upon earth of which man himself is the actor or the witness; and consequently all the historical and anecdotal parts of the Bible, which is almost the whole of it, is not within the meaning and compass of the word revelation, and, therefore, is not the word of God.—*Thomas Paine*.

A country cannot well subsist without liberty, nor liberty without virtue.—*Rousseau*.

Mr. Don't Care.

THE human race may be divided into four classes: Those who know that it is so; those who know that it is not so; those who do not know whether it is so or not; and those who do not care whether it is so or not. The first two of these classes have one virtue in common—they are positive characters. They are also apt to have one vice in common—dogmatism. The third class have the virtue of modesty, but are attended by the weakness that always hangs to uncertainty. The fourth class have no redeeming quality. They are general and particular nuisances, and have not even the honour of being active obstructionists.

To the first class belong orthodox theologians. Those who have no evidence for their beliefs are always the most sure that what they believe is true; and if this is contradicted by all experience, and indeed flatly impossible, all the more are they sure that it is true. To the second class belong the Materialists. To the third class belong the doubters, the Agnostics. To the fourth class, when the thing in question does not affect their pockets or personal comfort, belong, unfortunately, the great majority of mankind. This don't care family is not only very large, but very long-lived. They are the persons whom no wrong can offend and no injustice enrage, as long as their own precious persons or property is unaffected. They will see others endure the petty tyranny of the politicians and profiteers, or the savage outrages of the police and soldiers, without it ever occurring to them to protest or do anything to effect a change. They heard the moans and saw the lacerated backs of millions of slaves for over a century, but never had a thought or spoke a word, or did a thing that showed that they cared; and if the negroes were put back into slavery tomorrow it would be all the same to them. Show them that elections are won by hoodle or fraud, and that plutocrats rule in the councils of the nation, and it is nothing to them. Have they bread and beer and physical comfort? If so, everything is all right. Any religion, any government, any social system under which their backs are covered and their bellies are filled is just as it should be, even if others suffer every form of injustice and privation.

You know these persons. Call a meeting to protest against the murder and torture of innocent persons by the police in Ireland—crimes that should involve the severing of diplomatic relations with every civilized country—and they will not attend. Why? Because they are going to a card party or a variety show. Tell them that horrible blunders, stupid and ghastly crimes, have been committed; that innocent men have been shot and imprisoned with the sanction of the British Government, and it makes no impression on them. Show them millions of human beings like themselves compelled to live in filth, poverty, and crime: say to them, "See, *this* is why all this is so, and *this* is how it can all be prevented"; try to rouse them to the horror and shame of such a needless situation, and they look at you with half-dead eyes, and speak of you afterwards as if you were at least partly crazy.

These people hang round the neck of the human race like a corpse. They haven't even animation enough to decay and drop off, and get themselves buried. I do not deny that they are useful in their own particular small spheres as factors in the world's busy life. They are good as tinkers and tailors, actors and artists, doctors and farmers, ornamental as peers and princes, and picturesque as policemen and tramps, and so in many "practical" ways they make the world go. But so satisfied are they with their puny mental outlook that they regard persons who are not struggling for dollars and looking only after the immediate personal interests of number one as little better than lunatics.

They know that in making clothes, raising pigs and potatoes, and ministering to the gaiety of the world, they are doing something very tangible and practical; and they know, too, that things as they are *do* work for their own immediate comfort and happiness, and they simply cannot understand why anyone should be such a fool as to raise any disturbance in, what to them, at any rate, is a fairly happy world. But the words right and wrong, justice and injustice, have no meaning for them, except as applied to their own personal interests. If you say to them, "But, my dear sirs, a principle is involved," they have not the remotest idea what you mean.

I was talking to a smart business man lately, who has made a fortune by speculation. He is a "good" Churchman. I saw that he had never inquired into the truth of the doctrines he believed as carefully as he would inquire into the value of a piece of business paper. "Why, my dear man," said he, "I have never given a thought to such matters. These are the doctrines that my father and mother believed, and they are good enough for me. It is the parson's business to find out the truth of such things, just as it is my business to find out the truth of Stock Exchange reports." "But," said I, "is it a matter of no concern to you what kind of a God you believe in, or whether you accept as true doctrines that are plainly immoral and events that cannot possibly have happened?" But it was no good. He did not care whether his God was good or bad, or whether his religious beliefs were true or false. Only one thing seemed to concern him. He did not want to be scared when he came to die, and he evidently felt that if he went along with the parsons he would not be, and there his interest in the subject ended. It bored him to talk about it, but when he told me about a man who was trying to best him in some speculation he was as lively as a cricket. A matter of truth or falsehood was wholly uninteresting to him, but whether he won or lost £100 or not was of vital importance. This man is an ordinary specimen of the great Don't Care family.

And, curiously enough, there are many progressive persons who become members of this family at a certain point. For example, I have talked with State Socialists who have admitted that their theory would not be the ultimate solution of the social question; that there can be no satisfactory solution until each person shall be free from all forcible control by other persons or by majorities; that their scheme involves compulsion and injustice to the few for the benefit of the many. But they advocate State Socialism because they think it is practical; it is something that can be accomplished in a few years, and they want to see something done before they die.

Most people believe that it is much easier to achieve something that is wrong than something that is right. They admit that many social theories that are commonly called vagaries are really true and right, but they refuse to work for them because they think they can never be accomplished. All such persons are "Don't Cares" from the point at which they lose interest in what is right for the sake of accomplishing what is called "practical."

If a thing is not true or just, if it is something that will ultimately have to be changed or supplemented, I see no good reason for advocating it merely because it can be accomplished in my lifetime, or even in some hundreds of years, more especially if in doing so I must suppress all advocacy of the right and sufficient thing. It seems to me a matter of no consequence whether what is right can be accomplished in my day, or, indeed, any day. It seems to me to be my duty to advocate what is right—what will ensure the most and best good to all—and nothing less than that, even if I could know that mankind will never do that thing. We should *do* what we can or must, but we should *preach*

what is right. For example, this is a country where a few idle landlords hold sway, to the great detriment of the millions of honest and industrious workers. I do not like it, but I cannot help myself. But I will not advocate either nationalization of the land or the taxation of land values, because they are "practical." I will advocate the free use of all vacant land because it is right. I am compelled to pay taxes for the support of several things that I think should not be supported; and, furthermore, I think I should not be forcibly compelled to pay taxes at all—I think I should be free to contribute for what I want to have done. So I will not advocate a new kind of taxation, because it may be practicable. I will advocate the cessation of all compulsory taxation.

But, above all, cut the acquaintance of the "Don't Care" family. While one human being is suffering injustice through the prevalence of some hoary superstition, no one has a right to be happy; while religion sits upon the breast of reason no one who hates a nightmare should refuse to denounce it; while men are impoverished because they speak the truth; while women are oppressed because they are women; while children perish because plutocrats flourish, he who does not care is a species of monster. G. O. W.

Pages From Voltaire.

THE QUESTIONS OF ZAPATA.

1767.

[Zapata, a master of arts, elected professor of theology at the University of Salamanca, presented the following questions to the Academic Council in the year 1629. They were suppressed. The Spanish original is in the Library of Brunswick.]

Learned Masters.—I. How must I proceed if I wish to show that the Jews, whom we have caused to be burnt by the hundreds, were the chosen people of God for some four thousand years?

II. Why did God, whom we cannot without blasphemy regard as unjust, why did he discard the whole of the dwellers on his earth for one insignificant Jewish tribe, and in the end discard this petty tribe for another, which for two centuries was even more insignificant and contemptible?

III. Why did he work a great number of incomprehensible miracles, in favour of this wretched nation, before what we call the historic period? Why has he left off working them for a number of centuries? Why do we, who are the children of God, never witness any of them?

IV. If God is the God of Abraham, why do you burn the children of Abraham? And when you burn them why do you recite their prayers, even in the act of burning them? Why do you who worship the book of their law, consign them to death for acting in accordance with their law?

V. How am I to reconcile the chronology of the Chinese, Chaldeans, Phœnicians, and Egyptians with that of the Jews, and how am I to harmonize the forty different methods of reckoning time, which I find in the commentators? If I say that God dictated the book, I shall be told that he evidently knows nothing about chronology.

VI. In what way am I to prove that the books attributed to Moses were written by him in the desert? Can I say that he wrote them on the other side of the Jordan, when he never crossed that river? I shall be told that God evidently knows nothing about geography.

VII. The book called *Joshua*¹ says that Joshua wrote the *Law* on "whole stones over which no man hath lifted any iron"; this passage and others

¹ viii. 32.

ancient writers prove conclusively that, from the time of Moses and Joshua, Oriental peoples engraved on stone or brick their laws and commentaries. The *Pentateuch*³ tells us that, in the desert, the Jews were without food and clothing; it is surely improbable that they had men clever enough to engrave a great book on stones, when they had neither tailors nor shoemakers. How did they preserve this great volume cut on unhewn stones?

VIII. Which is the best way to refute the objections of the learned, who find in the *Pentateuch* the names of towns which did not exist at that time, precepts for kingly rulers whom we know at that time the Jews held in horror, and who did not begin to govern the land until seven hundred years after Moses, and, finally, certain passages where the author, much later than Moses, betrays himself by saying: The bedstead of the giant Og,³ king of Bashan, is it not in Rabbath?The Canaanite dwelled then in the land.⁴ The learned, basing their objections on the difficulties and contradictions which they impute to the Jewish chronicles, might be able to put even a master of arts in a quandary.

IX. Is the book of Genesis physical or allegorical? Did God really take a rib from Adam to make a woman, and why is it said in an earlier passage that male and female created he them? How did God create light before the sun? How did he divide light from darkness since darkness is nothing but the absence of light? How did he make the day before he had made the sun? How did he set the firmament in the midst of the waters, seeing that there is no firmament, this false notion of a firmament being no more than a fantastic notion of the Greeks. There are those who conjecture that *Genesis* was written when the Jews had some knowledge of the erroneous philosophic ideas of other nations, and I should be sorry to hear it said that God knows as little about physics as he does about chronology and geography.

X. What am I to say about the Garden of Eden, from which there flowed a river which branched out into four rivers, the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Pison, and the Gihon, which flow into Ethiopia, and which therefore can be none other than the Nile, whose source is a thousand leagues from that of the Euphrates? They will tell me once more that God is an indifferent geographer.

XI. For my part I have an earnest desire to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, and to me it seems strange that this eating should be forbidden; for God, having endowed man with reason, ought to encourage him in getting knowledge. Is it his will to be worshipped only by fools? I should be glad to have a conversation with the serpent, since he had so much intelligence; but I should like to know what language he spoke. That eminent philosopher, the Emperor Julian, put this very question to the great Saint Cyril, who was unable to answer it, but retorted that the wise Emperor was himself the serpent. St. Cyril was not a very polite man; but you will have noted that he pronounced this theological impertinence only when the Emperor was dead.

Genesis tells us that the serpent should eat the dust of the earth; but you know that *Genesis* is mistaken, and that the dust can nourish no one. With regard to God who walked in the garden in the cool of the day, and talked with Adam and Eve, and with the serpent, it would have been pleasant to have made the fourth in this party. But, as I believe you are more fitted for the company which Joseph and Mary had in the stable at Bethlehem, I should not propose to you a journey to the Garden of Eden, especially as the gate

is kept by cherubim armed to the teeth. It is true that, according to the rabbins, the word *cherubim* means *oxen*, surely an amazing sort of gatekeepers. I shall be grateful if you will let me know your interpretation of the word.

XII. How am I to explain the story of the angels who fell in love with the daughters of men, and got giants by them? Will it not be said that this story is taken from pagan legends? But as the Jews invented everything in the desert, and, as they were remarkably ingenious, it is clear that all other nations owe this knowledge to them. Homer, Plato, Cicero, Virgil knew nothing save through the Jews. Is not this proved conclusively?

XIII. How am I to account for the deluge, the floodgates of the sky, which has no floodgates, all the animals arriving from Africa, America, Japan, and the Antipodes, shut up in an immense box with their food and drink for one year, without taking into account the period when the land, still soaked with moisture, could produce no food at all? How could the small family group of the venerable Noah see that all these animals had the food suitable for them? It was made up of only eight in all.

XIV. How am I to give the semblance of truth to the Tower of Babel story? This tower must certainly have been taller than the Egyptian pyramids, seeing that God allowed them to be built. Did it reach to Venus, or, maybe, as far up as the moon?

XV. By what art am I to justify Abraham's couple of falsehoods? The father of all true believers, at the advanced age of one hundred and thirty-five years, passed off the beautiful Sarah as his sister both in Egypt and Gerar, in order that the kings of those countries might fall in love with her and present him with gifts? What a rascal the old man was to barter his own wife!

XVI. Inform me, if you please, why, when God had commanded Abraham that all his posterity should be circumcised, they were not circumcised even in the time of Moses?

XVII. Is it possible for me to know whether the three angels for whom Sarah served up a whole calf had bodies, or whether they borrowed them for the occasion? How did it come about that God having sent two angels to Sodom the men of that town wanted to commit a certain sin with them? They must have been remarkably handsome. But why did not that good man offer the men of Sodom his two daughters in the place of the two angels? The whole story of the escapades of these young ladies is not a pretty one.

XVIII. Am I likely to be believed when I tell people that Lot's wife was changed into a pillar of salt? What must I reply to anyone who objects that the story is perhaps a clumsy imitation of the old legend of Eurydice, and that the pillar of salt would melt away in a shower of rain?

XIX. What am I to say when I have to justify the blessings showered on that virtuous man Jacob, who deceived Isaac his father, and robbed his father-in-law, Laban? How am I to explain God's appearance to him at the top of a ladder? And how did Jacob wrestle all night with an angel?

XX. How am I to deal with the sojourn of the chosen people in Egypt,⁵ and their escape from that country? We are told in *Exodus* that they dwelt in the land of Egypt four hundred years, and yet by an exact computation I find it was no more than two hundred years. Why did the daughter of Pharaoh bathe in the Nile, where people do not bathe for fear of the crocodiles?

Englished by GEORGE UNDERWOOD.

(To be continued.)

³ Deuteronomy iii. 11.

⁴ Genesis xii. 6.

⁵ Exodus xii. 40. The writer of *Exodus* says four hundred and thirty years.

Correspondence.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE ART OF WRITING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I have read with much pleasure Mr. W. H. Morris's articles under the above title. I notice, however, a serious discrepancy in Article V., where he states that "Nathan Behrin at New York in 1912 achieved a record with Pitman Shorthand, writing at the rate of 278 words per minute for five minutes." As a matter of fact, the Press report which appeared on August 24, 1912, stated that Mr. Behrin attained a speed of 279 words a minute in Court reporting matter.

These statements are quite on a level with the feeding of the five thousand!

I would ask Mr. Morris, first of all, to try and read aloud 279 words a minute for even five minutes, and then try and put down in an orderly manner 279 dots a minute for five minutes, and he will see the absurdity of the whole thing.

In the Australian Commonwealth the highest test for the Government licence for Court reporting is only 150 words a minute, and there are few who pass it the first time of sitting; and in the United Kingdom the highest test in shorthand is the National Union of Teachers' Reporting Honours at 160 words a minute for seven minutes.

As to the alleged feat of Mr. Edward O'Shaughnessy in taking down Mr. Blake's speech in the House of Commons at 225-230 words per minute, I note Mr. Morris refers to this as "the most extraordinary feat done with Sloan-Duployan Shorthand." So it is—if Mr. Blake spoke at this amazing speed!

It is interesting to note that the *Evening News* of March 9, 1906, stated in reference to Mr. Haldane's speech on the Army Estimates that he spoke for two hours at the rate of 200 words per minute; yet, according to the *verbatim* report which appeared in the *Times*, Mr. Haldane spoke 11,000 words in 125 minutes, which shows an average rate of utterance of 88 words per minute!

May I add in conclusion that I have been a high-speed writer and teacher of script phonography for over thirteen years, and that my object in writing this letter is an endeavour to counteract exaggerated statements in regard to the whole art of shorthand writing. W. T. NEWMAN.

THE THREE NEWMANS.

SIR,—We are told in the *Freethinker* for November 14 that "the name of John Henry Newman is known the world over, that of his younger brother, Francis, is known to few." Apparently the name of Charles Robert Newman, the Atheist brother, would be totally unknown if left to "Mimnermus." He is made to appear of an unsocial, morose disposition by the pious biographers of his two religious brothers. I have long been trying to frame an opinion on the absence of congenial surroundings, but I find Wheeler has anticipated me. He says, "He had no contact with minds congenial to his own, and doomed himself to the life of a recluse." A lonely, pathetic figure, deserving more our sympathy than any other sentiment! He contributed to the *Reasoner* and to the *Owen* periodicals. At his death, thirty-six years ago, we read, "He left a box full of manuscripts, which were destroyed as useless." No ulterior motive in this destruction, of course not. None but a wicked *Freethinker* would raise the question. Three of his articles, *Essays in Rationalism*, were issued in book form in 1891, with a biographical sketch by Wheeler, and an appreciation of his character by Holyoake. These notes by Wheeler and Holyoake deserve reprinting. They should be republished in pamphlet form. A. G. BARKER.

GOD AND EVIL.

SIR,—May I ask Dr. Lyttelton, whose courtesy and urbanity as a Christian apologist is as delightful as it is rare, would he kindly tell your readers *how* "suffering rightly understood is a good and not an evil." And I invite him to exemplify and prove his theory in the following event:—

One night a fire broke out in a house, during which a family of eight were burnt to death. Some of them were

seen writhing in their agony, but could not be reached. Will Dr. Lyttelton show, in explicit terms, how their suffering was "a good and not an evil" to the sufferers?

The example is quite typical in its *incidence*, though not in the intensity of agony, of the bulk of human suffering.

Incidentally, he may further tell us what *is evil* apart from suffering?

His psychology of "remorse" I have no right to challenge; I must leave it to the person to whom it is addressed. KERIDON.

SIR,—I thank Dr. Lyttelton for his reply to another of my questions. He says that judgment is not a power of foreseeing results, but a knowledge of the difference between good and evil. But don't we have to find that out *by results*? And he thinks it wouldn't make much difference if man *could* foresee. Well, it may be possible to prefer evil to good, temporarily, but does any man really wish to wreck his life?

And what of the evils that man is *not* responsible for—the kind enumerated in the article, "Responsibility, the Guilt of God"—does Dr. Lyttelton really hold that they are *good*, to reconcile them with Theism?

I should like Dr. Lyttelton to answer my other question, omitted from his previous letter—how does he know that the conviction of God's existence is reliable, and not to be explained as Mr. Cohen explains it in Chapter 17, *Parson and Atheist*, par. 4 (p. 71). W. JAMESON.

HUMAN FREEDOM.

SIR,—Dr. Lyttelton, in his letter published in your issue of November 21, seems a little bit at sea on this question.

He says, "Sin means a choice of evil knowing it to be evil." This is an extraordinary standard for a Christian to set up. It makes the question of whether an action is wrong or not depend entirely upon the moral ideas of the person performing the action. So that the lower the moral outlook, the less likely is one to sin! Or take the case of Atheists. As they do not consider their expressions wrong, they do not sin, however blasphemous they may appear to Christians.

He writes about Atheists being unscientific in ignoring the facts of moral consciousness. They cannot explain remorse, while he does so very scientifically, as "the feeling of the soul dying by being cut off from the source of its life." I am not aware that science has discovered the soul yet. Remorse is not the feeling of responsibility, and one does not admit "after a wrong choice that he need not have made it." How does Dr. Lyttelton square this with his statement that God did not give men the power of foreseeing results? Surely the more one could foresee results the better chance there is of being able to do the right thing. It is *after* the action that one sees that he could have done better, but nobody understanding the question admits that he could have done differently under the circumstances prevailing up to the time of acting.

Again, if God gave men judgment and a knowledge of the difference between good and evil, how is it that people differ in their ideas of right and wrong? There are many actions certain men do which they honestly consider right, but which Dr. Lyttelton would just as honestly consider wrong. The knowledge and judgment, then, God gives to some men differs from that which he gives to others. This does not savour of much sanity.

The climax is reached when we read this: "All the evil in the world that man is responsible for is due to man preferring it to good, with his eyes open." This can only mean that man, having just as good a chance of doing good, deliberately does evil.

Good heavens! No wonder we are in such a mess after 2,000 years of Christianity. Never before has it dawned upon me with so much force how terribly humanity is misled by its spiritual guides. It is certain that not until reason dethrones such unreason is there much hope for mankind. W. MAYBANK.

It is wondrous how, the truer we become, the more erringly we know the ring of truth, discern whether a man be true or not, and can fasten at once upon the rising lie in word and look and dissembling act.—*Frederick W. Robertson.*

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.

FRIARS HALL (236 Blackfriars Road) : 7, Mr. J. T. Lloyd, "Christianity in the Melting Pot."

FULHAM (Town Hall, Fulham Road) : 7.30, Mr. Chapman Cohen, "The Benefits of Unbelief."

METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Johnson's Dancing Academy, 241 Marylebone Road, near Edgware Road) : 7.30, Social Gathering—Music and Dancing.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH, N. S. S. (St. Pancras Reform Club, 15 Victoria Road, off Kentish Town Road, N.W.) : 7.30, Miss O. M. Johnson, B.A., "The National Advantage of Birth Control."

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Trade Union Hall, 30 Brixton Road, S.W. 9) : 7, Mr. P. Wilde, "Science and What We Believe."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (South Place, Moorgate Street, E.C. 2) : 11, Edwin Fagg, "Art and Theory."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Stratford Engineers' Institute, 167 Romford Road, Stratford, E.) : 7, Mr. A. D. McLaren, "The Re-statement of the Theistic Position Examined."

COUNTRY. INDOOR.

ASSOCIATION OF ENGINEERING AND SHIPBUILDING DRAUGHTSMEN, Merseyside Branch (Walker Engineering Lecture Theatre) : Thursday, December 2, at 7.30, F. Clements, M.I.M.E., "Design of Centrifugal Fans."

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Baths Assembly Room, Northwood Street) : 7, Mr. W. H. Thresh, "The Record of the Rocks."

GLASGOW BRANCH N. S. S. (Shop Assistants' Hall, 297 Argyle Street, near Oswald Street) : 12 noon, Councillor Geo. Pettigrew, "The Spy System in America." (Collection.)

LEEDS BRANCH N. S. S. (Youngman's Rooms, 19 Lowerhead Row, Leeds) : Every Sunday at 6.30.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate) : 6.30, Mr. George Nicholson, "The Dangers of the League of Nations."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Co-operative Hall, Downing Street) : Mr. R. H. Rosetti, 3, "Christianity before Christ"; 6.30, "Christianity and the Growth of Militarism."

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N. S. S. (Room No. 8, Plymouth Chambers, Old Town Street) : Thursday, December 2, at 8, Mr. H. L. Darton, "The Book of Revelation."

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. 2. Bible and Teetotalism, J. M. Wheeler; 3. Principles of Secularism C. Watts; 4. Where Are Your Hospitals? R. Ingersoll; 5. Because the Bible Tells Me So, W. P. Ball; 6. Why Be Good? G. W. Foote; 7. Advice to Parents, Ingersoll. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 1s. per hundred, post free 1s. 2d. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 62 Farringdon Street, E.C. 4.

DR. FOOTE'S Home Cyclopadia. The Advertiser wishes to purchase one or more copies in good condition — Offers to S. S. S. c/o Freethinker Office, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4.

FREETHINKER offers Comfortable Apartments opposite Sea at Moderate Terms.—MRS LEWIS, "Esmeralda," Solent View Road, Gurnard, near Cowes, I.O.W.

MR. JOSEPH H. VAN BIENE has a few open Sundays for Lectures.

A FIGHT FOR RIGHT.

A Verbatim Report of the Decision in the House of Lords in re

Bowman and Others v. The Secular Society, Limited.

With Introduction by CHAPMAN COHEN.

Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.

Price One Shilling. Postage 1½d.

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

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President :

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Secretary :

MISS E. M. VANCE, 62 FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Principles and Objects.

Secularism teaches that conduct should be based on reason and knowledge. It knows nothing of divine guidance or interference; it excludes supernatural hopes and fears; it regards happiness as man's proper aim, and utility as his moral guide.

Secularism affirms that Progress is only possible through Liberty, which is at once a right and a duty; and therefore seeks to remove every barrier to the fullest equal freedom of thought, action, and speech.

Secularism declares that theology is condemned by reason as superstitious, and by experience as mischievous, and assails it as the historic enemy of Progress.

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

Membership.

Any person is eligible as a member on signing the following declaration :—

I desire to join the National Secular Society, and I pledge myself, if admitted as a member, to co-operate in promoting its objects.

Name.....

Address

Occupation

Dated this.....day of.....19.....

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

P.S.—Beyond a minimum of Two Shillings per year, every member is left to fix his own subscription according to his means and interest in the cause.

PIONEER LEAFLETS.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

- No. 1. What Will You Put in Its Place?
No. 2. Dying Freethinkers.
No. 3. The Beliefs of Unbelievers.
No. 4. Are Christians Inferior to Freethinkers?
No. 5. Does Man Desire God?

Price 1s. 6d. per 100. (Postage 3d.)

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

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 FARRINGDON STREET, E.C. 4.

Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

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

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM. Price 2d.,
 postage 1d.

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., post-
 age 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., post-
 age ½d.

By WALTER MANN.

PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN MORALITY. Price 2d.,
 postage ½d.

SCIENCE AND THE SOUL. With a Chapter on Infidel
 Death-Beds. Price 7d., postage 1½d.

By ROBERT ARCH.

SOCIETY AND SUPERSTITION. Price 6d., postage 1d.

By H. G. FARMER.

HERESY IN ART. The Religious Opinions of Famous
 Artists and Musicians. Price 3d., postage ½d.

By A. MILLAR.

THE ROBES OF PAN: And Other Prose Fantasies.
 Price 1s., postage 1½d.

By COLONEL INGERSOLL.

IS SUICIDE A SIN AND LAST WORDS ON
 SUICIDE. Price 2d., postage 1d.

CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY. Price 1d., postage ½d.

FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH. Price 2d., postage 1d.

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 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C. 4.

DOES MAN SURVIVE DEATH?**Is the Belief Reasonable?**

Verbatim Report of a Discussion

BETWEEN

Mr. HORACE LEAF

(Representing the Glasgow Spiritualist Association)

AND

Mr. CHAPMAN COHEN

IN THE

St. Andrew's Halls, Glasgow.

Neatly Bound in Coloured Wrapper. Price 7d.
 Postage 1d.

Special Terms for quantities for propaganda purposes.

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

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 9d.)

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.

For LANTERN and MICROSCOPE

LANTERN AND MICROSCOPICAL SLIDES for Lecturers, Teachers, and Students.

LANTERN SLIDES in every Branch of Natural Science and Commerce.

Preparers of the "ACCURATE" Series of Botanical Slides for the Board of Education Examinations.

We photograph everything—
Macro and Microscopical.

We prepare everything for the Microscope.
Microscopical Sundries—Slips, Covers, Stains, Mounting Media, etc.

Prices and Summary List free to all. Illustrated Lantern List free to Customers.

Developing, Printing, Enlarging, etc.

THE LABORATORY,

16, 18, & 20, Church Road, Longsight, Manchester.

A Fine Study of a Great Writer.

THE LIFE-WORSHIP OF RICHARD JEFFERIES.

BY
ARTHUR F. THORN.

With Fine Portrait of Jefferies.

Price ONE SHILLING. Postage 1½d.

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

A New Life of Bradlaugh.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH

BY
The Right Hon. J. M. ROBERTSON.

An Authoritative Life of one of the greatest Reformers of the Nineteenth Century, and the only one now obtainable.

With Four Portraits.

In Paper Covers, 2s. (postage 3d.). Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d. (postage 4d.).

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

Determinism or Free-Will?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

NEW EDITION Revised and Enlarged.

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

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.

Bring Your Orthodox Friends

SUNDAY LECTURE

TO BE HELD

Under the Auspices of the National Secular Society

AT

FRIARS HALL,

236 BLACKFRIARS ROAD
(4 Doors South of Blackfriars Bridge).

November 28—

J. T. LLOYD.

"Christianity in the Melting-Pot."

Doors open at 6.30 p.m. Chair taken at 7 p.m.
Opposition and Discussion cordially invited.
All Seats Free. Silver Collection.

A COURSE OF THREE LANTERN LECTURES (With nearly Two Hundred Beautiful Slides) on THE EVOLUTION OF LIFE AND OF MAN

WILL BE DELIVERED BY THE WELL-KNOWN LECTURER,
JOSEPH McCABE,

At PICTON HALL, LIVERPOOL,

On MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, and FRIDAY,
DECEMBER 6, 8, and 10, 1920, at 7.30 p.m. prompt.

Admission NINEPENCE to each Lecture. Reserved Seat Tickets:—Body of Hall, Front Rows (numbered), 2s. 6d.; Back Rows (not numbered), 1s. 3d. Course Tickets, 6s., 3s., and 2s. respectively. Tickets may be obtained of the Hon. Secretary, Rationalist Press Association, Ltd., 53 Belmont Drive, Newsham Park, Liverpool.

TUNIS DATES.

Extra Fine Quality, direct from the Centre of Production.

PRICE LIST.

1 box of 6 lbs. Tunis Dates	at 7s. 6d. per box
1 " 10 " " " " " " " " " " " "	at 12s. "
1 " 6 " Marzipan (Dates and Pistachios)	at 15s. "
1 " 10 " " " " " " " " " " " "	at 22s. "
1 " 6 " Assorted (half Dates and half Marzipan)	at 12s. "
1 " 10 " " " " " " " " " " " "	at 17s. 6d. "

Delivered by post, carriage paid, to any address in England within three to four weeks from receipt of order. Remittance with orders. Write to—

E. PARIENTE (Agent),

34 Rosemont Road, Richmond, London, S.W.

"Miracles" Have Not Ceased.

Send a Sample Order for any of the following list of Men's Shirts, and the Prices and Quality will prove the above assertion.

Fine Quality Tunic Shirts	6 11
Extra Quality Woven Striped Shirts	7 11
Super Quality Oxford Tunic Shirts	8 11
Double Warp Flannelette Shirts	8 11
Extra Quality Flannel Shirts	11 3

Sizes from 14 to 17 Neckbands.

Mail Order Terms: Cash with Order. Carriage paid.

If not completely satisfied return and Cash refunded.

R AXELBY,

156 Portobello Road, Bayswater, W.

DEPARTMENTS.

Mail Order Terms:

Cash with Order.

Men's Suits and Overcoats to Measure, a speciality. **Macconnell & Mabe,** Ready-mades. Tailors and Outfitters. Costumes, Blouses, and Rainproof Coats. Household Drapery. **NEW STREET,** Boots and Shoes. **BAKEWELL.**

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