

THE FREETHINKER

• EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN •
— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIX.—No. 13

SUNDAY, MARCH 31, 1940

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Civilization and the War—The Editor</i>	193
<i>Souls—George Wallace</i>	195
<i>Scuttling the Schools—Mimmermus</i>	196
<i>Noah's Ark—H. Culner</i>	197
<i>Atheism in Harley Street—G. H. Taylor</i>	198
<i>Highways and Byways in English History— Archibald Robertson</i>	202
<i>Other People's Superstitions—George Bedborough</i>	203
<i>Rumpelstiltskin—J. M. Wheeler</i>	204
<i>As Loyola defined the Jesuit Creed—J. Y. Anderoney</i>	206
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions

Civilization and the War

It is, I think, growing clear that the Churches hope to make some capital out of the war. Whether they will succeed remains to be seen, but in pursuing this policy they will only be repeating their tactics of the last war. Then with rare exceptions the clergy were unanimous that the war we were engaged in was a "holy war." Eulogies of war, as war, were not uncommon, and the few ministers of religion who stood out against the war were deposed from their positions. In that war both of the principal protagonists were Christians. There was no more pious man in Europe than the Kaiser. He advertised his faith in the Bible, advertised that he kept it by his bedside, and publicly proclaimed that it was his sheet anchor. There was no reason for doubting his sincerity. Neither was there any reason for doubting the sincerity of the ecclesiastical dignitaries in this country. The war was fought, God gave the Allies victory—and the victory—bearing in mind the way in which it was utilized—prepared the way for the present disaster.

Now it is theoretically probable that if this war lasts long enough religion may profit by it. War, whether just or unjust, whether inevitable or not, means of necessity a step downward in the scale of civilization. That downward step has already been taken. In this country we are agreed that we must sacrifice liberties that we had during peace. In the endeavour to beat the Dictator nations we are perforce setting up Dictators, big and little, in order to win the war. We have to think in terms of slaughter, we have to practise coercion; the policies of deception, lying and the fostering of distrust and suspicion. We take millions of men from the arts of peace and familiarize them with the arts and regimen of war. We are forced to hail as good news the killing of numbers of human beings, and stint ourselves of food and clothing in order to indulge in a plenitude of explosives. We have force as our chief argument, and welcome the wiping out of bodies of men as an occasion for gratification, if not for rejoicing. The message put in the

mouth of the Emperor of Germany during the Franco-German war,

I write to you, my dear Augusta
We've given the French another buster
Ten thousand Frenchmen sent below
Praise God from whom all blessings flow.

represents the spirit of war whenever and wherever it is waged. With that return to the wild, with that repression of the finer humanitarian feeling that all war involves, it may be that if the war lasts long enough religion will regain some of its lost ground. Man cannot throw off the little civilization he has acquired—even to a small extent—without giving the more primitive intellectual aspects of life a chance to reassert themselves.

* * *

How it is Done

In the last war there was a very determined attempt to bring about a revival of religion. Even the crudities of miracles were not ignored. There was the famous legend of the Mons Angels, in which it was said that a cordon of angels had interfered on behalf of the British army at a time when it was being forced back by the Germans. We may tell that story again one of these days, but many of our readers will remember the valiant attempts by the ex-Bishop of London, and many leading clergymen to bring forward men who had actually seen the celestial visitors. In some cases the soldiers outlied the parsons, in others they were mere amateurs following professionals. This time we have not yet had anything so striking as regiments of angels, but the war is in its early stages, and one cannot tell what will happen in the course of another twelve months. And, after all, it is not a very great step from believing that God intervenes, and that angels lend a hand. The man who can believe the one and cannot swallow the other must be a very particular sort of a person.

Everyone must also have noted the increased intensity of the Christian campaign carried on by the B.B.C., with which institution the evil influence of Sir John Reith is still powerful. Not alone has the number of religious services increased, but speaker after speaker has been engaged, some of them to give an ostensibly philosophic account of the present world situation, others to tell the world how the existing situation looks to a Christian, but whichever it be the moral is always the same—we must believe in a God and we must have a dominating Church, if the world is to get back to right living and justice is to prevail among and between the nations. What is being put before the people, in a very insidious form is a kind of revived and revised medievalism with the Christian Church restored to much of the power it once had.

A striking instance of this policy was also offered by Lord Cecil in a broadcast on the war situation. Quite calmly, and as though the statement admitted of no question, he told his listeners that we were fighting this war that the world might be controlled by religion

and morality. The separation of the two was welcome, for it was at least an implied admission that morality—ambiguous as that word may be—is something distinct from religion. But when Lord Cecil talks about religion controlling the world, as at least one of the purposes we have in fighting this war, he means the Christian religion, and more definitely the Christian Church. And that is simply not true. Announce that purpose plainly and without qualification, and we should split the armed forces into discontented sections. France is, avowedly, not fighting for either religion or the Christian religion. Millions of men who are now in arms in the Allied ranks are not fighting for religion. In all wars truthfulness is reduced to a minimum, and by each side, but there is no need to introduce so vague and—in practice—so fundamentally a dishonest word as “religion.” That has been a cover for anything and everything, good, bad and indifferent.

But the game is on. Here is a specimen from an East of England newspaper—the *Essex County Telegraph* :—

After Armenia—China, Abyssinia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Memel, Albania, Poland, Finland. The aggressors for the most part are, on their own confession, anti-God.

Who are the “aggressors” in these cases? Italy, Germany, Russia. How far and to what extent are these nations “anti-god.” Italy is a religious nation. It is the seat of the head of one of the oldest and greatest of the Christian Churches. There is no anti-god about Italy. Germany is overwhelmingly religious, and always has been. Hitler believes he was selected by God, he calls upon God to witness his struggles and show his approval by helping him to success, and has actually never disowned his connexion with the Roman Catholic Church. The B.B.C. talk of Hitler being against God is just an example of the activity of our British “Haw-Haws,” and to treat a difference of the kind of god worshipped as a denial of belief in any god is an example of Christian truthfulness in action.

We are left with Russia. Is Russia to be considered a nation of anti-godites? Not by a very, very long shot. It is true that religion is not encouraged by the existing Russian Government. It is true also that the Russian Government assists anti-religion, just as in this country the Government assists religion. But all the talk of Russia being a nation of Atheists, of having 150,000,000 Atheists, or even of 50,000,000, is the most arrant nonsense that was ever written or spoken. One might as reasonably speak of Great Britain as having 50,000,000 Christians because the Christian Church is in control and the Government does what it can to encourage Christian propaganda. And far more important than juggling with mere figures—that ever-present help for liars and salve for fools in times of stress—is the fact that the Russian mentality as a whole is profoundly religious in tone, even when it is consciously engaged in fighting forms of religion with which it has no sympathy. The myriads of generations during which religious beliefs have dominated human life, the extent to which our thought is religious, this moulding and controlling influence is not to be wiped out in a few years by any Government, least of all by one that favours unquestioning obedience to orders from above. More likely are we to witness an intermediate stage in which the superstitious reverence for a Church finds satisfaction—even though a declining one—in some other direction.

* * *

The “Times” Campaign

The *Times* campaign for the strengthening of Christianity in the schools, which as it develops confirms our suspicion that it was no mere individual effort, but

part of a set plan, is another example of an attempt to make capital out of the war situation. The demand here is for more definitely Christian instruction in the State Schools. What the *Times*, and those behind this movement are asking for is very plainly stated as not only that there shall be more definitely religious instruction given in the schools, but that “it shall be given by duly qualified and believing teachers.” There is no mistaking the meaning of this. And it carries with it the practice of preferential appointment and treatment of avowedly Christian teachers who on examination are found ready to give the kind of teaching which their examiners desire. It means lowering the standard of the teacher, and so lowering the quality of the education given. Were teachers on the whole built of sterner stuff they could kill a proposal which strikes at once at their dignity, their status and their quality. But, as we point out elsewhere in this issue, the aim of those journals which represent the mass of teachers appears to be far more concerned with proving that the religion given by them is very good and ought to satisfy the ecclesiastical world. One of these papers repudiates the implied charge of “slackness and insincerity in the impartation of religious instruction,” and so claims they are playing the part of parson’s catspaws in all loyalty and sincerity. And that, as all who know schools are aware, is not true. Religion is there in the schools, but in some cases the children get doses of it that are fitted to the religious atmosphere of a century ago, in others, teachers of the better class pride themselves on the fact that they manage to convert the religious lesson into an exercise in secular ethics. And as usual this effort to make and keep the schools religious in tone ends in placing a premium on inefficiency and hypocrisy, and drives many men and women away from a profession that should be one of the most honoured in the country.

One more item must be noted. In the House of Commons Sir R. W. Smith said that the absence of controversy in the correspondence published in the *Times* was sufficient proof that no answer had been made to the *Times* position. Anyone who understands the policy of the *Times* will appreciate *Education* for March 15 :—

The unanimity of the correspondence columns of the *Times* has been a selective unanimity. Other views of the question have been submitted to the *Times*, but refused expression. The Editor in his chair having much the same power as the Parson in his pulpit, it is no matter for surprise that acceptable unanimity is reached in the case of less reputable journals. But we thought better of the *Times*.

I am afraid the editor of *Education* does not know the *Times*. It has, in fact reacted quite loyally to the Northcliffe-Astor record. The better *Times* died years ago. One of its chief values to-day is that of providing specimens for a “case book” for students who are interested in observing the activities of the more retrogressive influences of our time.

Altogether I am prepared, if the war is a long one, to see, not a strengthening of the Christian Churches as institutions, but a revival of the more religious factors in life. The elimination of religion from life requires more than the rejection of a few established doctrines, and the loss of influence of existing churches. It means a reorientation of life as a whole. Religion, as I have so often said, is more than the belief in specific doctrines; it implies a mental attitude towards life as a whole. Religion is very early connected with morals. As many anthropologists have pointed out, it is often a form of ethical exercise and is a social duty. The effect of Christianity was not to weaken this association, but to moralize it, as it moralized so many of the worse aspects of individual and social life.

CHAPMAN COHEN

Souls

Wherefore thus saith the Lord; Behold I am against your pillows, wherewith ye there hunt the souls to make them fly, and I will tear them from your arms, and will let the souls go, even the souls that ye hunt to make them fly.¹ (Ezek. xiii. 18-21).

FACED with passages of Scripture like the above, Sunday School teachers, and many pious people, remark that "as such passages are put there by God to test our faith, any attempt at explanation would savour of doubt!" Though he bamboozle me, yet will I trust in him! (R.R.V.)

Said an old elder—"Dinna mistake me laddie, had the buik told one that Jonah swallowed the whale I wadna hae dooted it for a meenit!" Faith can remove mountains!

The word soul has many meanings. It may mean: The shadow of a shade; a material thing formed of invisible atoms (God, the hereafter, the whole "bag o' tricks," all similar material things); the seat of life in an animal; the intellectual principle; the understanding; a spiritual being; a disembodied part; living body or dead body; living soul or dead soul; that which distinguishes man from the brutes; life; in short, any earthly use that is made of it verbally.

The full soul means a man whose desire or appetite is fully satisfied.

From all of which it may be deduced that man is a soul, and that he cannot possess a soul.

But to the believer all things are possible!

"I see nothing to prevent me coming again just as I am now," said a highly qualified medical man. "The particles of matter forming my body, at any given time of my life, may again cohere, just as different numbers appear when dice are thrown. I may, possibly, have been here before many a time."

People, in early Christian days, believed in the destructibility of the soul. (Matt. x. 28).

Nearly everything material had a soul. Archbishop Whately pointed out that "all the arguments used to prove human immortality, apply, with exactly the same force, to prove an immortality, not only of brutes, but even of plants."

To be able to enter, in imagination, into the mind of primitive man when he looked into a river, or dreamed, even watched his shadow following him in summer, and the many little ghostly experiences of his life, is to be in possession of a magic wand—"avaunt perplexity!"

That the soul is immortal, and may be punished eternally, is objected to by the "Universalists" who believe that all will ultimately be saved. While the Annihilationists, or Destructionists hold that the wicked, after being punished, will be blotted out of existence.

Origen and Plato believed in the pre-existence of the soul.

Then there is the Transmigration of Souls. After inhabiting every animal in turn, we finally reach our Nirvana in man. Impressed by one of our many incarnations, we become branded, during our human existence, with the leading characteristic of the beast—foxy, sly, musical, murderous, etc.

Origen thought transmigration explained many Scriptural difficulties, e.g., Gen. xxv. 22; Jer. i. 5; John ix. 2; *Wisdom* (Apocrypha) viii. 20, etc.

Swedenborg (*True Christian Religion*), and Charles Kingsley (*Water Babies*), and others were believers in it.

But "within the range of Christian influence, the Manicheans appear as the most remarkable exponents

¹ See Frazer. The Psychic regarded as something that could be detached from the body, even captured and snared by witchery.

of the metempsychosis. We hear of their ideas of sinners' souls transmigrating into beasts, the viler according to their crimes; that he who kills a fowl or rat will become a fowl or rat himself; that souls can pass into plants rooted in the ground which thus have not only life but sense; that the souls of reapers pass into beans and barley, to be cut down in their turn, and thus the elect were careful to explain to the bread when they ate it, that it was not they who reaped the corn it was made of; that the souls of the auditors, that is, the spiritually-low commonality who lived a married life, would pass into melons and cucumbers, to finish their purification by being eaten by the elect." (*Primitive Culture* (Ed. 1891), Vol II., p. 14, Tylor).

And Tylor says further: "One of the most notable points about the theory of transmigration is its close bearing upon a thought which lies very deep in the history of philosophy, the development-theory of organic life in successive stages." (*Ibid*, p. 18).

In *the Day after Death*, by Louis Figuier, anyone wishing further details may feast their fill. And any one getting soul-sick must have instant recourse to a Soul-curer—a Parson—so that he, or she, may be "souled," and healed!

During the recent snow-storm I played with many souls, and I learned many things about them. For instance: People who never marry do not do so because they possess twin souls—male and female. In shape the soul is a perfect sphere. In size, that of a hen egg. And in colour, that of a luminous gold. So, when He takes them and "one by one back in the closet lays," it shouldn't be a difficult job. Settings of them will, doubtless, be put under the cherubim in due season!

Who made the soul? God! Who made God? He didn't need making! His name is Jehovah. (Ps. lxxxiii. 18). He is the only immortal being. (1 Tim. vi. 16). He is omni-present. He leaves no room for anyone else. Neither Gods, angels, nor souls. He occupies space!

After spending an "Eternity of Idleness," He adopted the Logos. Previously the Logos had been the Active Principle living in and determining the world for the Stoic philosophers, but after Jehovah had "counselled with him about the creation" and found him a capable person He made him his Clerk of the Works. (Prov. viii. 22-30).

The Logos and Lucifer were great gods in those days. They were both of them invested with the *Order of the Morning Star*, by Jehovah, for services rendered. And in consideration of this honour, these two *Morning Stars* sang a duet—"A song of praise to the Eternal One"—and the Sons of God in the audience were so thrilled by it, they shouted aloud for joy.

Later on Lucifer, getting tired of an absolute monarchy, rebelled.

The extending of his own dominion occupied his, and his followers', thoughts. The peopling of the world by Jehovah, he thought he could subvert. In the guise of an Angel of Light he deceived Eve, and begat Cain. On Eve's asking Jehovah for some slimming herbs, He asked concerning her rotundity. She replied it was due to eating apples. He suggested "Adam's Apple" as being probably the cause of it!

Later on Adam and Eve were thrown out of the Garden to prevent the birth taking place there, lest the child should become a God.

Lucifer then instructed his angels to get busy with the fair daughters of men in an attempt to outnumber Jehovah's following. (Gen. vi. 2-4). But Jah forestalled him, ordered a Flood and drowned all his brood.

The above, may I say, has been culled from Francis W. Newman's *The Soul: An Essay towards the Natural History of the Soul* (1849), Tylor's *Primitive*

Culture, and a number of strange Sermons, and theological essays, ancient and modern. In thus attempting to abbreviate recorded opinions, I am hoping that I have not misrepresented any of them.

One interesting sermon I find has been overlooked. Text :—

Eternal form shall still divide
The eternal soul from all beside;
And I shall know him when we meet.

(In Memoriam)

Identity I know is a great question with many; whither it will be sustained hereafter, and so on. But, theologically considered, God, only, can have identity. He, only, is unchangeable in his being—the same yesterday, to-day and for ever. Immortality and Identity can only characterize *Him*. Many people, not contented with much in this world, want much more in their next world. To merge into the Universal Soul, to them, is meeting with no recognition for the useless lives they have lived in this world. Need we wonder, as the Bounder used to say, that such an unwarranted proceeding should be Annie Themie and Mary Ann Arthur to *them*!

GEORGE WALLACE

Scuttling the Schools

To produce as much happiness as we can, and to prevent as much misery, is the proper aim and end of true morality.—*Landor*.

"I HAVEN'T been to school for months and months. Won't I be a dunce?" said a ten-years'-old child. It was true, and it was also true that over half a million other children were in a like position. If the present war lasts for years, and this process extends, what is to be the result on national education? A whole generation in a state of illiteracy, unable to read a newspaper intelligently, and the prey of every glib-tongued charlatan.

Education is a precious possession, and its controllers should have safeguarded this heritage. But Bureaucrats are seldom enthusiasts, except for larger salaries. When the war started it was early autumn, and schools could have been continued in the open-air for a few weeks, whilst adequate preparations were made for later developments. Large tents could have been requisitioned, such as are used by travelling evangelists and politicians. No one in authority seems to have even thought of such things, even though A.R.P. workers twiddled their thumbs in the abandoned schools, and teachers were forgetting their knowledge. Even so, the Bureaucrats levied the Education Rate, full well realizing that such a proceeding was perilously near obtaining money by false pretences. And docile ratepayers paid that rate. It is almost enough to make a Transatlantic Grafter take the first boat to reach such an Eldorado of Innocents.

This is not the only peril to National Education in this country. The *London Times*, the most sober and august of periodicals, had a leading article on March 9, pointing out the inadequacy of religious teaching in the national schools. An article such as this in the popular press would mean precisely nothing, but the *Times* is not such as these. The old "Thunderer" may be solemn, even oracular, but it is never sensational. Nor does it "tickle the ears of the groundlings." It has no more need for publicity stunts than the Sphinx, and is said to reflect the views of the Governing Class of this country.

Hence it follows that when the *Times* adventures upon the perilous paths of theology it is like Parson

Adams in *Tom Jones*, who said boldly: "When I say religion I mean the Church of England, and when I say the Church of England I mean the Protestant Reformed Church." When the "Thunderer" laments the lack of religious teaching in the National Schools, and quotes alarming statistics, it is but voicing the views of the State Church Authorities. When the Church of England is on the war-path it means mischief, for this staid institution does not fight for glory, but for things far more solid. And in all its enterprises it is backed by the enormous resources of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who are "wealthy beyond the dreams of avarice."

Reading between the lines of the *Times* articles, for there was an earlier one a fortnight before, it is quite evident that these earnest outpourings are actually intended as an overture to a campaign for the introduction, at a suitable opportunity, of a new Education Bill to Parliament. This is indicated by the fact that the earlier article has been reprinted, and, according to the *Times*, has been selling at a rate of 400,000 in less than twelve days. In other words, the Church of England intends not only to break the Compromise of 1870, but also to throw the Church's own schools on the rates, and thus relieve it of a heavy financial burden. This is thinly veiled in the admission:—

What is sought is merely that Christian teaching shall be made fully available in all places of education supported by the State.

Statistics quoted reveal that in Secondary Schools pupils who select religious subjects for study have fallen from 32 per cent in 1917 to 17 per cent in 1937, that is in the course of twenty years. In order to placate the Nonconformists a Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen has been arranged under the chairmanship of the Rev. Scott Lidgett. Presumably, the Nonconformists are to be nobbled before the real contest begins. If so, present-day Free Churchmen must be very different in character and outlook to the stalwarts who fought the Anglican Church more than a generation ago, under the leadership of Dr. John Clifford, and other men, who knew the difference between Medievalism and Modernism. The summing-up of the proposed campaign is very significant:—

Almost the chief gain that will follow the reform of our national system of education will be the development of Christian children who in due course will become Christian parents.

Here's a pretty kettle of fish! Whilst this nation is immersed in war and warlike preparations the representatives of Priestcraft emerge from their cloisters and vicarages and start a campaign to reverse the present policy with regard to religion in State-schools, where simple Bible reading has been the order of the day for seventy years. This does not satisfy them, so they bleat loudly that

masses of our younger people of to-day are unacquainted with even the primary truths of religion.

What are these primary truths of religion? The Anglican says one thing, and the Free Churches have each their own peculiar interpretation. The Anglican points to the Authority of his Church, and the Nonconformists insist on their own views of the Christian Scriptures. If the official Prayer Book is any guide, the Church of England stands for undiluted Medievalism, Caveman politics and Stone Age religion. As to the Nonconformists, you pay your money and you take your choice, from the Anabaptists to the Swedenborgians, and the Corybantic Christianity of the Salvation Army.

Despite the loud protestations of the many sects, the Secular solution is the only one that is equitable. The

State consists of persons who profess all sorts of religion, and none. If the State compels its citizens to pay for religious opinions in which they do not believe, it commits a palpable injustice. This is not merely a question of Tweedledum and Tweedledee, between one sect and another sect. It is, indeed, unjust to make a Quaker pay for teaching Church of England dogmas, or an Unitarian for teaching the deity of Christ, but it is equally unjust to make an Atheist pay for teaching Godism, or a Churchman for teaching "Nothingarian" Religion. The present position in Education in which half the schools teach Church of England doctrine, and the other half permit Bible reading without comment is a fiasco. It is high time that National Education should be secularized, and the propagation of religion left to the various churches.

This introduction of religion into education means discord, for no two men agree precisely upon such a subject. Especially is this the case with the so-called Church of England, which controls half the schools and is seeking to annex the remainder. This Church is hopelessly out of date, for it regards religion as existing to give sanction to Things As They Are, and to bolster the claims of the Upper Crust of society. Behind this latest crusade for religious education in all national schools there is a further menace that is none the less real because it is vague and too sinister for terms. It is the menace of Priestcraft, which conceives of men and women as a drama of puppets dancing to the will of their pastors and masters.

MIMNERMUS

FEDERAL UNION—AND A FEW OTHER THINGS (WHO IS THIS MAN?)

The man that named our country United States of America.

The man first to advocate independence for our country.

The man who did more to achieve this independence than any other man, giving his pen, tongue, sword, and pocket-book to the cause.

The man that in the darkest hour of the Revolution wrote the *Crisis*, commencing with the words, "These are the times that try men's souls."

Do you know that General Washington ordered this mighty work to be read to the Army once a week? The man who was joint author of the Declaration of Independence with Jefferson.

The man who borrowed ten million dollars from Louis XVI. to feed and clothe the American Army.

The man who established the Bank of North America in order to supply the Army.

Napoleon said in toasting him at a banquet, "Every city in the world should erect a gold statue to you."

The author of *The Rights of Man* which is acknowledged to be the greatest work ever written on political freedom.

This masterpiece gave free speech and a free press to England and America.

The man that first said: "The world is my Country, and to do good is my religion."

The man known as "The Great Commoner of Mankind, the Founder of the Republic of the World."

The man first to urge the making of our Constitution.

The man first to suggest the Federal Union of the States and to bring it about.

The man first to propose the Louisiana Purchase.

The man first to demand justice for Women.

The man first to plead for dumb animals.

The man first to advocate International Arbitration.

The man first to propose Old Age Pensions.

The man first to propose "The land for the people."

The man that invented and built the first iron bridge.

That man was Thomas Paine.

American Exchange

Noah's Ark

Few Bible stories have been defended by Christians in the past with so much persistency as the Flood. That a deluge—or rather the Deluge—had taken place exactly as described in God's word was the conviction of all Christians, and no amount of poking fun at the incredible story had the slightest effect in making them believe otherwise.

It is quite amusing these days to read the solemn nonsense written in the past in support of the truth of the story by really able men. All the objections are very earnestly met, as the Christian writers felt strongly that if such a story, with its wealth of detail, could be questioned or indeed flatly denied, there was not much hope for some of the other Biblical narratives.

Men like the Rev. John Hadie quite seriously declared that the building of the ark took between 700 to 120 years, though it is "doubtful where the ark was built." So convinced indeed was Mr. Hadie that he insists that it was found that "the vessel, in all its known parts and proportions, is in accordance with many received principles of naval architecture. And on the subject of *capacity*, the point has been satisfactorily established, that upon the smallest estimate of the cubit measure, the ark was fully adequate to the purpose for which it was prepared."

Mr. Hadie, however, does feel a little embarrassed about some of the facts he relates in his *Bible Encyclopedia*; not so the writer of Cassell's *Bible Dictionary*, which is a positive God-send of precious Fundamentalism. "We may fearlessly affirm," he cries exultingly, "that no solitary fact in the entire range of scripture history rests on more convincing or conclusive testimony than the historical reality of Noah himself, and the terrible catastrophe with which his name and biology are historically bound up." One feels it is a pity that this writer is not alive at this day; he might have seen Walt Disney's "Noah's Ark"—one huge scream, with sly blasphemous digs at orthodoxy enough to have had Disney sent to a cauldron of boiling oil in more Fundamentalist if less happy times than the present.

Needless to say, later investigations has shown that the story of the Deluge is merely one of the many variants of a wide-spread myth of which perhaps the most important in ancient literature is that contained in the Babylonian epic of Gilgames. This epic describes twelve adventures of its hero—much the same as the labours of Hercules—and the Deluge story is on the eleventh tablet, or is the eleventh adventure. As the *Encyclopedia Biblica* says:—

The twelve tablets of the adventures of Gilgames stand in relation to the passage of the sun-god through the twelve months of the year, and the principal event on every tablet has its analogue in the corresponding one of the twelve signs of the Zodiac, which as is now certainly known, had their origin in Babylonia. Now it is the eleventh tablet that contains the Deluge story, and the eleventh Zodiacal sign is Aquarius. The conclusion is obvious.

But even then, is there a historical nucleus in the story of the Flood? A local flood could quite well have happened, and a dim memory of it preserved in one form or another. But, of course, we are not dealing with a local flood at all, but with one which, except for a few people and animals, destroyed everything in the world. We have God's word for that.

Leaving out the Almighty for a moment, it is rather curious that so many similar stories should have occupied the ancient scribes. There is another Babylonian account according to the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, published from some fragmentary records by Peiser, and

still another found, written on some tablets in Constantinople Museum, by Scheil. And there is one version of the Deluge written by a Sumerian scribe on a clay tablet in the Nipper collection at the University of Pennsylvania Museum, deciphered by Dr. Stephen Langdon of Oxford in 1912.

Dr. T. K. Cheyne, though agreeing that we must look for the origin of the story to Babylonia, is of opinion that "the entire character of the narrative, and the connexion with other myths, are much more favourable to the view that we have to do, not with a legend based upon facts, but with a myth which has assumed the form of history." And he has no doubt whatever that the Bible story was copied from the Babylonians.

Dr. Cheyne comes to the final conclusion that "the Deluge-myth in Babylonia and elsewhere seems to have grown up out of an archaic ether-myth akin to that prevalent in Egypt. Originally the sun was imagined as a man voyaging on a boat in the heavenly ocean," and only later was the myth transferred to the earth. But it appears that there is a great deal more than Dr. Cheyne cares to admit in the Deluge story.

The word "Ark" is rather peculiar; it is derived, according to J. W. Lake, in his *Mythos of the Ark*, from the Greek "arche" "signifying a beginning in order of time, an entrance into being, first or chief in point of authority." He adds:—

The Greek rulers were called Archons, our chief bishops are called ark- or arch-bishops. The science of antiquity is called ark-eology. The chief builder—the one who supplies the ideas—is called the architect. So the lunette or crescent is called the arc of a circle, and this gives its name to the circular arch. The Greek word for the ship of Noah was Kibotus. Our word ark, however, has evident relation to the Greek *arche*, and serves as a plain guidance to the mythical meaning of the whole story of the flood.

J. M. Wheeler points out that "some have detected a phallic signification in the story of the ark and the deluge," and calls attention to a design in Bryant's *Mythology*, "in which the rainbow overshadows the mystic ark, which carries the life across the restless flood of time, which drowns everything that has life, and promises that seed-time and harvest shall endure, and the Ruach broods over the waters."

Has the symbology connected with the mystic meanings of the "ark" any connexion with the famous Argonauts who, under Jason, went in search for the Golden Fleece? Their ship was called the Argos, and curiously enough one of the southern constellations is also called "the Ship Argo."

To quote Lesley's *Man's Origin and Destiny*:—

The Greeks considered the gods of ARCADIA the most ancient deities. They considered their most ancient and sacred religious ceremonies ORGS (*orgia*), from which the Christians got their opprobrious term "orgies" for all sorts of heathen ceremonies, especially when they were practised in secrecy. The Roman word for any mystery was ARCANUM; for any religious teaching, ORACULUM—that is an arkite thing—knowledge shut up and concealed from public view. The old Egyptian word ARK signifies upon the monuments, says Bunsen, conclusion, shutting up, and in Coptic it signifies to guard. From this sense we have the word *ara*, a citadel, and in this citadel were kept for safety ancient histories and writings, hence termed archives.

If Wheeler is right, and a phallic significance can be attached to the ark, it is not surprising to find Lake admitting that the ark "symbolized, from the nature of its contents, the fertile principle of Nature, and thus was one and the same with the virgin goddesses of Paganism, with Maia of India, Isis of Egypt, Diana, Venus, and Astarte of Syria, Ceres of Greece, and

Juno of Rome, who in turn were all symbols the Holy Spirit, i.e., of Deity in its feminine aspect."

The ark figured a great deal in Egyptian mythology and symbolism. Thus the moon-god resided in the Lunar Ark; and according to Dr. Albert Churchward, in his *Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man*, "the Ark of the Covenant, built and set up by Moses in the wilderness, according to the Sacred volume—and which has not been seen—is precisely similar in all measurements to the 'stone chest' still to be seen in the King's Chamber of the Great Pyramid, and which is undoubtedly the original, although the contents are gone." But a discussion on the Ark of the Covenant would require an article to itself.

From what has been said, it can be seen that the simple story of the Noah's Ark and the Flood is not quite as simple as it looks. The ark actually figures in almost all mystery religions. The Hindu god Siva had a sacred ark or "argha"; the Druids certainly had an ark or chest of some sort. There was even an ark in the mysteries connected with the ancient religion of the Mexicans. And there must certainly be some significance in the fact that in the Hebrew the word used for the ark of Noah is a different one from that used for the ark of the Covenant.

Perhaps something of interest may be said of the latter in another article.

H. CUTNER

Atheism in Harley Street

(Concluded from page 165)

THE relations between science and religion support the analogy of a healthy-minded adolescent outgrowing the credulity of childhood, and replacing blind obedience to parental desires by a scientific scepticism. "As this proceeds," writes Dr. Forsyth, "any idea of dependence on a Heavenly Father is outgrown also, and the stage of Atheism is naturally reached." (*Psychology and Religion*).

Thus a disproof of God can come, he says, from psychology, for "the scientific study of the functioning of the mind has shown beyond any reasonable doubt that God is a figment of the imagination, with no existence outside the fantasies of the mind . . . no less delusory than any primitive spirit." (*Ibid.*) Speaking of those who halt at Agnosticism he asks, "Does not the new evidence require them to hold back no longer from the position of Atheism?" (*Ibid.*) As for the Christian, since he is already atheistic towards the gods of other cults, why should he wish to retain his own since all gods spring from the same traceable sources? Of a thousand gods the Christian rejects 999, and the Atheist also the extra one.

"In freeing himself from his dependence on God man must look to himself for help. Instead of striving for the salvation of his soul in a future heavenly life, he must plan his welfare here below." (*Ibid.*) He can, and does, do without the puerile conceptions of heaven and hell, resting on a quite childish estimation of values. To such ideas science comes as a rebellious adolescent:—

With the gradual extension of scientific knowledge one religious explanation after another has been supplanted by a scientific explanation, until now psychology has proved the illusory nature of the entire religious interpretation of life.

The psychic truth that religion represents is an infantile endowment, while the objective truth of science appears later and develops only slowly as the personality matures through adolescence into adulthood. Materialism is never found in the childish

temperament, and shows itself only as a concomitant of adult development.

The recourse to vitalism is also, psychologically, a survival of religion. Vitalism is the theory that natural changes are only performed at the behest of a "life force" or some other kind of non-materialistic intervening, or in Neo-Vitalism directive, agency. Vitalism was once applied even to planetary motion (cf. Kepler's genii), but:—

As science gradually explained more and more of the "mysterious" phenomena, vitalists gradually accepted the mechanistic explanation of them; invoking, however, a directive force for phenomena which were still beyond scientific explanation. All the while, therefore, vitalists have been concerned with an ever-narrowing range of possibilities, and each generation of them has accepted the mechanistic interpretation of phenomena which were mysterious to their predecessors.

It rather appears that vitalists are mechanists where explanations are known, and vitalists where problems are as yet unsolved. That is, they have become mechanists regarding, e.g., the structure and functioning of the ear and of the eye (a favourite stand-by for a long time), and the physico-chemical basis of metabolism, digestion, muscle contraction, heat production, etc. But with regard to tissue repair and certain features in embryology they remain vitalist.

Paralysed by fear of the unknown the mental faculties fail in the savage, the child, and the religionist. They run for protection to a superior power, to the parent or to God. Similarly the Vitalist appeals to his "vital force." The temptation to do this applies even to such a pioneer as Harvey, for whom the task of understanding the heart was, he lamented, "so truly arduous, so full of difficulties," that he began to think "that the motion of the heart was only to be comprehended by God." In the end he comprehended, and without the hypothesis of God.

The opposition to Forsyth, as apart from the mere clerical blather, chiefly concerned his dismissal of religion as a projection of the "pleasure-principle," and therefore a fantasy. In this he is strictly Freudian. Psycho-Analysis, said its master, "has traced the origin of religion to the helplessness of childhood, and its content to the persistence of the wishes and needs of childhood into maturity."

McDougal strenuously objects, and beside him none of the other objectors really matters very much. Briefly, McDougall's point is as follows. Man's nature has led to the development of religious ideas, granted. But it has also led to the development of science, so that on this ground one falls with the other. If religion is illusory because of its psychological sources, so also is science. But so far as they both arise from the nature of man, thus far they are equally valid. Consequently he speaks of "Freud's contempt for the laws of logic" (*Psycho-Analysis and Social Psychology*).

In the first place, McDougall is making no allowance for the respective beliefs being checked by experience, the ultimate criterion as to whether they are of fantastic origin. As a child I gathered the notion that the Holy Ghost corresponded to a floating beard without material connexions of any kind, a be-whiskered vacuum or faceless fungus. I also believed the relationship of the cock to the hen to be that of a man to a woman. In the light of experience one of these beliefs works. The other is a fantasy; that is, it is drawn from elements of experience which are re-assembled into a form which has no objective counterpart. Religion is fundamentally associated with the belief in the practical efficacy of extra-natural beings. If such had been checked and found correct then the discovery that the belief arose in childish projections would not prove detrimental to its later form. But

if religion does not lie parallel to science in respect of its beliefs being satisfactorily tested, then the discovery of its psychological origins is a necessary and clinching fact as to its illusoriness. And it is not science, but religion, which is shown to rest on psychological error. Religion is a fact, just as science is a fact, but it is the *nature* of that fact which is the issue. In Forsyth's language, religion is a psychic, science an objective, truth.

Forsyth's refutation is on similar main lines, but I have deliberately proceeded without the use of the psycho-analyst's "pleasure principle" (giving religion and magic) and "reality principle" (giving science), since McDougall will not have these at any price.

Forsyth argues that religion does not put its fantasies to the test, whereas science *does* put its hypotheses to work.

Finally, in regard to the religious enslavement of the human mind throughout the Christian ages, Forsyth has much the same attitude as Robertson. Where Robertson sees the lust for power Forsyth traces the phenomenon back psychologically to sadism. Where one sees superstitious reliance on authority by the masses the other sees masochism. Robertson recognizes that Christianity was accepted by barbarian rulers as a political instrument:—

The summary of 700 years of Christian expansion in Northern Europe is that the work was mainly done by the sword in the interests of kings and tyrants, who supported it against the resistance of their subjects who saw in the Church an instrument for their subjection.

But inasmuch as their present suffering was to be rewarded by future bliss the masses accepted Christianity, which thus succeeded because it fulfilled the double purpose of being suitable for the governors and for the governed. It is, so Forsyth maintains, a sado-masochist religion, with masochism most evident in Lent, penance, self-denial and self-mutilation. Christ is the masochist Lamb, and so he appeals more to women than to men, the former tending more to masochism. He concludes that "in every state where it has been subordinated to secular power it has become also a political force which helps the few to rule the many."

G. H. TAYLOR

Acid Drops

Easter has come and gone. We have had fine weather, a huge number of holiday-makers have enjoyed themselves, and the B.B.C. has surpassed itself in dosing the people with Christianity direct and indirect. A special interlude was arranged on Good Friday so that the "nation" might join in reading the Lord's Prayer. One can guarantee that not one tenth of the people did join in the prayer, but in the size of the lies and the impudence of the lying the B.B.C. has nothing to learn of Goebbels—where religion is concerned. Its training under Sir John Reith has been neither outworn nor forgotten. It was as the head of the B.B.C. that Reith qualified for Minister of Information. And, of course, information is an ambiguous term. Information is information whether it be the "truth," a "half-truth," a religious "truth," or a plain unadulterated lie. Information means—just information.

The Archbishop's contribution to the game was to assure the world that God would not let all the toil and struggle and sacrifices of the Allies go in vain. Maybe not, but if the Archbishop could not count so confidently on so many dupes, would he have dared to risk a saying that must give rise to the thought, "If God can give the world peace and justice in the end, why does he not give it in the beginning?" The hundreds of thousands of dead that will be piled up, the myriads of shattered lives that will remain, how can it be all right with them? We poor

humans may have to go that road to get justice and peace. But God? One can only excuse people for swallowing such monstrous sentiments as those set forth by the Archbishop, by believing they do not understand what is said or what it is they profess to believe.

Finally, so far as Easter is concerned, we see from a paragraph in the *Church Times*, that some people are puzzled why some bodies of Christians keep Easter on dates different from others. The mystery is solved by the fact that the date of the death of Jesus is determined by the date on which the Moon is full, and that varies with the position of one on the face of the earth. The moon is at the full on one date in England and on another in Australia. And who ever heard of the anniversary of a man's birth or death being fixed in this manner? That alone is enough to demonstrate that in dealing with the story of Jesus Christ we are dealing with a myth. The last year on which the moon was full on March 24 was in 1799. Fancy an anniversary that happens once in 141 years! Lord, what fools we mortals be! After all, births and deaths occur all at once, and the date on which either happens is fixed for ever. It is not subject to the vagaries of an astronomical calendar.

We have so great a respect for the quality and quantity of the equalitarian feeling in France, greater than among any of the other "great" powers, including our own country, that we regret the policy adopted towards the Communists as regards organization. The whole reason for this, as well as the chief justification for it, is that the country is engaged in a war, and at close quarters, with an enemy that threatens its very existence. But the real spirit of democracy is deeply embedded in the French people, and just as the press censorship, established during the early months of the war has been swept aside, so we may look for reform in the direction of the freedom of political movements.

We do not agree that because a country is at war that all criticism of a Government should be suspended. There is no time and no occasion when the right of criticism should be withheld, and we are in strong disagreement with the Government inspired advice, given so liberally by the B.B.C. (one may safely say at the instigation of the Government) that we must all obey orders and not criticize our rulers. We claim the right to say on special grounds, and on particular grounds, we do not think we have, for a long while, had a Government that, in the interests of the people, needed criticism more than does our present one.

We say this without the least regard to any particular party or policy. We agree with Mr. D. N. Pritt, M.P., that "If you are not allowed to criticize your Government there is no chance of ever being able to find out whether or not what that particular Government is doing is wrong," and he rightly adds "what you want is freedom of speech for the unpopular." That is a plain statement of a very valuable doctrine. They are first principles of political freedom. And the chief objection to the totalitarian States, what ever be their precise nature whether German, Italian, Russian, or other is that it rules criticism of the Government and the State as among the greatest of crimes. It is standing for freedom of expression of opinions with which we disagree that finally decides whether a man has a belief in freedom of expression, or is merely using a phrase to cover his own intolerance.

The *Times* article on the subject of religion in the schools, and about which we wrote recently, was evidently meant for the opening of a campaign in favour of trying some doses of Hitlerism in this country, in case it happens that it is stamped out in Germany. We call it Hitlerism because part of that policy, and a very important part, is to get hold of the children, keep certain things away from them, press other things on them, in order that in the end they grow up with the human Robots' ideas which one wishes them to hold, while remaining blind to any opposing considerations. Hitlerism is made up of many things but the chief principle

with them all is this one-sided education which is an effective obstacle to the child doing much independent thinking "on its own."

All over the country, in all sorts of papers—part of an obviously planned campaign—articles have appeared praising the *Times* suggestion of more of the Christian religion being introduced in the State schools, and the religion being taught by teachers who are themselves Christians, which if it means anything at all means a test for teachers. Those teachers who are not prepared to sell their independence for a salary and a pension, will go into the schools pretending to be what they are not, while the honest and independent teachers will be shut out. It is quite certain that this will happen, if the Churches, led by the *Times*, or in arrangement with the *Times*, get their way. A religious test in the schools means not only a lowering in the quality of the teachers, it means also poorer education. It means that we who are exhorted to submit to the utmost sacrifice to beat Hitlerism, are to permit a goodly slice of it to be established in the schools of this country.

So far the protests of the papers devoted to education—and who are most wide-awake where salaries and such things are concerned—appear to be chiefly concerned with trying to prove that there is good religious teaching in the school; and that is really surrendering the main position to the *Times* and the clergy. For the root of the whole question is not whether there is good religion or bad religion in the schools, but should religion be there at all? So long as it is there the clergy will not cease to plot and plan, and politicians in office, or wishing to get there, will not cease to adopt all sorts of dishonest plans in order to purchase the support of the Churches, while religious parties who do not particularly desire religious education in the schools, will remain silent for fear of losing votes. Political parties are outstanding examples of this. The children become so many pawns in the fight for political gain.

So we repeat what we have recently said. Let all those who believe in the liberty of the child, all who believe that the child should be left alone—religiously—until it is old enough to realize what it is being taught, all who believe that it is not the duty of parents to force beliefs on children that they would not dare to put before a body of educated adults, all who believe in securing as teachers those who place a high value on intellectual sincerity, let all these withdraw their children from religious instruction. That would give these religious and lay plotters an indication of how many in the country believe the freedom of a child's mind to be something too great and too valuable to be sacrificed to the interests of vote-hunting politicians and unscrupulous clerics. It is the parents who must act. So long as salaries and pensions are not touched, it does not look as though we can count on very much help from teachers. The statement in a leading article in the *London Teacher* for March 8, that "Religion in national life must be restored via the schools," is symptomatic.

Meanwhile there are indications that this campaign for more religion in the schools may lead to a discussion of how to devise a system of education that shall be really free and educational in a wide and genuine sense. The position as we see it is (1) to leave the education of the young in private hands spells necessarily inefficiency. (2) to have a system of State education is to have a more or less partizan, and therefore, a one-sided, view of life taught and in consequence a deficient education. This must happen, whether the State is Conservative, Liberal, Socialist, Communist or any other. It means turning out a generation of intellectual robots, a generation that is enslaved to phrases and the tool of whatever party is in power. Fortunately the education we have at present is sufficiently mixed to save us from a complete slogan-loving, formulae-fascinated generation that is only completely happy when it carries a badge on its shoulders or wears a collar round its neck. The education of a people should incite to difference if it is to be really healthy and truly progressive. The question is, how to secure it?

To get a New Subscriber is to make a New Friend

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No. : CENTRAL 2412.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A SUBSCRIBER to our Jubilee Freethinker Fund has reminded us that we did not publish the total subscribed to this Fund. We did this when the Fund was formally closed. Other contributions came to hand afterwards. Together with the sum already acknowledged—the total of which was given, the amount was £614 4s. 10d. Stating this gives us an opportunity of once again thanking all concerned, who so promptly and so generously helped. The task of keeping a paper such as the *Freethinker* afloat is never an easy one, but it would be an impossible one but for the readiness with which help is given by *Freethinker* readers in this country and abroad.

B. OSMOND.—Paper has been sent. Thanks.

V. BINGHAM.—The number of forgeries put forward, either by the Roman Church, or by individual Christians is very great. They began in the earliest days of Christianity and have continued until our own times. We may, when we have time, write a series of articles on the subject, unless someone else takes it up.

MRS. A. J. VANSTONE.—We are pleased to learn that our old friend J. Hammond was in such good form at the Odd-fellows Hall, Teignmouth. His long acquaintance with Freethought qualifies him for "speaking with authority" on this subject. We hope that more work of the kind will be done. The West of England needs stirring up where Freethinking is concerned.

The "*Freethinker*" is supplied to the trade on sale or return. Any difficulty in securing copies should be at once reported to this office.

The offices of the National Secular Society and the Secular Society Limited, are now at 68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4. Telephone: Central 1367.

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

When the services of the National Secular Society in connexion with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary, R. H. Rosetti, giving as long notice as possible.

Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, and not to the Editor.

The "*Freethinker*" will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad) :—
One year, 15/-; half year, 7/6; three months, 3/9.

Sugar Plums

To-day (March 31) Mr. Cohen will lecture in the St. Andrew's (lesser) Hall, Glasgow. His subject will be "Dictators and Democracies." Chair will be taken at 7 o'clock. Admission will be free, but there are a limited number of reserved seats.

On Saturday evening Mr. Cohen will be present at the Annual Dinner of the Glasgow Branch N.S.S. The Dinner will be at the Grand Hotel, Charing Cross. Tickets, 6s. 6d. each, may be obtained from the Secretary, Mrs. M. Whitefield, 351 Castlemilk Road, Glasgow. These functions take a deal of arranging, and application for tickets should be made as early as possible.

Mr. George Bedborough is now, for a time, staying in Cambridge. There should be many opportunities within say a twenty-mile radius of Cambridge for the delivery of Freethought lectures of different kinds, as well as for holding meetings where the Freethinking lectures would be welcome. Those who can help in this form of propaganda should write to the Secretary, National Secular Society, 68 Farringdon Street, London E.C.4. The expenses would be met by the N.S.S.

Dr. Hardwicke writes :—

In my article on "Easter," I inadvertently omitted to mention that the Buddhist Swastika was frequently in evidence over the burial places of the Christians in pre-Constantine days in the Catacombs of Rome; a form of cross now repudiated by the Latin Church, though that Church does not object to the use of the Buddhist crucifix, which Constantine adopted as the emblem of his Sun-god, but which was not used by Christians as such till after the Council of Constantinople, 707 C.E.

K.L.M. sends us the following rhyme to explain why some people like YEAST, a substance condemned in a recent number of this journal by Mr. Wallace :—

There once lived a priest in the East
Who swallowed huge doses of Yeast;
He said : I shall gain
If man CAN rise again,
And by Yeast I'll get started at least.

There is time to make a note for the benefit of West London (and other) Freethinkers to repeat last week's notice, that the West London Branch will hold a "Social" at the "Lamb and Flag," James Street, opposite Bond Street Station, on Saturday, March 30, at 8 o'clock. There is a nominal charge for tickets, sixpence each. These can be had from the Secretary, Mrs. Buxton, 18 Cambridge Gardens, N.W.6.

THE PATRIOT

[The more times change the more they remain the same. The following was written by C. F. Browne (Artemus Ward) about eighty years ago.]

"No, Barker, you cannot have my daughter's hand in marriage until you are her equal in wealth and social position."

The speaker was a haughty old man of some sixty years, and the person whom he addressed was a fine looking young man of twenty-five.

With a sad aspect the young man withdrew from the stately mansion.

Six months later the young man stood in the presence of the haughty old man.

"What, you here again," angrily cried the old man.

"Ay, old man," proudly exclaimed William Barker, "I am here, your daughter's equal and yours!"

The old man's lips curled with scorn. A derisive smile lit up his old features; when casting violently upon the marble centre table an enormous roll of greenbacks, William Barker cried out :—

"See! Look at this wealth. And I've tenfold more. Listen old man. You spurned me from your door. But I did not despair. I secured a contract for supplying the Army with beef."

"Yes, yes," eagerly exclaimed the old man.

"And I bought up all the disabled cavalry horses I could find . . ."

"I see, I see!" cried the old man, "and good beef they make, too."

"They do, they do, and the profits are immense."

"I should say so!"

"And now I claim your daughter's fair hand."

"Boy, she is yours. But hold. Look me in the eye Throughout all this have you been loyal?"

"To the core," cried William Barker.

"And," continued the old man in a voice husky with emotion, "are you in favour of a vigorous prosecution of the war?"

"I am, I am!"

"Then boy, take her! Maria, child, come hither. Your William claims thee. Be happy, my children! and whatever you do, and whatever your lot in life may be, let us all support the Government."

Highways and Byways in English History

III.—THE REFORMATION

DURING the later Middle Ages the merchant class and townspeople generally—compactly summed up in the word "bourgeoisie"—had grown increasingly prosperous and increasingly impatient of feudal and especially ecclesiastical privilege. Literacy was now no longer a clerical monopoly. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw the foundation of grammar schools controlled by merchant or craft guilds. Sometimes the founders of these schools expressly provided that the schoolmaster should *not* be in holy orders. To keep the younger generation under her guidance and counteract heretical tendencies, the Church on her side founded colleges at Oxford and Cambridge and such schools as Winchester and Eton. The literate upper and middle classes, thus created, provided a market for the output of the newly invented printing press, introduced into England by William Caxton about 1474. The strength of the Catholic Church lay in her enormous material resources, in the traditional association of her festivals and ritual with popular customs and sentiment, and in her consequent utility as a buttress of secular authority. Her weakness lay in the smouldering resentment of the educated laity at the multifarious clerical exactions to which they were subject.

How ripe the time was for revolution may be seen from the episode of Richard Hum, a merchant tailor of London, who, in 1514, disputed a "mortuary," or customary offering demanded by his parish priest on the death of one of his family. Hum was accused of heresy, and was found dead while in the custody of the Bishop of London. A coroner's jury found the bishop's chancellor and two others guilty of murder. The Bishop, Richard Fitzjames, then wrote to Wolsey as follows:—

I beseeche your good lordshipp to stande so good lord unto my poore chancellor nowe in warde, and endited by an untrewed quest for the death of Richard Hum, that by your intercession it may please the kynge's grace to have the matter duly and sufficiently examined by indifferente persones of his discrete counsayll in the presence of the parties, or there be any more done in that cause, for assured I am if my chancellor be tryed by any xii. men in London, they be so maliciously set *in favorem hereticæ pravitalis*,¹ that they wyl cast and condempne any clerke, though he were as innocent as Abell.

Wolsey used his influence with Henry VIII., and the trial was dropped.

The fall of Wolsey in 1529, and the knowledge that the King no longer protected the Church, opened the flood-gates to a pent-up tide of anti-clericalism which had been accumulating since the days of Wycliffe. A number of acts were passed limiting clerical exactions, declaring the King supreme head of the English Church, vesting the appointment of bishops in the King, and forbidding all payments and appeals to Rome. The breach with Rome was followed by the most revolutionary act of Henry's reign, the dissolution of the monasteries and the confiscation of their property. I find it impossible to be very sorry for the victims. The wealth of the medieval Church is sometimes called "the patrimony of the poor." Some of its superfluity no doubt went to the relief of destitution; but that was not its main function. The phrase is about as sincere as a modern business firm's assurance that "our motto is service."

It was not until after the Reformation that men be-

gan to be romantic about monks. There was a reason for this. The dissolution of the monasteries was carried out in the interest, not of the people as a whole, but of those landowners, and merchant capitalists risen to be landowners, who founded our great ruling families—the Russells, Cecils, Cavendishes, Pagets, and their like. The masses soon found that they had merely exchanged whips for scorpions. Naturally the new ruling class were determined that the Reformation should halt at a point convenient to themselves. They had no intention of encouraging common folk to call their betters in question. Besides landlords and merchants covetous of Church land, the Reformation had rallied to its banner artisans and peasants who, using their intelligence on the newly-translated Bible, demanded social equality in the name of the Gospel. In 1535, before the dissolution of the monasteries, fourteen of these Anabaptists,² immigrants from Holland, were burnt alive in various English towns. In Elizabeth's reign the stake and faggot continued to be used against these sectaries. In 1575 "two Dutchmen Anabaptists were burned in Smithfield, who died in great horror with roing and crieng." These people held, among other opinions, "that a Christian man may not be a magistrat or beare the sword or office of authoritic," and "that it is not lawfull for a Christian man to take an oath." Both these tenets are supported by the letter of the Gospels, and were the natural outcome of the private interpretation of the Bible by poor and simple men. But Anabaptism was also an important precursor of modern Freethought. From using Scripture to question established authority, it was but a step to the use of reason to question Scripture itself. The step was soon taken. In 1570 Matthew Hamont, a ploughwright, for denying the New Testament, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, and the sacraments, was sentenced by the Bishop of Norwich and the civic authorities of that place "to lose both his eares, which were cut off on the thirteenth of Maie in the market place of Norwich, and afterwards, to wit on the twentieth of Maie, he was burned in the castell ditch of Norwich." In 1583 John Lewes was burnt at Norwich for "denieng the godhead of Christ, and holding divers other detestable heresies," and in 1588 Francis Ket, fellow and tutor of Cambridge, for "divers detestable opinions against Christ our Saviour."

Anabaptists who denounced the existing Church and State as pagan; Socinians who denied the Trinity; the so-called Family of Love, who "attenuated all Scriptures into Allegories, and made them aery, empty nothing"; and the Communist Family of the Mount, who "questioned whether there were an heaven or an hell, but what is in this life," and "believed that all things come by nature"—these sects merged into one another and are hard to disentangle in the records of Elizabeth's reign. The overthrow of the medieval Church was the first step in a revolt against authority, which was to know no halting-place short of modern Materialism.

The Elizabethan settlement of religion was dictated by the interests of the new ruling class, of whom William Cecil, Lord Burghley, was a typical example. These men, enriched by the dissolution of the monasteries, and later by the plunder of the Spanish Main, and the lucrative monopolies granted to them by Elizabeth and her successors, saw in the Church of England, administered by bishops who were royal nominees, an excellent instrument for promoting docility among the middle and lower classes. Not only were

² The name of Anabaptists, or rebaptisers, was given to these heretics because they rejected infant baptism and rebaptized their converts. This was not the most important of their tenets, but merely that which struck casual observers most.

¹ "In favour of heretical depravity."

the bishops still armed with medieval powers of persecution, but the Church then played as great a part as the press now plays in the formation of public opinion. Control of the pulpit was as potent a weapon in the politics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as control of the press to-day.

Yet among the courtiers of Elizabeth, and in the literary world which ministered to their leisure, there existed a private freedom of opinion which far outran the narrow bounds of orthodoxy prescribed for the common people. Giordano Bruno, the future martyr of Freethought, lived in England from 1583 to 1585, under the protection of the French Ambassador, and was well known at court. To such men as Raleigh and Bacon, alive to the new horizons of knowledge and power opening out around them, Anglicanism was no more than a political expedient. Raleigh was reproached with "atheism"; and Christopher Marlowe, who was among his friends, shared the imputation. Francis Ket, the Cambridge fellow burnt in 1588 for "divers detestable opinions against Christ our Saviour," may have had some share in forming the opinions of Marlowe. The issue proved that opinions tolerated in Raleigh, the courtier, were a matter for prosecution when vented by Marlowe, the shoemaker's son. He was marked down for arrest, and might have been sent to the stake if he had not been killed in a tavern quarrel before the law could reach him.

The last burnings for heresy in England were in 1612, when Bartholomew Legate, a cloth-dealer, was burnt at Smithfield for denying the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, and Edward Wightman, at Lichfield, as an Anabaptist. James I., who fancied himself as a theologian, had Legate brought into his presence and argued with him; but when Legate declared that he had not prayed to Christ for seven years, James kicked him out of the room, saying, "Away, base fellow, it shall never be said that one stayeth in my presence that hath never prayed to our Saviour for seven years together." There was some difference of opinion among lawyers as to the legality of the sentence; but Bacon, to his everlasting shame, advised as Solicitor-General in favour of its execution. An attempt by the crowd to rescue Wightman from the stake nearly succeeded. Among those active in these proceedings was William Laud, then chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. But the temper shown by the people warned James and his bishops that such weapons might prove dangerous to the users. Popular feeling was in advance of intellectuals like Bacon. Thenceforward no heretic suffered death.

The discontinuance of burnings for heresy was due to the increasingly bad relations between the court and ruling class, on the one hand, and the country at large on the other. A cleavage of interest had developed between the aristocracy of monopolists and the unprivileged middle class immediately below them. Trading monopolies directed the profits of foreign commerce safely into the hands of great merchant princes and well-connected shareholders, while lesser men had to be content with the crumbs that fell from their table. The theory of the divine right of kings suited the privileged class admirably, since the power nominally vested in the King was in practice delegated to his ministers and favourites. The Church, as we have seen, was merely an auxiliary policeman under their orders. Dislike of monopolies in trade, and dislike of the tyranny of bishops produced between them a formidable body of middle-class discontent, and drove that class, including the smaller gentry, into chronic opposition to the Crown for the best part of a century. The quarrel had no direct connexion with Freethought. The Puritan middle

class, given the power, were as ready to persecute for opinion as their oppressors, and proved it when they settled in New England beyond the reach of king or bishop. But the weakening of government entailed by the internal struggle inevitably diminished the power to persecute. In the next article we shall see how the clash of authorities and multiplication of sects in the Civil War led to a measure of freedom of thought and disbelief in Christianity greater than had ever been known before in England.

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON

(To be continued)

Other People's Superstitions

We all know there must be myriads of men (and at least as many women) who

Compound for sins they feel inclined to
By damning sins they have no mind to.

Centuries ago there was a pious patriot who listened with indignation to the story of atrocities committed by armed men against unarmed civilians. Learning, however, that the aggressors were the troops of his native land, he changed his tune and stoutly cursed the scoundrels who had incurred his country's severe "justice."

Under the authority of the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, a pamphlet has been issued with the title: "What Is Superstition?" It is impossible for Freethinkers to disagree with this clerical denunciation of a fault with which Freethought is always at war.

The Rev. G. R. Balleine—writer of the pamphlet—admits with admirable frankness that "Superstition" etymologically derives from "religion." Mr. Balleine's profession debars him from attacking any superstition having its basis in Christian canons and Christian history. This seriously cripples his well-meant efforts.

Take, for instance, a purely idolatrous, ignorant, and superstitious reliance upon the salutary powers of some kind of stick or stone representing the Cross. Our author says:—

It had at any rate a religious basis: it was a kind of appeal to Christ for help.

But in what respect does this differ from the worship of any idol? That too has a religious basis; that too is a kind of appeal to God for help.

Is Mr. Balleine correct in saying that "if we cannot satisfy our sense of the supernatural by the practice of a real religious faith, we fall back on rags and tatters of mouldy moss-grown superstitions"? Yes, but what is the difference? If there is so silly a thing as "a sense of the supernatural," may there not equally be "a sense of the moss-grown superstitions" also? Besides we hold that the current superstitions of the leaders and followers of the Christian creeds are as "mouldy" as any which this pamphlet denounces.

Freethinkers condemn all superstitions without quarter, but it must not be supposed that they waste their lives in actively combating every trifling absurdity which is rightly designated a superstition. Life is short, and it is an all-day job to fight the religious system dominant in the day and area in which we live. Our objection to superstitions is quite indiscriminating—and even intolerant.

The housemaid thinks a fire burns better if she makes the poker "cross" the bars of the grate. But little harm is done by a superstition as innocent as the nonsense told to children about Santa Claus. Passing under a ladder may have its dangers; a person is not

necessarily superstitious who gives painters' ladders a wide berth. A mascot on a car may be a mere ornament: the driver may not really rely upon a beautiful Psyche in silver saving him from accidents. Lightning conductors—often omitted nowadays by scientific builders—owe their origin to reason—Benjamin Franklin's reason—not to religion. Whether useful or useless they owe nothing to religion.

The superstitions which cluster around Fridays are based on the "Good" Friday when Saviours were crucified. To eat meat or cut your nails or start anything on a Friday is said to invite catastrophe. Mr. Balleine humourously admits that he gets his hair cut on Fridays because the absence of the superstitious makes more room in the barber's shop every Friday.

To "touch wood" comes from the benefits derivable from cross or crucifix. The pamphlet, Protestant as it is, is careful not to throw too much contempt on a very Christian custom.

One of the "superstitions" Mr. Balleine condemns is the idea that the number Thirteen is specially unlucky. Its origin is connected with the Last Supper, of course, as is also the absurd idea that spilling salt is specially unlucky. You can placate the Devil by throwing more salt over the left shoulder ("into the Devil's eye.")

Mr. Balleine suitably characterizes Astrology as the fraud it is. In fact this section of the pamphlet is worth noting, especially his quotations from leading Astrologers, in respect of world-famous events which never received even a paragraph in one of their many organs, and of lies told about events which never happened. The Abdication of King Edward VIII. was literally undreamt of, but his Coronation was "fore-told" as well as its beneficent influences generally.

These stories are amusing; they ought to be sufficient to destroy for ever the claims of modern astrology. The old astrology had been completely exposed. Only to a people brought up in a religious atmosphere could such nonsense nowadays have appealed.

If mascots have a wide popularity to-day, so have religious medals, images, and so on, which are essentially just the same as mascots. Catholic and Anglo-Catholic advertisements of saint-blessed mascots, charms and amulets suggest that a religious appeal to avoid such superstitions is bound to fail. St. Christopher medallions to save motorists' lives is only a proof that a saint's name is regarded as of value—like a Duke's on a directorate. Only when men cease to believe in saints (and dukes) will they repudiate these superstitions.

"Omenphobia" is justly condemned, but what kind of people believes in Omens? The idea is idiotic anyway, but at least it needs belief in a God who sees His taboos ignored. Mr. Balleine comments severely on the stupid idea "that God would allow seven years trouble to follow the breaking of a mirror." Well, let us see a sample of what Mr. Balleine's own book of superstitions (the Bible) tells us about God's own idea of it.

Numbers (chapter 14) tells us how God, Mr. Balleine's God, punished a whole nation for forty years

until your carcases be wasted in the wilderness

for "offences" as little criminal as breaking a mirror. A man accidentally touched a Box on Wheels, or did it to steady it and prevent its fall. His life was violently ended for his "crime." And Adam's love of apples incurred a terrible curse on the entire human race!

There are many similar cases. Even the promised blessings of God are as much "Omens" as His curses. Mr. Balleine need not go outside the pages of his Bible for all his illustrations of the senselessness of superstition.

As to "Dream-books," which, according to Mr.

Balleine "almost make one afraid to go to bed at night," our author finds them the silliest of all reading matter. We consider the Bible a red-hot Dream-book. It deserves Mr. Balleine's description "utter rubbish." There are few events of importance reported in the Bible which do not involve a belief in Dreams.

From "Genesis" wherein God regularly appears to people in dreams, down to the last Bible book: "Revelation," dreams are a vehicle specially chosen by God for revealing Himself and His Messages to mankind. Had it not been for such dreams the Patriarchs would never have known and their descendants would never have believed that they were "God's Chosen People." But for a dream, the world would never have suspected that Jesus was anything but the human son of human parentage.

Mr. Balleine had better watch his steps. In denouncing Dream Books he is getting perilously near to reason, commonsense, science and "infidelity." However—on the last page of this protest against superstition—the little work concludes:—

The Christian's very different attitude can be summed up in the texts: "Whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe," and "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."

Different? It seems to us exactly the same thing, or no more different than Tipster Joe's warning to his dupes not to be deceived by Tipster Tom, and assuring them that Tom's idea that Sunny Jim will win is quite fallacious because Saucebox will romp home at ten to one.

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH

Rumpelstiltskin

In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.—*John* i. 1.

In the charming stories which the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm collected from the folk lore of the German peasantry, and which, under the name of *Grimm's Goblins*, delighted my childhood, there is one that had the fascination of a mystery. It is called Rumpelstiltskin—there, the whole mystery is out—for like many other mysteries, it rests mainly in a word.

The story tells how a maiden was set the task of spinning straw into gold. She is assisted by a dwarf, who claims her first child unless she tells him his name. She marries the king and the dwarf comes for the child, but she has learnt his name. It is Rumpelstiltskin. Similar stories were current in England and other countries, indicating a notion that the name is an integral part of the personality and that to know it puts the owner in subjection.

Few suspect that this childish nonsense has anything to do with religion. But it has. The power of a name lies among the very roots of religion and is still a great source of its sustenance. In the minds of savages, among whom religion arose, names and personalities are confused, and this confusion leads to many curious superstitions. Traces can be found in all faiths, including the Christian.

An Indian asked Kane, the Arctic traveller, whether his wish to know his name arose from a desire to steal it; the Araucanians would not allow their names to be told to strangers, lest these should be used in sorcery. Mr. Clodd, in his book on *Myths and Dreams*, has a chapter on "Barbaric confusion between names and things." There he tells how in Borneo and other places, the name of a sickly child is changed to deceive the evil spirits which have tormented it. An aged Indian of Lake Michigan explained why tales of the spirits were told only in

winter, by saying that when the deep snow is on the ground, the voices of those repeating their names are muffled; but that in summer the slightest mention of them must be avoided, lest the spirits be offended. The Australians believe that a dead man's ghost creeps into the liver of the impious wretch who has dared to utter his name. Dr. Lang tried to get the name of a relative who had been killed from an Australian. "He told me who the lad's father was, who was his brother, what he was like, how he walked, how he held his tomahawk in his left hand instead of his right, and who were his companions; but the dreaded name never escaped his lips, and I believe no promises or threats could have induced him to utter it." Wagner's beautiful opera of Lohengrin has this necessity of a supernatural being concealing his name among its motives.

We have a remnant of the old faith in the popular saying, "Talk of the devil and he is sure to appear." All over the barbaric world we find a terror of naming the dead, lest the ghost be raised. Mr. Clodd says:—

A survival of the dislike to calling exalted temporal, and also spiritual, beings by their names, probably lies at the root of the Jews unwillingness to use the name of Yahveh (commonly and incorrectly spelt Jehovah), and in the name "Allah," which is an epithet or title of the Mohammedan deity, and not the "great name"; whilst the concealment by the Romans of the name of the tutelary deity of their city was fostered by their presence, when besieging any place, to invoke the treacherous aid of its protecting god by offering him a high place in their Pantheon.

The name of the tutelary deity of Rome was kept so profound a secret that Valerius Soranus is said to have been put to death for daring to divulge it.

Sir John Lubbock, in his *Origin of Civilization*, relates that in one of the despatches intercepted during our war with Nepal, Gouree Sah sent orders to "find out the name of the commander of the British Army; write it upon a piece of paper; take it, and some rice and tumeric, say the great incantation three times; having said it, send for some pluntree wood and therewith burn it."

Bancroft, in his work on *The Native Races of the Pacific States*, says: "The Chinooks of Columbia are averse to telling their true names to strangers; with them the name assumes a personality; it is the shadow or spirit, or other self, of the flesh and blood person, and between the name and the individual there is a mysterious connexion, and injury cannot be done to one without affecting the other; therefore, to give one's name to a friend "is a high mark of Chinook favour."

Any careful reader of the Bible must have been struck with the frequency with which "the name of the Lord" is mentioned, and the care not to profane that name. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" is the second commandment, and Christians still speak of God "in a bondsman's key with bated breath and whispering humbleness," for no better reason than this old superstition. In Leviticus xxiv. 11 and 16, the word translated by us "blasphemeth" was by the Jews rendered "pronounces," so that the son of the Israelitish woman was stoned to death for pronouncing the ineffable name of Iahveh* The Talmud says "He who attempts to pronounce it shall have no part in the world to come." Once a year only, on the day of Atonement, was the high priest allowed to whisper the word, even as at the present day "the word" is whispered in Masonic lodges. The Hebrew Jehovah dates only from the Massoretic invention of points. When the Rabblis began to insert the vowel-points they had lost

* The L.X.X. reads "and the son of the Israelitish named THE NAME."

the true pronunciation of the sacred name. To the letters J.H.V.H. they put the vowels of Ebonai or Adonai, lord or master, the name which in their prayers they substitute for Jahveh. Moses wanted to know the name of the god of the burning bush. He was put off with the formula I AM THAT I AM. Jahveh having lost his name has become "I was but am not." When Jacob wrestled with the god, angel, or ghost, he demanded his name. The wary angel did not comply. (Gen. xxxii. 29.) So the father of Samson begs the angel to say what is his name. "And the angel of the Lord said unto him, why asketh thou thus after my name seeing it is secret." (Jud. xiii. 18.)

The charge brought against Jesus by the Jews was that he had stolen the sacred Word and by it wrought miracles. We read in the gospels that Jesus "cast out spirits with his word" (Matt. viii., 16). Jesus promised that in his name his disciples should cast out devils, and Peter declared that his name healed the lame (Acts iii. 16). When the Jews asked, "By what power, or by what name have ye done this" (Acts iv. 7), Peter answered, "By the name of Jesus Christ." Paul says, God hath . . . given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow in heaven and in earth and under the earth (Philip ii. 9, 10).

This is why converts are baptized "in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." The names were spells to ward off evil demons. All prayer indeed is the development of the belief in the efficacy of words as charms or spells to obtain the wishes of the petitioner. (Reprinted) J. M. WHEELER

As Loyola defined the Jesuit Creed

"SOLDIER OF THE CHURCH," is the title selected by the German author, Ludwig Marcuse, for a life of Ignatius Loyola, the pioneer missionary of the Catholic faith.

A chapter that particularly interests me is "The Agent in the Far East."

In this, Marcuse relates the exploits of Francis Xavier, one of Loyola's original associates, among the people of Japan. How did they regard the new religion to which he sought to convert them? With Xavier was a Japanese named Anjiro, serving as an interpreter.

Through Anjiro and Marcuse we get a very informative statement.

"Anjiro's relatives and acquaintances," it is related, "were eager for information. Of what material had the Invisible One, who had now landed on their shore, created the soul? He had created it like the sun, the moon, and the other attributes of the world, without material—by His will alone.

"What colour was the soul, and what shape? If the air, which really was corporeal, had no colour, how could the soul, which was without body, have colour?"

"Yet the Christian doctrine could not be true, because it had remained unknown to the Japanese until then. Why had the Christian God, if He was really omnipotent, kept the Japanese in ignorance till now?"

"The yellow men's scepticism struck at the white Creator's weakest spot.

"If this God was truly benevolent, why had He created the Devil? Why did He permit his beloved children to sin? Why did He make it so hard for them to reach paradise? Why was he so cruel to those who had departed this life without knowledge of His magnificence—that they were required to roast in hell for ever?"

"This severe God must either be impotent or the

worst of all devils. One could never tell. The Great Unknown might very well be a devil.

"The yellow men become greatly perturbed over the fate of their dead. They implored their countryman, God's interpreter, to put in a good word for the innocent Japanese departed. But Xavier was as inexorable as his God was sympathetic."

From this it is clear that in those far-back years—the first half of the sixteenth century—the Japanese were with the enlightened world of the present day in their utter inability to reconcile the conflicting claims made by apologists for the God of the Bible.

The propounders of the Christian religion, it is interesting to find, had their counterpart among the Japanese—even in those days.

"The bonzes," remarks Marcuse, in reference to the perturbation of the Buddhist monks at the advent of Xavier, "fought back hard. Here was a new God, with a new following, who wanted to take their customers away. The white competition was something to be reckoned with. The foreign priests resorted to the trick of wanting nothing for themselves. They were cheaper than the cheapest, since they could under-bid the most modest demands of their Japanese colleagues. The bonzes had to fight or be bested. They crept from house to house crying down the Christian God and promoting their own stock. Would anyone, misled by the white competitors, hold it against the bonzes that they did not concern themselves with the poor? Those who could not pay had no right to hope for paradise."

Marcuse gives a vivid picture of the extent to which Loyola combined jesuitry with sincerity.

Born in Spain, he was—first a page at court, and then a military officer. It was entirely due to a permanent injury to a leg that he was deflected from a military career. He embraced religion, wholly because it appeared to offer opportunities for distinction that he could discern in no other direction. Beyond question is the fervour that he rapidly developed in this respect.

Early in his career he suffered great hardships and deprivations.

"Christ demanded of an aide, he told himself, what a great Christian King would require from a volunteer. Such a King would say, 'It is my will to subjugate the unbelievers. Whoever wishes to march with me must be satisfied with the sort of food and drink and clothing I allow myself. Like me, he must strive by day, and lie awake at night. Later he may share the glory of victory proportionately as he has shared the hardships.' He spent seven hours a day on his knees in prayer. Once a day he ate bread that he begged. One cup of water must suffice his thirst. When exhausted he lay on the ground or floor."

Loyola became the head of a little following—"The Grey Robes."

But the work he was doing was not at all consistent with the interests of the priests of his day. "If any lazy fool could save his own soul," it was felt, "what became of the authorities of the church, and their hard-earned privileges!" Repeated attempts—all of them unsuccessful—were made to have him declared a heretic.

"The endangered hierarchy," says Marcuse, "still had its reliable guardians. The austere Alonzo Mexia, a perfectly disciplined functionary, had no patience with unlicensed practitioners, the unlettered, the poor, the women, the blasphemous Jews, Mohammedans, Humanists. He would put these Grey Robes in their places." Loyola "was forbidden to teach religion, or any related subject, for the next three years." Further, "he must quit dressing like a preaching friar." It was useless for him to say that he had no money—that he could not buy decent secular clothing.

"Loyola retorted, 'I should not have thought that one could be conspicuous among Christians by speaking of Christ.' Embittered, he turned his back on the city which pronounced piety impious."

Such, then, was the treatment meted out by fellow-Catholics in Spain to the man who became, perhaps, the greatest individual proselytizing servant the Catholic Church has known. Papal approval was accorded him when years later he settled in Rome, in due course heading a world-wide enterprise, and from his administrative office in that city directing his representatives wherever they happened to be.

The years brought other great changes.

"He saw to it," Marcuse continues, "that the Loyolas who were growing up in a thousand places to succeed him would not develop into good Christians with bad stomachs. He was pleased when his table companions enjoyed their food." Meticulous, too, did he become regarding "the colour, cut and material of their coats; the height of their collars; the length and width of their waist-bands; the weave of their stockings; the shape of their shoes." Certainly a very different Loyola from the Loyola of earlier years. "At that time his beard had been allowed to grow wild to honour God. The General now, in God's name, prescribed the length of beards. At that time, the pilgrim and student lodged in refuges for the homeless. The General now kept an immaculate house, in which even the toilets were inspected each evening."

What were the means whereby Loyola attained his end?

Marcuse explains that "under twelve heads he had sketched the strategy which his colleagues were to follow. 'Make yourselves liked by all, becoming all things to all persons in humility and love, and adapting yourselves to the customs of the people.'" He even advised Jesuits stationed in Munich to drink beer "for the love of Christ." Further, they were not "to become over-zealous and be decried as Papists, for in that way they would lose the people's confidence." Expressed in a Loyola sentence, the guiding principle of the society was: "In through the other man's door, but out through your own."

Soldier of the Church—the book from which I have been quoting—is, I would say, a most serviceable exposure of religion generally, and particularly of the jesuitical methods that are so pronouncedly followed in the interests of the Catholic Church.

Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

J. Y. ANDERONEY

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

LONDON

OUTDOOR

KINGSTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place) : 6.30, A Lecture.
NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead) : 11.30, Mr. L. Ebury. Parliament Hill Fields, 3.30, Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park) : 12 noon until 6 p.m. Various Speakers.

INDOOR

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Cricketers' Arms, Inverness Street, near Camden Town Underground Station) : 7.30, Mr. H. Cutner—"Bible Curiosities."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1) : 11.0, Professor G. W. Keeton, M.A., LL.D.—"Education for Democracy."

COUNTRY

INDOOR

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (St. Andrew's (Lesser) Hall, Glasgow) : 7.0, Chapman Cohen—"Dictators and Democracy."

TEES SIDE BRANCH N.S.S. (Jubilee Hall, Leeds Street, Stockton) : 7.0, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

By

G. W. FOOTE

Before LORD COLERIDGE in the
Court of Queen's Bench

Price 6d.

Postage 1d.

**The Crucifixion and Resurrection
of Jesus**

BY

W. A. CAMPBELL

Cloth 2s.

Postage 2d.

**Historical Jesus and the Mythical
Christ**

BY

GERALD MASSEY

Price 6d.

Postage 1d.

THE REVENUES OF RELIGION

BY

ALAN HANDSACRE

Cloth 2s. 6d. Postage 3d. Paper 1s. 6d. Postage 2d.

MOTHER OF GOD

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Post Free

2½d.

Shakespeare & other Literary Essays

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Price 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

Christianity, Slavery and Labour

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Cloth 2s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

Footsteps of the Past

BY

J. M. WHEELER

Price 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

SOME CHRISTIAN TYPES

by

CRITICUS

Price 4d.

By post 5d.

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

THE FOURTH AGE

By

WILLIAM REPTON.

Price 1s.

Postage 1d.

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

**THE OTHER SIDE
OF DEATH**

By **CHAPMAN COHEN.**

Cloth Bound **THREE SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE**
Postage 2d.

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

FOUR LECTURES on

FREETHOUGHT and LIFE

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price - One Shilling. Postage 1d.

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

**Realistic Aphorisms and
Purple Patches**

By **ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.**

320 pages.

Paper Covers 3/6.

Postage 4d.

(All Cloth copies sold).

ROME OR REASON

BY

R. G. INGERSOLL

Price 3d.

Postage 1d.

FANFARE FOR FREETHOUGHT

By

BAYARD SIMMONS

A collection of verse wise and witty, filling a gap in Freethought propagandist literature. Specially and tastefully printed and bound.

Price One Shilling.

Postage Twopence.

THE AGE OF REASON

THOMAS PAINE

Complete edition, 202 pp., with a 44 p. introduction by Chapman Cohen. Price 6d., postage 2½d. Or strongly bound in cloth with portrait, 1s 6d., postage 3d.

THOMAS PAINE

JOHN M. ROBERTSON

An Investigation of Sir Leslie Stephen's criticism of Paine's influence on religious and political reform. An indispensable work for all who are interested in Paine and his influence

SIXPENCE

Postage 1d

THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH

CHAPMAN COHEN

A critical examination of the belief in a future life, with a study of spiritualism

CLOTH 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.; PAPER 1s. 6d., postage 2d.

RELIGION AND SEX

CHAPMAN COHEN

Studies in the Pathology of religious development

Price 6s.

Postage 6d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

By G. W. FOOTE and W. P. BALL

Cloth 2s. 6d

Postage 3d.

Prayer : An Indictment

By G. BEDBOROUGH

Price 2d.

Postage ½d.

PAMPHLETS FOR THE PEOPLE

By CHAPMAN COHEN

1. Did Jesus Christ Ever Live?
2. Morality Without God.
3. What is the Use of Prayer?
4. Christianity and Woman.
5. Must We Have a Religion?
6. The Devil.
7. What Is Freethought?
8. Gods and Their Makers.
9. Giving 'em Hell.
10. The Church's Fight for the Child.
11. DEITY AND DESIGN
12. WHAT IS THE USE OF A FUTURE LIFE?
13. Thou shalt not suffer a Witch to Live.
14. Freethought and the Child.

Other Pamphlets in this Series to be published shortly
One Penny Each; Postage halfpenny

WILL CHRIST SAVE US ?

G. W. FOOTE

This pamphlet is a characteristic piece of writing of the founder and late editor of the *Freethinker*.

Thirty-two pages, Twopence. Post free 2½d.

Other Pamphlets by G. W. FOOTE

BIBLE AND BERR. 2d., postage ½d.

THE MOTHER OF GOD. 2d., postage ½d.

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH (being his speech before Lord Coleridge in the Court of Queen's Bench). 6d., postage 1d.

THE JEWISH LIFE OF CHRIST. (Translated from the Hebrew), with introductory preface. 6d., postage ½d.

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

FASCISM & CHRISTIANITY

Chapman Cohen

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

This is a timely and appropriate propagandist pamphlet, and should be circulated as widely and as wisely as possible. Packets of Fifty copies will be sent post free for 4s. 6d.

ONE PENNY. By post Threehalfpence

PETER ANNET—1693-1769

Ella Twynam

Price post free 2½d.