

THE FREETHINKER

EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN
— Founded 1881 —

VOL. I.X.—NO. 17

SUNDAY, APRIL 28, 1940

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
Man and Morals—The Editor - - - - -	257
China's Chief Classic—Mimmermus - - - - -	259
Serpents and Dragons—H. Cutner - - - - -	260
Consider the Lilies!—C. G. L. Du Cann - - - - -	261
"Christ Triumphant over Death"—George Wallace - - - - -	262
Is Psychology in Chaos?—G. H. Taylor - - - - -	266
Scientific History and Christianity—J. Reeves - - - - -	267
Alternatives—C. S. Fraser - - - - -	269

Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums,
Letters to the Editor, etc.

Views and Opinions

Man and Morals

THE *Freethinker* has many readers in India. It has readers all over the world, and if our circulation were as deep as it is wide our financial worries would be at an end. We flatter ourself that the secret of our wide circulation is that we are concerned with genuine human problems, and these are the same the world over. Problems of ethics, or religion, of sociology, are everywhere fundamentally the same. They differ only in form, and if fools are concerned with the form and are unconscious of the substance, the explanation is that they are fools. To the scientific mind differences in form do not hide identity in substance. The mother and her child, the lover and his mate, the ruler and the ruled, the fool and the philosopher, are fundamentally the same whether we meet them in New Guinea or Park Lane. They differ mainly in what is superficial. We may paraphrase the French saying and apply to humanity as a whole what was originally said of politicians: "The more man changes the more he remains the same."

We are reminded of this by a criticism of a "Views and Opinions," by the editor of the *Indian Thinker* (Trivandrum). We think that this criticism is worth dealing with at length, as the same difficulty may have been felt by others. In our notes we were protesting against the assumption that religion was based on morals, or that it had any necessary connexion with morals. From those notes my critic quotes the following:—

I do not admit for a moment that the Christian religion or any other religion is based upon love of one's neighbour. Morality is a fact, a cardinal fact, long before it is a conscious one. Man no more needs to learn to practise morality than he has to attend school to learn to inflate his lungs. Both are natural facts, the one a physiological fact, the other a social one, but also with a physiological or biological basis. The basic fact of both is forced upon animal life as a whole by the exigencies of existence.

Watch an animal mother caring for its young and you have the roots of one line of moral development which reaches a conscious state with the human group. Note the behaviour of those animals that live in groups and you have the beginnings of another line of development which finds conscious expression in our laws, and consciously respected customs. The lines of behaviour which the animal organism follows unconsciously, are mainly those forced upon it by the necessities of individual existence. The lines of behaviour followed by those animals that live in groups are those enforced by the group life of the herd and which again find conscious expression in the social life of mankind. Moral laws are as truly the laws of social physiology as physiological laws express the behaviour of the individual organism.

On this the editor comments:—

Religion apart, how can morality be accepted as a fact like the inflation of the lungs—as Mr. Cohen would have it? The teaching of evolution is that unsophisticated nature is "red in tooth and claw." It is the sophistication that has to tame Nature and make it good. And if goodness is to come only from the exigencies of individual necessity, its extent in time and space will depend on that necessity and no more. But that would not be morality as ordinarily understood. Morality worth the name must stand on more altruistic grounds. The only morality that can so stand is the morality that comes from the recognition of the fact that the world is inter-connected and animate and that, the law of action and reaction being inexorable, morals alone will pay in the long run. We wish to know what Mr. Cohen has to say to this.

There is enough material here for a fair-sized book; but brevity counsels a mere restatement of our main point only.

* * *

Our Lowly Brethren

Morality is a form of behaviour. This definition covers all forms of social life, and may, if one wishes, be extended to those animals that live in groups. It must, if we wish to understand human morality, be so applied; for unquestionably man developed from animals that had some form of social or herd life. It is this group life that differentiates morals from other forms of behaviour. For group life implies reciprocal feelings and actions; it covers what is well called the instinct of the herd, which subordinates individual actions and feelings to the welfare of the group. In such cases where the individual character runs counter to this tendency the penalty is elimination. The law of the herd is very drastic in its operations, and in the process of events the pressure of the group, in other words the social and other-regarding impulses, becomes of growing importance.

All this belongs to what we may call the sub-conscious aspect of human existence, but it is important to note that definitely human society begins with the

germs of the "altruistic" feelings solidly planted and with not the slightest reference to religious beliefs. Morality predates religion. The need of the early human group is not, as Bagehot strangely supposed, that of being broken into the social yoke, it is rather that of acting against the power of the group and so making further progress possible.

This development of human society proceeds more rapidly with the development of speech and abstract thinking. But when we permit abstract thought to take the place of concrete facts we make for confusion. "Good" must always apply to things, including actions. To be good, a thing or a teaching must be good for something, whether we refer to actions or objects. I do not know whether anyone has ever written an essay on the wit and humour of Socrates, and I have no time to look up the matter, but it is well worth doing. For Socrates pricked the bubble of abstract morality when he said that a thing which is not good for something is good for *nothing*. No matter how much we develop our actions and purify our aims we cannot lose sight of this definiteness of moral actions without making ourselves ridiculous. If my critic will bear this much in mind, I think that a great deal of his difficulty will disappear.

* * *

The Blight of Religion

A great deal of the confusion that is current concerning the nature of religion is due to two things: (1) the hangover of religion in the minds of most, and (2) the unconscious dislike (religious in origin) to reduce fundamental morality to the operation of social forces. This difficulty may be cleared out of the way by reflecting that religion is mainly intellectual in origin, while morality has its foundations in sub-human life, and develops under pressure from the social environment. Primitive mankind—by that we do not mean the comparatively primitive peoples that still exist, but man as he was when just emerging from sheer animality—comes upon the scene with a *capacity* for thought, but has yet to acquire knowledge and develop understanding. Therein lies the source of his troubles and also of his greatness. For the first form of thinking is definitely supernaturalistic. The "natural" considered as a distinct category has yet to be born. The vague mysterious power (Mana) which exists around is all powerful. It is personified and the gods come into existence. The first real intellectual contact of man with nature is made in this god-infested world. The consequence is that our thought-forms bear strong marks of the condition of their formation, and the myriads of generations that lie between us and our earliest human ancestors have not yet removed all traces of supernaturalism from our thought. If one were to draw a graph of humanity in terms of superstition, one would find a very steep rise followed by an irregular fall, with considerable allowances for the current existence of sheer primitive fears and follies all through.

When one studies this graph from another, a more comprehensive point of view, it will be found that our naturalism has all along been saturated with a greater or lesser quantity of supernaturalism. The thought that is brought to bear on the world, the language that is used to express a scientific attitude towards it, carry with them the supernaturalism with which naturalism is at war. There is, indeed, a two-sided process here. On the one side is the cardinal fact that moral feelings are active in the pre-scientific field, at a stage when supernaturalism rules unchecked. Morality is thus, to use a common phrase, implicit, in fact long before it is explicit in theory. The mother does not need a commandment to teach her her love for her child. Man does not need a

command to teach him loyalty to his fellows or to work harmoniously with the group to which he belongs. However much reflection may clarify ethical action, it does not create it. Knowledge and experience may teach us in what way our ethical feelings can be better expressed for our own benefit and for the benefit of others, but the basis of ethics is there in the very nature of associated existence. This is what I meant when I said that social life provided the situations out of which morality develops. The individual as we know him is not an individual who *decides* to live with others. He is the individual he is because of the social structure into which he is born.

That is one side of the process. The other side is that when the moral feelings find vocal expression the vocalization is inevitably saturated with religious ideas. That is why so many peoples have legends of a god who taught them morals. Man's thought is always conditioned by his environment and the saturation of the first attempts at naturalistic thinking inevitably shows the influence of supernaturalism.

I hope that what I have said will sufficiently explain and justify my position. I think I have at least made plain what I mean by saying that man has no greater need to learn to be moral than he has to learn to attend school to learn to inflate his lungs. I do not deny that morality must embrace altruistic teaching. But as a social animal, consideration for others is ultimately a consideration for self since the development of the self is dependent upon the development of others. I do not agree, by the way, that nature, in itself, is "red in tooth and claw." That is a picturesque or poetical expression only. Morality does not exist in nature apart from living beings, and nothing can endow non-human, or, say, non-animal nature, with qualities that have existence and meaning with animated nature only. The concluding statement of my critic is rather puzzling. That the whole world of existence is inter-related is commonest of scientific beliefs. The world is a fact; but I do not see how it follows that therefore it is animate. That morality will pay in the long run, should be a naturalistic axiom. It is certainly not a supernatural one. Morality *must* pay, in the long run, otherwise it would not be morality, since it is by its consequences that any moral teaching must stand and fall. Reduce morals to their proper naturalistic basis and it is soon recognized that the difficulties exist only because belated religious ideas are allowed to influence one's reasoning.

One other word. When I said that the lines of morality were dictated by the necessities of individual existence I had in mind the beginnings of human morals in the animal group. The development in the purely human stage is so great that we have to deal with one of those increases in quantity that emerge in quality. But all morality, as distinguished from mere behaviour, is social. Take away this factor and ethical teaching is as nonsensical as the Christian teaching that this life is a preparation for another in which everything is quite different.

CHAPMAN COHEN

The Night has a thousand eyes,
And the day but one,
Yet no light of the bright world dies
With its dying sun.
The Mind has a thousand eyes;
And the heart but one,
Yet the light of a whole life dies,
When its love is done.

—Gourdillan

China's Chief Classic

Without fears, without desires, without ceremonies, Confucius has used sheer reason, and played the philosopher.—*Voltaire*.

That only binds us together which aggregates all in a living principle.—*Whitman*.

THE most benign figure among the alleged founders of the great religious systems of the world is the Chinese, Kung-Foo-Tse, or Kung the Master, whose name the Roman Catholic missionaries Latinized into Confucius. He was born in the sixth century, before the coming of Christianity, a century notable in the history of the world. This century saw the birth of Gautama Buddha, whose religion outnumbered all others, and in Greece of Æschylus and Pythagoras, the forerunners of the Greek Golden Age.

What is truly remarkable in Confucius is that he was a scholar, and never for a moment pretended to have dealings with the supernatural. Possessing the modesty of true greatness, he actually described himself as "a transmitter, not a maker" of the wisdom of his predecessors. Is there anywhere else in the world a similar position accorded to one who was simply a teacher, and who made no use of hocus-pocus or abracadabra? In the legends, "Christ" declared himself to be a son of a god. Mohammed pretended that he was inspired, but he annexed his inspiration from Hebrew and other scriptures. Gautama Buddha claimed to give a spiritual interpretation of the universe. But Confucius was only a modest man, inferior, in his own estimation, to the master-minds of the Ancients. Yet, while the sages whose names and services he celebrated are forgotten, he has swayed the minds of countless millions for twenty-five centuries. He is recognized as the intellectual father of a whole people, and, though only a scholar, as a superman of the first rank.

The great object of Confucius was to collect and collate the wisdom of ancient sages, and to spread that knowledge among the people. He was, however, a truthseeker, and to his sincere nature, imposture and pretensions were abhorrent. He knew nothing beyond Nature, and, therefore, would not pretend knowledge of the supernatural. But a stable and peaceful society seemed to him the one thing needful for mankind. His aim was to secure the regulation of the family, the government of the nation, and the pacification of the world. In short, the ideal of Confucius was an united and peaceful empire. This, indeed, is the secret of that marvellous unity which has enabled China to triumph over the trappings of many conquests and domestic strife.

Confucius was sanity personified, and he always kept his feet on the ground. No cloud-cuckooland dreams for him. "We cannot as yet perform our duties to men; how can we perform our duties to spirits?" Again, "We know not so far about life; how can we know about death?" Again: "My aim is to learn from things below and rise to things above." Still yet again: "The love of truth without knowledge is blind." He believed in the innate goodness of man's nature. When asked if there were one word which would serve as a rule of conduct, he replied: "Is not reciprocity such a word? What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others." He saw through the sham of monastic asceticism. "If I associate not with people, with mankind," he said, with quiet scorn, "with whom shall I associate?" The impression he made on his disciples was enormous. Many of them were among the ablest men in China of their time. The old sage gained their hearts and won their admiration. They began the chorus of praise which has sounded through all the intervening ages, nor is it less loud and less confident now than it was five and twenty centuries ago.

When Sir John Lubbock compiled his famous list of the Best Hundred Books he did well to include the *Analects of Confucius*. This Chinese sage did more for his own country than any other among the countless myriads of her sons had done. This great man we too must learn to know, for he has a message for modern men. He was at one with Emerson in teaching that it was the duty of every man to attain to perfect self-government. Stoicism, noble as were its ideals, succeeded only with fine characters like Epictetus, the slave, and Marcus Aurelius, the emperor, but Confucius, more realistic, succeeded in impressing his teaching upon the most populous nation of the world.

It is given to but few philosophers to see life steadily, and to see it whole. Besides Confucius, there are but Socrates and Plato, who was a pupil of Socrates. It is this clarity and sanity which makes such a resemblance between their various teachings and utterances, and which impressed men so deeply. Socrates reached the summit of human grandeur in his death, the mere record, of which is one of the most imperishable things in all the world's literature. Plato has influenced deeply the scholars of the civilized world for nearly twenty-five centuries. But Confucius had the greatest measure of success, because he reached everyone, high and low, rich and poor. His system of ethics is Secularistic. It confines itself to this world; it knows nothing of the supernatural; and has no room for priests or priestcraft. Instruction in the classics supplies all that is needful. And it has sufficed for the ethical needs of hundreds of millions of Chinese people for thousands of years. This is important. Other races may die out, but they are one of the permanent factors of humanity. Their fibre is of the toughest. They cannot be crushed or absorbed.

To Confucius society was the great reality. For the preservation of civilization he trusted mainly to education, and to him it is chiefly due that the Chinese educational system is so complete and so successful. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that an educational system like that of China is the very ideal after which many administrations in Christendom are striving. The British Government has adopted the principle, as regards the Civil Service of the Indian Empire, and it is being applied more and more to many departments in Britain, in the Colonies, and in the United States of America.

Really great men and their works are a continuous inspiration. Our debt to Plato, Socrates, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, and others, has been duly acknowledged. Due honour has been paid to them. But Confucius, who has had such enormous success in China, has so far received less than justice in Europe. His ideas and teaching are of the utmost value, for they are practical and realizable. Confucius was only a scholar, and a truthseeker. Yet he became one of the greatest teachers the world has seen. The fact is one that any scholarship must admit. It is a tribute to his undoubted worth. Few men have taught worthwhile things with such rare lucidity of thought and utterance. Although to the great mass of Europeans he is only a great name, to the world of intellect he ranks with the very highest of those who open up vistas to men's eyes, and widen the horizon of knowledge. A teacher of rare genius, he was also an historical force of remarkable influence. If he erred on the side of conservatism, he "aimed at a million." What matter if he missed an unit!

That low man goes on adding one to one,
His hundred's soon hit;
This high man, aiming at a million,
Misses an unit.

Serpents and Dragons

ONE of the greatest curiosities in the history of religion is the way in which all sorts of objects and animals became deities in turn, devotedly and reverently prayed to by credulous man. Among them was the serpent, almost universally abhorred as a repulsive reptile, yet raised as a god in many lands in the course of ages.

The most famous serpent in history, is, of course, the one which tempted Eve. It is true that many Christians in these very sceptical days do not like to give the impression that this particular reptile actually had an objective existence, or that it ever really held a familiar conversation in grammatical Hebrew with the lady who is still held in Fundamentalist quarters to be the "mother" of the race of man. We are often hastily assured that the whole story of the Garden of Eden is pure allegory though "revealed" by Almighty God. Many quite orthodox commentators on the first chapter of Genesis hedge delightfully on the question of the literal interpretation of the Garden of Eden story. They feel that chronology and science are against them; but after all, are not God's ways *not* our ways? Are Adam and Eve, and even a talking serpent, impossible to an all-powerful God?

Actually the serpent has a long and fascinating history in connexion with religion and superstition. The myths and stories about him have been the subject of many books; and I suspect that even their authors must have been a little astonished at the high place he took in folk and legendary lore. His entry into the Hebrew and Christian religions was only the natural consequence of his connexion with the other superstitions which form the basis of all religious beliefs.

The serpent is found in the old Persian religion. He was there sent by Ahriman, prince of devils (also called Druj—"deceit") to the first created couple to tempt them to evil. Not only did he cause them to forfeit eternal happiness, but he entered their minds and called forth envy, hatred, discord, and other evil passions. There seems a strong likeness between the Persian serpent and the Jewish one.

So there is, for that matter, in the Babylonian, Assyrian and Chaldean serpents. In fact, archæological investigations have made important discoveries on this point. There is an Assyrian cylinder, for instance, which shows two figures, a male and a female, sitting with a tree between them, and at the back of the lady is a serpent standing on its tail. And Ajax, the son of Oileus, is said to have had with him a serpent fifteen feet long. Needless to add that the serpent is venerated in India where numbers of Hindus appear to spend a great part of their time piping music, cajoling them from their baskets.

That the fear inspired by the serpent produced the many myths attached to it must be obvious. Ordinary folk, as a rule, looked upon the serpent with the utmost abhorrence; but this did not prevent priests of some religions from deifying the reptile. Indeed, in many cases human beings were actually sacrificed to him. There is a representation in a tomb at Thebes which shows three men on their knees with their heads struck off and a serpent opposite erecting its crest. The priest standing by is the executioner.

As is well known the serpent either as a symbol or as a god appears all over Egypt; in Greece and in Italy have been found many remains of serpent-worship; while both in Mexico and in South America similar remains have been discovered.

For the ancient Mexicans it was the boa constrictor which was held sacred. "They viewed its actions," says one authority, "with religious horror; they crouched beneath the fiery glance of its eyes; they

trembled as they listened to its long-drawn hiss, and from various signs and movements predicted the fate of tribes or individuals, or drew conclusions of guilt or innocence. The supreme idol was represented encircled and guarded by sculptured serpents, before which were offered human sacrifices."

Other sculptures have been found far more realistic than this one—the serpent god, for example, with a human victim half engulfed in its jaws. All this does not appear very much different from other religions, especially those inspired by fear. If it is not a serpent-swallowing man, it is the jaws of hell; and the fate of nations as well as of individuals was often settled by the religion of "love and mercy"—that is, Christianity.

Classical mythology abounds with serpents. The one with Ajax has been mentioned; and both Serapis and Æsculapius had serpent symbols. When the gods declared war against the giants an enormous serpent attacked Minerva (in Greece, Athena)—one of the many "virgin" goddesses—but she seized and threw it into the heavens where it became fixed among the stars.

Sometimes the serpent by having wings fixed upon it became a dragon. It was a dragon that guarded the golden apples in the famous garden of the Hesperides; the well-known eleventh labour of Hercules describes his attempt to obtain the celebrated fruit. Dragons and serpents were often for the ancients synonymous; one writer actually calling the serpents which squeezed Laocoon and his sons to death, dragons.

In the story of the "Golden Fleece," it was a terrible dragon which guarded the treasure, and which was, luckily for Jason, put to sleep by Medea. But this particular dragon pales in significance before the one so bravely killed by St. George. Incidentally, it may as well be said that no scepticism from infidel historians will ever destroy the "wonderful" story of St. George. A princess about to be swallowed by an awful dragon and saved by a valorous knight forms a picture the very pith and stuff of romance; and love and romance can never be destroyed while woman is fair and man is brave.

The archangel Michael, fighting at the head of his angels, also had an encounter with a dragon and his host and luckily pinned down the beast with his lance as it vomited from the infernal pit. It should be added that the velvet-covered buckler worn by Michael in his war with Lucifer used to be shown in a church in Normandy down to 1607. The Bishop of Avranches perhaps had a few qualms about the authenticity of the relic, for he gave orders no longer to exhibit it. This proves what a wonderful fight the Roman Catholic Church has put up against superstition.

The ancient mythologists were certainly preoccupied with these stories of serpents and dragons, and it would have been surprising if some variants of the myth had not penetrated into Christianity. Even in Judaism, we have the story of Moses and his brazen serpent.

Who originated all these stories it is impossible to say; but they certainly appear very early in recorded "history." One of the early gods of Egypt, Anubis, is represented on a tomb at Thebes, actually armed in a cuirass like St. Michael or St. George, with a lance in his hand with which he pierces a reptile that has the head and tail of a serpent. Probably one of the main sources of the myth is Scorpion, in the signs of the Zodiac. It is possible also that the Devil originated from the same sign.

If Christians in these pagan days hate to recall the serpents and dragons which besprinkle so many of the stories connected with their saints and even em-

perors—Eusebius declares that Constantine loved to have himself painted armed with a cross and striking a formidable dragon with a lance—it is because Free-thought has struck a heavy blow at their superstitions. A recall to the ancient faith these days means only a lot of mouthing about the unique qualities of Jesus. Rarely indeed are we regaled with the fear and terror inspired by the awful dragons and serpents. Not even those of the much-feared Secularism!

H. CUTNER

Consider the Lilies!

Few scriptural adjurations are more pleasantly vivid and impressive than Christ's adjuration: "Consider the lilies of the field: how they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin." And yet . . . "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

From it further teaching follows: "Take no thought for the morrow what ye shall eat or drink or wherewithal ye shall be clothed." You are to rely instead on the bounty of your Heavenly Father. This passage about lilies from the beauty of its language and the audacity of its thought is really a most arresting passage. Its poetry can be appreciated by non-Christians as well as Christians. On the first occasion that it was uttered, the lovely phrases must have deeply affected not only the minds but also the hearts of those who heard it from the orator's lips. Even to-day its spell is not lost on us who read it in cold print or hear it nasally or throatily intoned by clergymen in church. Deservedly it is a favourite passage.

Well—let us really consider the lilies. A beautiful miracle like a growing lily deserves thoughtful consideration (as well as aesthetic appreciation) by all of us, Freethinkers or religious adherents. Did not the poet Keats teach us that "Beauty is Truth, Truth beauty" and that this was all man knew on earth or needed to know? They are beauty incarnate: therefore consider the lilies. Botanists, gardeners and poets do so. Let us follow their example and the adjuration of Christ for it seems both sensible and interesting.

But did Christ—who has been said by the Church to be omniscient or all-knowing although some priests and laymen in the Church of England cast doubt on that doctrine to-day—really know much about the lilies of the field? Did Christ know as much as you—or even as little as I? Or as much as members of the Lily Committee of the Royal Horticultural Society? Or as much as that remarkable Indian, Bose, who taught us such extraordinary things about plant life? Let us see.

"They toil not, neither do they spin," declared Christ. His audience would agree with that. But can we? Certainly lilies don't spin with a machine like girls in Lancashire and Yorkshire factories. But do they not toil? We know to-day that, in the process of growth of a lily bulb slowly breaking into leaf, bud and flower, there is as much intense activity as in a growing man-child in the womb. Similar activity in each microscopic cell of the lily as in a star-world. No toil! Why the lily works—even in sleep!

Consider for a moment how the lilies grow, not as Christ bade you, but as the modern nursery-gardener or the modern scientist *knows* the "how" of their growing. Then you will probably come to the conclusion that in declaring that they "toil not" Christ did not know what he was talking about. He spoke with the knowledge of A.D. 30, not A.D. 1940. The fact is that the lily must eat and drink; must have suitable soil containing such foods as nitrogen and potash from which its ever-toiling roots draw its daily

bread; must absorb water; must be sheltered from the worst weather either by the local conditions as in Galilee or else by artificial protection as we afford the rarer sports in sheltered spots in English gardens. Lilies do not live in a vacuum relying upon "God," but they live by their "bread" as we by ours. Note how the plant "toils" to overcome obstacles, pushing its roots past stones and thrusting its obstinate yet delicate spike fiercely through the soil up to the blessed necessary light and air.

Certainly a lily toils. But Christ was a carpenter, not a gardener nor a botanist, and he never knew Bose's wonderful experiments measuring accurately the movements and sensitivity of a plant. Did Christ know that a lily could become intoxicated or fold up all its sweetness in sleep? Or that it could bleed and suffer as himself? Or was the lily to him only a beautiful object fit for a metaphor—just as to his audience? Indeed, the last seems true.

"Neither do they spin." Not spin? That is nearer the mark, as I have said. At any rate literally, for lilies do not sit at the spinning-wheel. But do they not clothe themselves by their own innate activity and the help of soil, air, sun and rain? In that sense they spin and weave too. (Unrestingly; not even resting on the Sabbath Day. These lawless heretic lilies whom the Lord's Day Observance Society might well consider and pass a resolution about!) And as Christ well said about them in a beautiful and fitting simile that every lover of literature will approve: "Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." Critics, even the severest, will give full marks to the mind that coined that sentence.

Consider the lilies again. And having considered what Christ said of them, consider—equally significant I suggest—what he might have said, if he had lived to-day and known what we know. For generations people have cut or picked lilies and let them die without a qualm of pity or shame. You see flowers were "not Christians" (as the carter beating his horse said to Thomas Hardy). Not, of course, that Christians (or any men or any animals) are any safer than flowers for all the hypocrisy and pretence of other predatory Christians! But to-day, the most sensitive and cultured of western people refuse wantonly to cut or pick flowers and that great Freethinker, Llewellyn Powys, in his book "Love and Death" tells how his brother in boyhood taught him that it was wrong wantonly to destroy the life of flowers—as wrong as to destroy other form of life, all life being beyond man's power to restore.

Indeed, "No flowers by request" is a frequent new-fashioned motto instead of the old-fashioned flower-slaughter at human funerals. Such an attitude—never cut or pick a flower—is perhaps too fastidious imaginative and sensitive for most of us, but in its kind it does represent the high-water mark (going beyond Christ-teaching) of our day. If the Christ of the Bible had taught kindness to the animals, and flowers of Palestine, how that would have been adduced by the clergy of England as evidence of his divinity? Since he did not—I need not complete the sentence. There must have been much cruelty to animals in Palestine and no doubt the lilies of the field were wantonly plucked or trodden underfoot. On these things, so far as the records go, he said nothing. To be fair, it does not follow that he was indifferent to them. But we can only go by the records.

Yet again consider the lilies. Beautiful and innocent enough? Can a man possibly associate criminality with such lovely harmless and perfumed growing things? Alas! There is nothing man will not profane and debase to his ridiculous ape-like thought and behaviour. In a daily newspaper I read that four Irishmen were punished by a Belfast Court for

wearing Easter lilies—a "symbol of the I.R.A.," their political creed. The lilies might have led to a breach of the peace, it appears. Well, that is an old story. We have endured the War of the Roses once in England.

Surely, on the subject of the lilies, Christ's teaching shows a limited and superficial mind—the mind of a Galilean rhetorician of his day, not ungifted with poetic imagination, but destitute of the scientific knowledge about lilies that even a modern child of our time and our country may possess. If Christ was omniscient and omnipotent, having all the Godhead attributed by Christian theology to God the Father, one can only say that it is apparent from his limited vision about lilies that he must have been divested, or have divested himself, of all such qualities when on earth. In short, he must really have been only a carpenter and a missionary, not anything of a gardener, nor anything of a botanist. There was no need for him to "talk down" to his audience of Galilee. They would have been thrilled, indeed, had he told them of what a microscope tells us or had he told them what every humble English gardener knows to-day. Nor was there any need for him to "talk down" lower than the knowledge of the Western World destined to read him after his death. Rather the reverse, one would imagine.

Shakespeare's words were said to be "not for any age, but for all time." But those words of Christ about the lily not toiling seem intended for his contemporary age of ignorance merely. But why? Surely because he was the child of the ignorance of his day.

"They take no thought." It may be. Try living as a lily in England nowadays! If they do not think, do they not still, by an amazing vegetative instinct, obtain what they eat and drink and turn food and liquid by metabolism into "wherewithal they shall be clothed," just as we turn our aliment into the skin that clothes us. If the lilies "take no thought" they have at least some "urge" equivalent to thought in man and instinct in animals which enables them to gain their needs of light and sunshine, food and drink. They obey the inexorable laws of Nature as all children of Nature, animal, vegetable and mineral, must. And what a refreshment they are to contemplate, not only as a subject for thought, but for emotion, even more delight-giving than Wordsworth's daffodils when "they flash upon that inward eye"!

Well may we consider the lilies of the field. They will repay consideration as indeed most things in Nature do.

C. G. L. DU CANN

NATURAL MORALS

Substitution of the Darwinian code of morals for the Christian and other "authoritarian" rules of life was suggested as an approach to human welfare problems by Dr. S. J. Holmes, zoologist, educator and author, in his presidential address to a divisional convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The Darwinian code, an outgrowth of Charles Darwin's theory of evolutionary descent, holds that man's welfare and survival are dependent upon the extent to which he follows the laws of nature and adjusts himself to his surroundings, doing things for the good of his group and helping to protect it against its enemies.

Dr. Holmes cited the ancient Hebraic laws and the Christian ordinances as examples of "authoritarian" codes and suggested that such philosophies conflicted with human nature and therefore were responsible for some of the world's human welfare problems. He contended that some of the problems would disappear and the others might be solved if they could be isolated from "authoritarian" moral philosophies and left to science.—*New York Times*.

"Christ Triumphant over Death"

ON Easter Sunday I listened-in to a sermon on the above text. It was a pitiful thing, but well worthy of the wireless. Though the preacher, in the early days of Christianity, would probably have been condemned to death for his heterodoxy, if Hegesippus' (third century) account of the heresies of the time is to be believed.

Christ triumphant would have suggested to the early Christians that only Jesus died; that Christ—the second person in the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, the Logos—ascended to heaven and left Jesus—the human part—on the Cross to suffer alone, Christ being impassible. Proof of this is found in the expression of Jesus—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46.)

The clergy would have us believe that the soul is triumphant over death now. But in early Christian days, and ours till we grew ashamed of it, people believed:—

That the soul died with the body, and that all men would be in a state of insensibility from the time of death to that of the general resurrection. (Euseb ii, *Hist.* l. vi. c. xxxiii. p. 299.)

No one knew the risen Lord. Joseph of Arimathea had embalmed him, before laying him in the new tomb, and this had doubtless altered his features considerably. The preacher avoided mention of such things. He never attempted to explain how, before Joseph finished his preparations for burial, it must have been nearing Saturday morning, and that Jesus being up before daylight on Sunday morning, he could not have been more than twenty-four hours in his grave, while the scripture tells us that "The Son of Man was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Then again—Jesus was circumcised (Luke ii. 21)—not Christ, and Mary was unclean for seven days after giving birth to the Savior of the world! (Luke ii. 22.) No mention of this!

The clergy, of every denomination nowadays, have grown remarkably cute. However much they may differ on points of doctrine, they all agree to adopt the same phraseology to enable them to fool the people.

O, what authority and show of truth
Can cunning sin cover itself withal!

Who was Christ? Was Christ human? Was the Son a mere creature—first begotten of all creation—a voluntary production of the Father? Was the Holy Ghost his mother?—in the Gospel of *Hebrews* Jesus speaks of the Holy Ghost as his mother (*Early Christianity*, p. 62, S.B. Slack, M.A.). Endless questions like the above were common for many centuries amongst people trying to find a common denominator. Such questions still exist, but they are now treated circumspectly!

The Athanasian Creed dates from the end of the fifth century. Centuries of wrangling produced this priceless piece of buffoonery!

The object of the following is to give a brief account of a few of the controversies which agitated the minds of early Christians. To suggest that unanimity of belief, in any marked degree, on any doctrine, was prevalent is to be either dishonest or very ignorant.

Cerinthus (first century) taught that Jesus was a man born of Joseph and Mary, that the Holy Ghost, or the Christ, descended upon him; and that Jesus died and rose again, but that the Christ was impassible. (*History of Heretics*, p. 150.)

On the other hand Marcion (second century) held that Christ was not born at all, but that "The Son of God took the exterior form of a man; and appeared as a man; and without being born, or gradually growing up, to the full stature of a man, he showed himself at once in Galilee, as a man grown." (*Ibid.* P. 227.)

Novation (third century) lays the stress on Christ's being begotten, and the Father not begotten. "If," says he, "The Son had not been begotten, he and the Father being on a level, they would both be unbegotten and therefore there would be two Gods."

The Docetæ (second century) who first asserted the divine origin of the Son of God, said that Jesus was one thing, and the Christ, or the heavenly inhabitant of Jesus, another; and that when Jesus was going to be crucified Christ left him."

Sabellius (third century) denied that there were three persons in the Trinity. But that the three persons, or rather characters, were only different names of attributes of the same person or being.

The Fathers of the Council of Sirmium (fourth century) say, "If anyone says that the Son was not begotten by the will of the Father, let him be anathema. For the Father did not beget the Son by a physical necessity of nature, without the operation of his will, but he at once willed, and begat the son, and produced him from himself, without time, and without suffering any diminution of himself."

The above met with the approval of Hilary.

Lactantius (fourth century) gave the name second God, saying, "The Lord and maker of the Universe, whom we justly call God, made a second God, visible and sensible."

Hilary (d. 367) wrote twelve books on the doctrine of the Trinity to prove that the Father is the only existing God.

A great controversy raged for long over the "Procession of the Holy Spirit." An attempt was made to unite the Latin and Greek Churches, after centuries of debate, at the Council of Ferrara, in 1439. The Procession of the Holy spirit was thus explained:—

The Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son, and he proceeds from them both eternally, as from a single principle, and by one single procession.

As Peter Lombard (twelfth century) said of the Trinity:—

He that can receive this, let him receive it; he that cannot, let him however believe it; and let him pray that what he believes he may understand.

And think, finally, on this remarkable debate, started in the ninth century, on how Christ was born:—

Paschasius Radbert wrote, "An elaborate treatise, to prove that Christ was born without his mother's womb being opened, in the same manner as he came into the chamber where his disciples were assembled, after his resurrection, though the door was shut?"

This gentleman wrote in the ninth century. So, for nine hundred years Christians and others were making frantic efforts to become sane, just as we are doing to-day, in the twentieth century.

If anyone can find anything "Triumphant" then or now, I shall be pleased to hear from him.

But, something too much of this! The Gospels come to us not only in such a questionable shape, but the manuscripts on which they are written almost beggar discription.

S. B. Slack, M.A., speaking of New Testament History, warns the student who has only the English Version before him. "This version," he says, "professes to be a translation from the Original Greek. The question then arises: From which of the many manuscripts? For there are altogether 2,339 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament at present in existence, and so far are these from containing the same text that there are probably 200,000 different readings. Which of these then is the inspired text?" (*Early Christianity*, P. 27.)

Any reader, with any imagination, can soon discover how Christianity has grown to be what it is to-day. That, living in such a beautiful world, brimful of interesting things inviting our study, such a misbegotten thing as Christianity should lead us astray is beyond belief. What fools we mortals be!

In conclusion, the following quotation is significant of much:—

There is more to be said for the theory that the Gospel narratives originated in a sect like that of the Essenes. Even the name Essene has been derived from Jesus. According to this theory the Gospels in their original form were allegorical; in other words Christ is a collective name for the primitive Christians (cp. Matt. xxv. 40), just as the name Israel in the Old Testament is often a collective name for the Israelites (e.g. Hosea xi. 1). The Gospels were not intended to be regarded as a narrative of events that actually happened any more than, e.g., Bunyan's *Pilgrims Progress*, or Dante's *Poem*. (*Early Christianity*, pp. 31-32, S. B. Slack, M.A.)

GEORGE WALLACE

Aoid Drops

There is a definite movement on foot to suppress the preaching of Communism in this country on the ground that it is part of Hitler's fifth column, and is acting under instructions from Russia and Berlin. Norway has given an illustration of the method of working adopted by Germany at least, and that a certain number of Communists do take their cue from Russia, whether voluntarily or otherwise, can hardly be disputed. All the same, we must never forget that there has always been in this country a number of people, some of them in high places, who have really hated freedom of thought, and have always been ready to urge its suppression, or limitations. We should remember the way this fifth column worked during the war in Spain, and that one Cabinet Minister—Sir Samuel Hoare—expressed to that monument of bigotry, Captain Ramsey, his sincere regret that he could not as Home Secretary forbid the International Freethought Conference being held in London.

We have said our say against Communism as a theory, and discovered in the saying that even amongst *Freethinker* readers we have two or three who are so fanatically intolerant that they decline further to read a paper that stands for genuine freedom of thought. But the real friends of German Fascism are to be looked for among those who before September, 1939, worked under the disguise of organizations ostensibly formed for the purpose of creating more intimate relations with the German leaders, and the German people.

Until war was declared these people were publicly active, and the slave States that Germany has now created are to some extent due to their influence. These people have ceased their activities publicly, and under the old names, at least. But they are still here. And it is this fifth column that needs watching, both now and when the war ends. We have no doubt whatever as to our winning the war. What we have most to fear is the peace. To use the expressed fear of the Hitler

fifth column in this country, to suppress Communism would be a fresh crime against freedom. Certain restrictions during war-time must be expected, but it is easy under cover of this to achieve a victory in the everlasting war against the free expression of opinion.

The *Church Times* is very anxious that nothing dealing with religion should be made fun of on the wireless. If that is to be accomplished all the religious services and sermons will have to be suppressed altogether. We have had some of the most amusing times from the Rev. Elliot. But lately he has ceased to imitate George Robey, and has become quite dull as a consequence.

There is a section of the Nonconformist world that is anxious to amalgamate with the Church of England, and there is a section of the Church of England that is desirous of amalgamation with Rome. The first of these groups finds a mouthpiece in the Rev. D. W. Langridge, who asks, in an article in the *Christian World*, "Why Nonconformity?", and that is replied to by Dr. Griffith Jones under the title of "Why Not Nonconformity?" All these people have the same God, the same inspired—or used to be inspired—Bible, and many of the same beliefs in other directions. There the unity stops. When it comes to what these things mean they will fight like wild cats, but with not so much scrupulousness in the conduct of the battle. The one thing they agree upon after centuries of squabbling is that the world must become Christian. And it is clear that the Roman Church will not combine with the English Church, and the English Church cannot combine with the Nonconformists. Altogether there is one certainty that arises from the conflict—each is ready to take the other in.

The comment of the *Modern Churchman* on the above situation is:—

Unfortunately there are others, not extreme Anglo-Catholics, who, by clamouring for Disestablishment, do not see that they are playing into the hands of Rome and are demanding a policy which if adopted would not only ruin the Church of England, but eventually the cause of the Christian religion in England.

It is delightfully instructive to note that disestablishment of the Church would "eventually" lead to the downfall of Christianity in this country. If that means anything at all it must mean that to take from the Church the social and political prestige it has, and the huge income it enjoys, there would probably be an end to Christianity in England. Even the power of God Almighty does not appear to be capable of preventing this.

Another piece of inside information concerning the Church, taken from the *Church Times*:—

The new Bishop of London is among the numerous body of clerical pipe-smokers, as indeed are two at least of my clerical colleagues. Bishop Gore had a number of pipes on his desk, lighting them one after the other, and putting each down after two or three whiffs. I have seen his Grace of Canterbury smoke a cigarette. I have never seen him smoke a pipe; but Dick Sheppard, once told me that one of his duties when he was Dr. Lang's chaplain at York was to sweeten new pipes for him.

What a job for a man to undertake! Nothing is said about having to warm the Archbishop's socks, or to act as tea-taster.

Cardinal Hinsley believes that as God has chosen England to be on His side during the war there are hopes that England will become Roman Catholic again. Cardinal Hinsley puts "Christian" where we have put "Roman Catholic," but that is what he means. And he bases his belief on a house-to-house canvass by the "League for God," which showed a ninety-five per cent

"longing to know about God." But what Cardinal Hinsley insists on is that this ninety-five per cent must be taught by some "authority," and by "authority" he means his Church. We have heard a lot lately about "wishful thinking;" we must now add to the current terms wishful statistics. Ninety-five per cent are anxious to know about God. And only about ten per cent go to Church. Evidently the ninety per cent who stay away from Church are not very hopeful of getting much information from that quarter.

To those who have wondered why God is not looking after the cities and people of Czechoslovakia, Finland and Poland, the answer comes from a recent biography of Dean Church, by Mr. Algernon Cecil. We cull the following extract from the *Church Times Review*:—

Mr. Cecil puts forward the view that many Englishmen at times have been haunted by a sense, faint, perhaps, and intermittent, of alienation from the Holy See. "To some eyes . . ." they "still wander in this valley of indecision, like men awaiting some hour of deliverance." He cites from a letter words in which Church referred to Rome as the one city in the world besides Jerusalem on which we know that God's eye is fixed.

So both eyes of the All-Powerful God are occupied in gazing at Jerusalem and Rome. One of the old deities of the Greek mythology was Argus, who possessed more eyes than the pair with which other gods were furnished. In these days the Christian God ought to have at least as many eyes as Argus.

Merry in God! We quote the title of Longman's new Biography of the Jesuit Father Doyle. Christian ideas of merriment are worthy of the *Mikado's* famous "something with boiling oil in it." Father Doyle autobiologizes thus:—

I gashed my breast with a razor to shed my blood for Jesus . . . several times I have undressed and rolled in furze-bushes; the pain of the thousands of little pricks is intense for days afterwards. . . . I found a forest of nettles. I undressed and walked up and down till my whole body was one big blister, smarting and stinging; words can never describe the sweet but horrible agony.

Other delightful "merrinesses" are here recorded. We are not opposed to the book's publication: it was worth publishing as an illustration of the impossibility of distinguishing between being "merry" (standing naked up to the neck in a lake on a frosty night and so on) suggesting a sexual complex which is frequently encountered in religious emotionalism, and the same acts which, when unaccompanied by frenzied piety are subject to penal action.

The *Schoolmaster* says that

on all sides the *Times* attack on religious teaching in Council Schools has missed fire—more than that, it has done positive harm to the cause it was supposed to help. I have met and have heard of several leading advocates of religious teaching who are disturbed at the unfortunate effects upon teachers and others of this new campaign. Alienation rather than co-operation has been the net result. One thing I can't understand is the low standard of tactics employed. One would have thought that the newspaper that so ostentatiously stood for religion would also stand for fair play—but complaints that the *Times* has suppressed letters in opposition to its views have been made by both *Education* and the National Education Association.

The expression of surprise concerning the suppression of hostile letters by the *Times*, particularly where religion is concerned, is more theatrical than real. The *Schoolmaster* cannot be unaware of the policy of our papers where religious interests are concerned. We doubt whether even the *Schoolmaster* itself would permit an article in its columns examining the whole question of religion in the schools. A letter very mildly protesting against the injustice of religion in our State schools might pass, but anything of a really drastic character—?

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.

For advertising and circulating the *Freethinker*, A. W. R. Cole, 10s.

JOSEPH CLOSE AND FRANKLIN STEINER.—Thanks for addresses of likely new readers; paper being sent for four weeks.

MISS E. MATHEW.—Thanks for quotation. Shall be used.

M. J. GREENAWAY.—Sorry we have no recollection of the case you mention.

H. EVERARD.—Mr. Cohen is not likely to be speaking in London this side of September. If you have the time he would be pleased to meet you at the *Freethinker* office before you return to Canada.

J. C. KING.—Thanks for article. Shall appear, but crowded with copy for the moment.

D. DALE.—The excerpt is rather lengthy for its purpose and our limited space, but will try and find room later.

R. B. KERR.—Next week.

G. FARMER.—The birch has always had a prominent place, historically, in the educational curriculum of the Christian Church. Theologically, mind training has given a front place to negative or positive coercion.

A. L. JONES (Rhodesia).—Please accept our sincere condolence on your loss. We are gratified to learn that our writings have been of service.

S. MARTIN.—We are not surprised at what you write. There is nothing so powerful for ill as convinced ignorance, and the worst form it can take is to refuse to consider that there is always a possibility of one's judgment being wrong. The other side is always worth consideration.

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.

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.

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. Roselli, giving as long notice as possible.

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.

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

Lecture notices must reach 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, by the first post on Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

Sugar Plums

There is every promise of a good muster of delegates and members for the N.S.S. Annual Conference in Manchester on Whit Sunday, and many anticipations of a pleasurable reunion of friends can be gathered from the communications which are coming in from different parts of the country. All details concerning Branch delegates should have been sent to Headquarters by now, but will these requiring hotel accommodation please notify the General Secretary, stating their needs, as soon as possible? Reserved seat tickets for the evening demonstration in the Chorlton Town Hall may be had in advance, one shilling each, from either the local secretary or the N.S.S. offices, 68, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

The *Freethinker* has experienced another blow, the second of its kind. Notice has been received from a North London reader that owing to our attitude towards Russia (we presume this refers to our criticism of the invasion of Finland, and to our statement that there is not complete freedom of speech, publication and political action in Russia), he will no longer subscribe to the *Freethinker*. On consideration we are not so much surprised at losing this reader, as we are that he ever became one. For surely this is not the only point on which others of our readers have disagreed with us, and they seem to bear with us very patiently. We should imagine that absolute agreement with us on every topic exists with but a minority of our readers. We really write for men and women not for recording instruments.

But what we lose on the finance and circulation swings we more than make up on the roundabouts. Our business manager informs us that in spite of the many who may have been cut off from the paper owing to the war, our circulation is on the increase—not enough to cause a flutter in the heart of one of the "national" daily papers, but enough to show us that we are slowly and surely making more friends. And our real friends are always those who read a paper such as the *Freethinker* in order to reflect on a point of view, not merely to gratify prejudices or bolster up already formed, or dictated, opinions.

The following, from the *Birmingham Mail*, will be of interest to many of our readers. Mr Roberts, it should be explained, was a well-known Christadelphian, and had some reputation as a debater:—

Roberts was a great debater, but he met his match when he crossed swords with the great Charles Bradlaugh, who was the head of the Freethinkers, and, like Roberts, a great authority on the phraseology of Holy Writ. It was a wonderful discussion, but there was an incident that made many devout Christians smile faintly. Bradlaugh got his opponent slightly rattled, and, in his haste, Roberts, seeking to find a certain passage in the New Testament, said hurriedly, "I know it is here, but I can't find it. It proves my point."

Swiftly Bradlaugh turned over the leaves of the "Good Book" and handing it to Mr. Roberts with sublime courtesy asked, "Is not that the passage you want?"

The latest issues of the Thinkers' Library (Watts and Co.) are two that should be welcomed by all Freethinkers. The first is a reprint of Miss Tennyson Jesse's *Act of God*, a novel to which we called special attention on its first appearance a few years back. The characters are well drawn, and whatever propaganda it contains is not spoiled by being over-emphasized. To preach in a novel is inexcusable, and Miss Jesse steers clear of this end. For those who are looking for a Freethinking novel we commend this one. The satire is pronounced, but is of the kind that should please all who are able to appreciate its quality. The published price of this series is now 1s. 3d., and is still cheap at this figure.

The second of the two issues is a reprint of Herbert Spencer's *Man Versus The State*, with an introduction by Lord Snell. Spencer's book led to a great deal of discussion when it first appeared, and although Spencer failed to make adequate allowance for the beneficial action of the State, in which there was then and is now, room for development, there are lessons in this work that may yet be learned with profit by many. And we are to-day receiving proof that the worship of the State may be responsible for as great, if not greater, evils than those which State action is expected to cure. But anyone who is not a fanatical devotee of some economic system may still read with profit the four essays which comprise this book, written by one of the leaders of his time. Lord Snell puts well a justification for the re-issue of the work (if any were needed) in the following:—

It is the warning that this book contains rather than its illustrations that I commend to the close attention of its readers. The question we have to face to-day is

not whether all State-action is wrong, but how far State-action can usefully be extended. . . . The State can do wonderful things for citizens in its appropriate sphere of action. It can defend them against invasion by an enemy power; it can protect their lives and their property; it can provide for them security against many forms of disease. . . . But the State has rarely interfered with the mental or "spiritual" life of the people without injuring both it and them.

The oscillation of the social pendulum has gone from one extreme to the other, and with some very ugly consequences. Another book we should like to see issued in the same series as the two just noted is Spencer's "*Study of Sociology*." This is a book that brings the great qualities of Spencer more clearly to the front than that of any other of his works—at least within so small a compass. For those who have the wit to perceive them its lessons are as pertinent to-day as when they were set forth in 1873.

Is Psychology in Chaos?

It will be appreciated that I have not presented Gestalt in opposition to either Psycho-analysis or Behaviourism. It is conceivable that their differences do not so much represent mutual antagonism as reflections of specialized direction of interest.

Perhaps we may ultimately expect one psychology, with various ways of treatment and approach warranted by the extreme complexity of the subject matter. We should not condemn physics if some investigators confine themselves to a study of atom-analysis, others to a specialized study of crystals and yet others to the sector of astronomy. Nor should we regard biological science as chaotic if we find some researchers interesting themselves in ecology, others in genetics and others, again, in hormones and enzymes. Is it not, then, to be expected that where the material for study is at a still higher level of complexity the aspects selected for examination will be even more numerous?

Having made this general generalization, I may now detract something from it by saying that the various psychologies advocated to-day are not entirely supplementary, and in this the parallel with physics and biology fails. If, however, the generalization made is regarded in the nature of a forecast, then whatever chaos exists at present may be regarded as a temporary feature of psychology.

I have before devoted articles to each of the three major psychologies (Gestalt, Psycho-analysis and Behaviorism); as for the rest, a bird's-eye view picks out the *hormic* psychology (McDougall); *Intentional*, or *Act* (Brett); *functional* (H. A. Carr); *motor* (Washburn); *structural* (Bentley, Boring, Nafe, with Wundt and Titchener as precursors); *reaction* (Dunlap); *dynamic* (R. S. Woodworth); *two-factor* (Spearman) and *motivational* (Troland), as well as the offshoots from Freud. It seems probable, therefore, that if psychology has still much to learn, it has also much to amend or discard. Professor McDougall, for instance, claimed the right to explain things by the introduction of new and unproven principles, regardless, apparently, as to whether they could be submitted to investigation. His psychology is encumbered by such "principles" as (1) Disposition, based on the inherited instincts (2) Temperament, based on chemical metabolism and the glands (3) Character, the sum of acquired tendencies built up on the first two, and (4) Temper, the way in which instincts work. With psychology tending to discard useless premises it is little wonder that he cut a somewhat lonely figure, turning latterly to psycho-analysis for help, and being

saddened to find Freud an unresponsive figure. His last appeal was to Flügel, once a pupil of his ("before he succumbed to the Master," as McDougall put it).

Of the others, Spearman¹ has perhaps gained most attention. Here again, there is a different treatment, namely, the study of the results of mental and intelligence tests, from which, partly in conjunction with Dr. C. Burt, he has collected much data. He posits two factors in intelligence, *g* (general ability) and *s* (special ability), both active in each and every mental operation, with the first perhaps arising from the general cerebral energy, and not increasing after the age of fifteen or so, and the second perhaps depending on the particular engines involved. He finds the *g* factor greater in Germanic than in Mediterranean peoples, and greater in the whites than the negroes of U.S.A.

Dr. E. Heidbreder (*Seven Psychologies*) attempts to find some broad lines of agreement which emerge from the present situation in psychology. She finds a tendency to study the nervous system as a system (on Gestalt principles) and not as a sum total of reflexes. She opines, too, that psychology now "regards man as an animal reacting to his environment as other animals do, and in consequence psychology was freed from the idea that human beings constitute a unique and special case in the order of nature."

It may well be that as psychology is purged of its unscientific elements, psycho-analysis will lose some of its accretions, particularly those of that "much-despised pair" (as they have been called), Adler and Jung, who seceded from Freud in 1911 and 1915 respectively.

The late Professor A. Adler's "Individual" psychology sees characters as guiding threads, ready attitudes creating psychical phenomena, their expression. Personality he regards as largely dependent on the reaction to one's own bodily excellences or deficiencies. He replaces the Freudian insistence on sex by the "Will-to-Power," which is the essential human urge. What is expressed is mainly self-assertiveness, and as a reaction to natural limitations we get, e.g., the "masculine protest" of some women.

Adler does not appear to add very much to Freud; rather he subtracts from, and reorients by a change of emphasis. McDougall's opinion is that his psychology "lacks any vestige of scientific quality," having "a total disregard for logic, truth, consistency and coherence."²

With Jung the Freudian *libido* becomes widened from the sphere of sex to the whole *élan*. His "unconscious" is widely separated from the conscious, and a deep layer of it contains the common psychic inheritance of the race, the "collective unconscious," in which Jung finds not only conflict and repression, but also many noble impulses. The *persona* is the self we want to be. He makes much of intro- and extro-version, and posits distinctive "Archetypes," depending apparently on the inheritance of acquired characteristics. (Some stages of introversion and extraversion are, it may be noted, induced by quite material agencies like coffee and wine respectively.)

The idea of God, so Jung contends, is a powerful psychical intensity, and he who rejects it recreates it as State or Wodin or some "ism." He therefore offers something in the nature of a pragmatic religion. An elephant is true because it exists, and so, he maintains, we must recognize the magnitude and import-

¹ See *Creative Mind* (1930) and *The Abilities of Man* (1932).

² *Psycho-Analysis and Social Psychology*.

³ *Psychology and Religion*.

ance of religion. Even Roman Catholicism is beneficial, he allows, if it works for its devotees. "Is there . . . any better truth about ultimate things than the one that helps you to live?" (*ibid.*)

His argument here is decidedly thin, and could be advanced on behalf of any savage belief which has at some time prevailed. Following Jung, we might further reason thus:—Theism directs the life of Jones. Therefore theism is true. Atheism directs the life of Brown. Therefore Atheism is true.

Though it has given such offshoots, psycho-analysis has much that appears well founded. From the triple author of *The Science of Life* comes the following tribute: "Freud's name is as cardinal in the history of human thought as Charles Darwin's. These psychoanalysts under his leadership, have created a new and dynamic psychology, one that thinks in terms of activities and strivings of impulses and conflicts, in the place of a flat, lifeless picture of mental states." McDougall concedes that "Freud has quite unquestionably done more for the advancement of our understanding of human nature than any other man since Aristotle." Yet he considers the doctrines of Freud an intimate blend of truth and error, and continues, "The recognition of subconscious activities is of the first importance, but the Unconscious is a fraudulent entity that has gravely obstructed the path of progress;" the same, he thinks, applies to other psycho-analytical terminology, and he applauds Flügel's *Men and their Motives*, wherein he finds no use is made of the Freudian foundation stones, "pleasure principle" and "reality principle." McDougall desires to claim psychoanalysis as teleological and hormic, depending on instincts or propensities.

Flügel is ambitious for the future of psycho-analysis and writes that "there is now scarcely a single important aspect of human activity to an understanding of which psycho-analysis has not in some degree contributed." He regrets that the system stands in need of more controlled and repeatable experiment and a logical setting down of the whole scheme.

As for Behaviorism, its successes have earned for it considerable repute, and the only danger here is that its friends should consider it the alpha and omega of psychology. "Watson and his school have made a real contribution to psychology in showing how plastic the mind of the child is, and what a huge part conditioning plays in the building up of much human behaviour," says *The Science of Life*, but "because human minds are built up, so to speak, upon a practically blank sheet by an accumulation of conditioned reflexes, they have run on to the absurdity that any system of conditioned reflexes can be built up in any infant. They have leapt on to the assumption that every human being starts with the same blank sheet of the same texture and capacity for receiving and carrying impressions. They deny that heredity counts for anything in determining personal quality."

To conclude, the following verdicts are ventured on the three chief psychologies:—

1. Experiments in psycho-analysis strongly indicate that when the scheme is reduced to some kind of established order, at least a large permanent core of truth will be found. It will be on Freudian lines rather than those of the seceders and deviators.⁵ It

would perhaps not too greatly transgress the bounds of restrained language if I said I failed to see where some of Jung's work is easily distinguishable from commercial quackery.

2. Behaviorism is obviously true—at the behaviorist level.

3. In philosophical implication Gestalt is the psychology *par excellence*, for it offers an epistemology which, if the philosopher does not accept it, he must either bend to experimental psychology in order to dispose of it himself, or must patiently suspend his system until some psychologist has kindly disposed of it for him. Ignore it he cannot.

G. H. TAYLOR

Scientific History and Christianity

III

CONTINUING the strictures on the lives of the clergy in *The Revelation of Goliath the Bishoppe* (taken from Professor Robinson's Readings in European History):

The lion is the Pope, that useth to devoure,
And laicthe his bookes to pledge and thirsteth after gold,
And doth regard the marke, but sainte Marke dishonor,
And while he sailes aloft on coyne takes anker holde.

And to the Bishoppe in the caulfe that we did see,
For he doth runne before in pasture, feild and fenne,
And gnawes and chews on that where he list best to be,
And thus he fillis himselfe with goodes of other men.

Th' Archdeacon is likewise the egell that dothe flie,
A robber rightlie cald, and see a-farre his praie,
And after it with speed dothe follow by and by,
And so by theft and spoile he leads his life awaie.

The Deane is he that hathe the face and shape
of man,
With fraude, desceipt, and guile fraught full as he
may be,
And yet dothe hide and cloke the same as he best
can,
Undir pretense and shewe of plaine simplicitie.

And theis have winges to flie, eche one of these
said foure,
Because they flye abroad, and lie about affaires,
And they have eyes eche one, because that everye
houre,
They looke about for gaine, and all that may be
theires. . . .

Full filthelic the priest dothe service celebrate
Withe voice, and breathes on God his surfet's
belching cheere. . . .

He is more bolde to synne because he heares in Lent
The people's grievous crimes, and all their synnes
at large,
And all the faultes for whiche they ought for to be
shent,
And thus he countes his owne to be of smallest
charge.

And when the Abbat doth among his bretheren suppe,
Then tossed are the cuppes with quaffinge to and froe,
And then with bothe his handes the wine he holdeth
uppe,
And with a thunderinge voice these wordes he doth
outblowe:

⁴ 100 Years of Psychology.

⁵ See Adler's *Theory and Practice of Individual Psychology* (1932), *Understanding Human Nature* (1932) and various case-books; also Jung's *Psychological Types* (1933) and *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1933).

"O how muche glorious is the lordes lamp so bright,
The cuppe in strong man's handes, that makes men
drunke I mean.
O Baccus, god of wyne! our convent guyde aright,
With fruiet of Daviddes stocke to wash us thoroughlie
clean."

And after this the cuppe he takethe from the breade,
And cries alowde, "Ho, sires, can yow as well as I
Drinke this cuppe in his kind that I lift to my
heade?"

They answer, "Yea, we can," then go to by and by.

Then of a monke a right demoniake is made,
And every moncke dothe chatte and jangle with his
brother,
As poppingaye or pie, the which are taught this trade
By filling of their gorge, to speake one to an other.

Their order to transgresse, thei have but small
remorce,
By fraude and perjurie, by misreport and spite,
By grediness of mynde, withholdinge thinges by
force,
By filling of their pawches, and fleshlie fowl delight.

Worse than a moneke there is no feende nor sprite
in hell,
Nothing as covetouse nor more straunge to be
knownen,
For if you give him ought, he maie possesse it well,
But if you aske him ought, then nothings is his own.

Professor Robinson remarks that is not unnatural to suspect that such writers have been guilty of exaggeration in their denunciations, but that the cold daily record which the Archbishop of Rouen kept of his pastoral visits is open to no such objection. There is no reason to suppose that he did not tell the exact truth. After reference to "clerks" wandering about the church chatting to women during the service, etc., the record continues:—

As for the canons themselves, we found that Master Michael of Berciac was accused of incontinence, likewise Lord Benedict. Likewise Master William of Salmonville of incontinence, theft and homicide. . . . Likewise Master Alain of frequenting taverns, drunkenness and gaming.

At St. Firmit, where there were fifteen secular canons, a prior and six canons in residence, it was found that:—

Regnaud of Stampis is accused of incontinence, and has a boy with him whom he supports. Bartholomew, the vicar of the cantor, sometimes gets drunk and then does not get up to matins. . . . John, the vicar of the dean, is a tipsy fellow.

A nunnery, housing sixty-three nuns, was visited. A number of less serious defects are specified. But Robinson states that the nuns were accused of far more grievous sins (not specified) than keeping squirrels and having each a locked chest, and the reports of the condition of the parish priests are as bad as those which relate to the monks and canons.

Further reference to clerical wickedness, as well as of the superiority of the clergy and their claim to immunity from civil trial and penalty, even for murder, is contained in a remarkable book, *Philobiblon*. The author was Richard of Bury, Bishop of Durham, a book collector of the early fourteenth century and a member of a literary circle that Henry II of England gathered about him. After assuring his fellow clerics that they are raised far above the laity, are a chosen, holy, royal race, he says the givers of these things are books (the ability to read), and shows how the reading of a few words may save a priest from the gallows:—

At length, yielding your lives to wickedness, reaching the two paths of Pythagorus, ye choose the left branch, and, going backward, ye let go of God which ye had first assumed, becoming companions of thieves. And thus, ever going from bad to worse, blackened by theft and murder, and many impurities, your fame and conscience stained by sin, at the bidding of justice ye are confined in manacles and fetters, and are kept to be punished by a shameful death. Then your friend is put far away, nor is there any to mourn your lot. Peter swears that he knows not the man; the people cry to the judge: "Crucify him, Crucify him! If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend."

Now all refuge is gone, for ye must stand before the judgment seat, but only the gallows is in store for you. While the wretched man's heart is thus filled with woe, and only the sorrowing Muses bedeck their cheeks with tears, in his strait is heard on every side the wailing appeal to us, and to avoid the danger of impending death he shows the slight sign of the tensure which he received through us, begging that we may be called to his aid and bear witness to the privilege bestowed upon him.

Then straightway, touched with pity, we run to meet the prodigal son and snatch the fugitive slave from the gates of death. The book he has not forgotten is handed to him to read, and when, with lips stammering with fear he reads a few words, the power of the judge is loosed, the accuser is withdrawn, and death is put to flight. O marvellous virtue of an empiric verse! O saving antidote of dreadful ruin! O precious reading of the psalter, which for this alone deserves to be called the book of life! Let the laity undergo the judgment of the secular arm, that, either sewn up in sacks they may be carried out to Neptune, or planted in the earth they may fructify for Pluto, or may be offered amid the flames as a fattened holocaust to Vulcan, or at least may be hung up as a victim to Juno; while our foster child, at a single reading of the book of life, is handed over to the custody of the bishop, rigor is changed to favour, and the forum being transferred from the laity, death is routed by the clerk who is the nursling of books.

Whether the homicidal priest or priests referred to in the previous passage and by the Archbishop of Rouen would continue the priestly function is not stated. But this seems likely enough in view of a passage from Pilichdorfer's book, *Against the Waldenses*. These heretic Christians maintained that an evil-living priest could not administer the sacraments as efficiently as a righteous one. The answer to that contention is as follows:—

Since the sin of adultery does not take from a king the royal dignity, if otherwise he is a good prince who righteously executes justice in the earth, so neither can it take the sacerdotal dignity from the priest, if otherwise he performs the sacraments rightly and preaches the word of God. Who doubts that a licentious king is more noble than a chaste knight, although not more holy? . . . No one can doubt that Nathaniel was more holy than Judas Iscariot; nevertheless Judas was more noble on account of the apostleship of the Lord, to which Judas and not Nathaniel was called. . . .

For example, a red rose is equally red in the hands of an emperor or of a dirty old woman; likewise a carbuncle in the hand of a king or of a peasant, and my servant cleans the stable just as well with a rusty iron hoe as with a golden one adorned with gems. No one doubts that in the time of Elijah there were many swans in the world, but the Lord did not feed the prophet by swans, but a black crow. It might have been pleasanter for him to have a swan, but he was just as well fed by a crow. And though it may be pleasanter to drink nectar from a golden goblet than from an earthen vessel, the draught intoxicates just the same, wherever it comes from.

J. REEVES

(To be continued)

Alternatives

WORDS provide our reasoning with several facilities which are absent in wordless thinking. But they possess many disadvantages which render verbal argument liable to serious errors. One of these is that, inherently, words have no meanings at all and the meanings given to them in actual use are seldom precise.

Precision in meaning can only be given by correct definition, and correct definition is only attainable when all possible definitions have been put to the test of reality. In actual speech it is, of course, impossible to define each word before using it. But this does not prevent us from acquiring unambiguous meanings for the words we use before we use them. The acquisition of such meanings is a great preventive of the danger of arriving at false conclusions in our attempts to solve all manner of problems.

An example of a false conclusion, which has been arrived at by the failure to provide certain words with correct meanings, is given in the following sentence:—"Since murder is wrong, then war must be wrong, because war is wholesale murder."

The argument here turns upon the meanings of the words *murder* and *war*. The one is equated to the other in meaning, and so because the first is wrong, the second must also be wrong. But there is no meaning which is common to both words, which is also correct for both words. The only common meaning is "killing a human being." But "killing a human being" is not always murder—as in the case of pure accident. Murder, more correctly defined, is "killing a human being in a manner contrary to the laws of a given country." But that mean-
won't fit war. For war is "killing human beings in accordance with international law." So whatever conclusions we may arrive at concerning war, we cannot arrive at them correctly by comparing it with something else which, by correct definition, it is not.

The necessity for acquiring unequivocal meanings for the words we use is something which the majority of us are slow to appreciate. Even those of us who value precision in meaning are sometimes apt to be tripped up in our reasoning by words whose meanings we have not properly put to the test of reality. Our Editor is one who seldom makes this mistake. But just because he has done so (and for one other reason), I take a few sentences of his in illustration of my point. The second reason for my choice is that he ends these sentences with a question which he does not answer, and which, since it was presumably addressed to me, I shall endeavour to answer as simply as possible.

"Alternatives," wrote Mr. Cohen, "are of two kinds. In the one case the alternative may be inevitable. In the other case it may be contingent upon circumstances. For example, 'Will you pay a blackmailer, or face discredit which is certain to arise if the money is not given?' But I may pay the blackmailer and still suffer discredit. In what way does that destroy the original alternative?"

(Note.—First: definitions of alternatives. Second: an example to illustrate them. Third: an addition to the illustration, amplifying the first alternative in the example. Last: a question asking how this addition affects the illustration.)

It will be granted, I imagine, that the word "alternatives" always implies a choice between two or more *different* things. Also that in so far as identical factors occur in these things, those factors do not constitute a part of the genuine alternatives. Thus, if a man were to compel you to choose between having your hand cut off, or just one finger, you would not regard the choice as one between genuine alternatives. (Nor would he, if he were sane!) And the reason, of course, would be that one so-called alternative included the other. In fact, no alternatives are presented at all, despite the verbal form of "this or that."

Again, if someone told me that I must take either a banana plus an apple, or a banana plus an orange, I would not regard the choice as one between genuine alternatives as a whole. Why? Because, so far as the banana is concerned, I have *no alternative* but to take it. The real

alternative is between the apple and the orange. And if the person who forced this choice upon me had been trained to speak logically, he would have said: "You must take a banana and one other fruit. I give you the alternatives of an apple or an orange for the other fruit."

The point should now be clear that, *if alternatives are to be genuine alternatives, they must be mutually exclusive*. And, *in so far as any common factor exists, that factor is not a part of the genuine alternatives and is irrelevant to the choice presented*.

To return to Mr. Cohen's sentences and to begin with an analysis of his definitions. Let us take "inevitable" first. If we say that we must inevitably choose *one* alternative, we would be perfectly correct. But this does not mean that either alternative is inevitable. For by the simple process of choosing any alternative we render all the others avoidable. And since, before choosing, we cannot say which one will be chosen, it is impossible to describe any of them as inevitable. The inevitability is in the *choice* of one alternative, not in the alternative itself.

Furthermore, since the act of choosing one alternative automatically destroys the existence of any alternatives, it is not correct to say that, by choosing, we have made one alternative inevitable. By choosing we have caused what *were* alternatives to vanish. So in no sense can the descriptive term "inevitable" be correctly used to define a class of alternatives.

As for the definition "contingent upon circumstances," I do not quite understand what Mr. Cohen means. *Choice* of one or other alternative may be contingent upon circumstances—in fact, must be. So must any particular sequence of events following my choice. But scarcely the alternatives themselves—unless we mean it in the sense that everything existing is contingent upon circumstances. But in this case it is not a description of one sort of alternative as distinct from another, or as distinct from anything.

The example given by Mr. Cohen consists of the so-called alternatives: "To pay; or not to pay and therefore to face certain discredit." With all due deference to Mr. Cohen's prophetic abilities, I deny that he, or anyone else, can prophesy anything with absolute certainty—not even the actions of a blackmailer. It has been known for a blackmailer not to carry out his threats. So I think it will be agreed that the alternatives should be stated thus: "To pay; or not to pay and therefore risk discredit."

Are these genuine alternatives? They would be if the first alternative implied "to be certain of avoiding discredit." For then each alternative would be exclusive of the other. But Mr. Cohen is chary of prophesying anything with certainty in this instance. Indeed, he goes out of his way to amplify this alternative by adding the words "may still suffer discredit." So that the alternatives in the end boil down to the following:—"To pay and risk discredit; or, not to pay and *risk* discredit."

The answer to Mr. Cohen's question, then, is:—If credit or discredit is the important issue at stake, then the addition of possible discredit to the first alternative does destroy it as a genuine alternative. For, in so far as credit or discredit is concerned, since there is no certainty as to the outcome whichever course is chosen, there is obviously no alternative. But if payment or non-payment is the chief issue, then the addition of possible discredit to the first alternative is as irrelevant to the choice which has to be made, as its presence is in the second alternative.

If we take the illustration as a whole, the genuine alternatives amount to just this:—"To pay; or not to pay."

C. S. FRASER.

Who hears music, feels his solitude
Peopled at once.—Robert Browning.

Every book is worth reading which sets the reader in a working mood.—Emerson.

The history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom.—Hegel.

Correspondence

SWEDENBORG AND METEMPSYCHOSIS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—Swedenborg lived on bread, milk, and vegetables because of his belief of metempsychosis. I think Mr. Chadwick will find this stated in one of the eight volumes of his *Arcana Caelestia*. But I did not make my statement on a mere recollection. When in doubt whether a statement be true or false, I refrain from making it. I found corroboration in the *Newcastle Chronicle Encyclopedic Dictionary*, Vol. 7, p. 166. . . . "It (metempsychosis) formed part of the system of Swedenborg (True Christian Religion 13)."

GEORGE WALLACE

OSCAR WILDE

SIR,—As my veracity, or perhaps my memory, is in question, will you permit me to reply to Lord Alfred Douglas's letter.

Our slight acquaintance dates, as he says, only from about ten years ago; but I had known him by sight from his youthful days. Lord Alfred says in his letter to you: "It is impossible that he can have heard me utter the words which he attributes to me, nor as a matter of fact did I ever use such words." I will endeavour to recall to Lord Alfred an incident of long ago, when he and Wilde were luncheoning at the Café Royal. They were seated facing the bar and nearly in the centre of the restaurant. Lord Alfred was on Wilde's right side and I was at the next table, about three yards distant from him. It was there and then that I heard him ask the question, long remembered and recorded in my letter. If he and I could "revisit the glimpses of the moon" I would indicate the marble-topped table whereon their lunch was served and the long settee covered with red plush on which they, and I, were seated, if these accessories remain. That Queensberry did intend at one time to chastise Wilde I have every reason to believe. My friend, Frank Cobbet, told me this, and they certainly did lie in wait in Albemarle Street. Cobbet, who was a powerful heavyweight, could have overcome Wilde in a moment, for his condition was rather like that of Jos Sedley when that "big bean" first met Becky. Queensberry was a small man; but fit and active, as I, who had many a hard-fought set at tennis with him, know. I hope that this note will remind Lord Alfred, not unpleasantly of an incident of long ago. This may not be so, but the words of well-known people are often remembered by others, though forgotten by those who uttered them.

EDGAR SYERS

LEVY'S PHILOSOPHY

SIR,—In his article entitled "Levy's Philosophy," Mr. G. H. Taylor has wrongly stated—perhaps as a deduction from Levy's use of the word "dialectical," on page 113 [L.B.C. edition]—that the book is an exposition of dialectical materialism. Levy does not claim it as such [*Labour Monthly*].—he is mainly concerned with using his theory of isolates to enunciate certain general laws change. His philosophy, after comparison with that of Engels, can be more easily seen for what it is, viz., mechanistic (i.e. non-dialectical) materialism.

"Motion," wrote Engels, "is the mode of existence of matter. . . . Matter without motion is just as unthinkable as motion without matter," and, "The world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready-made things, but as a complex of processes, in which the things apparently stable . . . go through an uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away." Levy's general law of movement, summarized by Mr. Taylor, is, presumably his substitute for the Marxist "unity and interpenetration of opposites" [Lenin wrote: "two fundamental . . . conceptions of evolution are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition; and development as a unity of opposites (the division of the one into mutually

exclusive opposites and their reciprocal correlation). The first conception is dead, poor, and dry; the second is vital."] and the "transformation of quantity into quality."

I am somewhat disappointed to find that Mr. Taylor did not comment on Levy's study of social development. While Levy realizes that "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it." [Quotation from Marx's *Thesis on Feurbach*] his ideas on "causal agencies" are mechanist.

There is, however, one criticism of Mr. Taylor's which is incidentally a criticism of dialectics. In discussing the "ultimate" constituents of matter he writes "We have disposed of the Aquinate Prime Mover without embarking on the equally unintelligible recession to infinity." In this connexion, Lenin [*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*—to which the eraser is referred for a fuller discussion] wrote: "The 'essence' of things, or 'substance' is also relative; it expresses only the degree of profundity of man's knowledge of objects; and while yesterday the profundity of this knowledge did not go beyond the atom, and to-day does not go beyond the electron and ether, dialectical materialism insists on the temporary, relative, approximate character of all these milestones in the knowledge of nature gained by the progressing science of man." Shortage of space prevents my developing this thesis beyond noting that:—

1. Mr. Taylor, by implication, asserts the permanent existence of homogeneous particles of matter—certainly a big assumption.

2. The fact that there is a limit (not necessarily fixed for all time) to our knowledge of the structure of matter is analogous to the fact of the limited nature of our knowledge of evolution. Yet this latter does not imply creation.

SYDNEY GOLDSTEIN

CONFUCIUS SAY

SIR,—With reference to Mr. Elstob's article *Confucius Say*, a letter I have just received from a friend in Los Angeles tells me that the Chinese are having a "high time" circulating more subtle and less respectful witticisms preceded by "Mark Twain say . . ." Possibly, the bland Orientals have remembered that Confucius said something about reciprocity.

ERIC F. RUSSELL

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

LONDON

INDOOR

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1) : 11.0, Professor M. Polanyi—"Social Action by Plan or by Principle."

OUTDOOR

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place) : 6.30, Mr. J. W. Barker.

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.

COUNTRY

INDOOR

WATERFOOT (Left Book Centre, Liberal Club) : 7.30, Friday, Mr. J. Clayton.

OUTDOOR

BRADFORD BRANCH N.S.S. : Sunday, Miss B. Harrison—"Has Trades Unionism a Future?"

BURNLEY MARKET : 7.0, Sunday, Mr. J. Clayton.

DARLINGTON (Market Steps) : 6.30, Sunday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

HAPTON : 7.30, Wednesday, Mr. J. Clayton.

NEWCASTLE (Bigg Market) : 7.0, Friday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

SOUTHEND BRANCH N.S.S. (Marine Parade) : Sunday afternoon, Mr. G. Taylor will speak

WORSTHORNE : 7.30, Monday, Mr. J. Clayton.

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.

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.

A

Grammar of Freethought.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Cloth Bound 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 Farringdon Street, E.C.4.

SPECIAL OFFER!

Twelve 6d. books sent C.O.D. for 4s. 6d.

LITTLE BLUE BOOKS

By JOSEPH McCABE

1. The Revolt Against Religion—2. The Origin of Religion—3. The World's Great Religions—4. The Myth of Immortality—5. Did Jesus Ever Live?—6. The Horrors of the Inquisition—7. The Moorish Civilization in Spain—8. Christianity and Slavery—9. Religion and the French Revolution—10. The Triumph of Materialism—11. The Fraud of Spiritualism—12. My Twelve Years in a Monastery

SEND NO MONEY

Just write to us, giving your name AND address in BLOCK LETTERS—a postcard will do—ask to have the 12 books by Joseph McCabe sent to you by post and add "I will pay the postman 4s. 6d. on delivery of the parcel"

THE LITTLE BLUE BOOKS,

Mail Order Booksellers,

100 Frant Road, Thornton Heath, Surrey

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

i. BIBLE CONTRADICTIONS. ii. BIBLE ABSURDITIES. iii. BIBLE ATROCITIES iv. UNFULFILLED PROPHECIES AND BROKEN PROMISES. v. BIBLE IMMORALITIES, INDECENCIES AND OBSCENITIES

By G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball

Millions of people have read "The Bible" but only a few read it with an unprejudiced mind. Believers read it in the light of inculcated obsessions and with their minds closed to a real understanding. "The Handbook" sets forth the Bible message as it really is, it is made to tell its own story. Every text is cited accurately and exact reference is given. It is a book that is useful, even indispensable to Freethinkers and it is educational to Christians.

Cloth 2s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

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 BEER. 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.

The Christian Sunday : Its History and Its Fruits

By A. D. McLAREN

Price 2d.

Postage ½d.

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING

FIFTH SERIES

CHAPMAN COHEN

About Books. The Damned Truth. Maeterlinck on Immortality. On Snobs and Snobbery. Jesus and the B.B.C. Man's Greatest Enemy. Dean Inge Among the Atheists. Politics and Religion. Christianity on Trial. Woman and Christianity. Why? Man and His Environment. The Nemesis of Christianity. Good God! God and the Weather. Women in the Pulpit. All Sorts of Ideas. According to Plan. A Question of Honour. Are We Christian? A Study in Fallacy. Medical Science and the Church.

1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Series 2s. 6d. each

Price 2s. 6d. Postage 3d.

BRAIN and MIND

— BY —

Dr. ARTHUR LYNCH.

This is an introduction to a scientific psychology along lines on which Dr. Lynch is entitled to speak as an authority. It is a pamphlet which all should read.

Price - 6d. By post - 7d.

PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS IN MODERN THOUGHT

CHAPMAN COHEN

Cloth, gilt, 2s. 6d. Postage 2d. Stiff paper
1s. 6d. Postage 2d.

THE PIONEER PRESS,
61 FARRINGTON ST., LONDON,
E.C.4

HUMANITY AND WAR

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Forty pages, with cover. **THREEPENCE**, postage 1d. extra. This is a Freethinker's view of the whole subject of war, fearlessly and simply expressed. In order to assist in its circulation eight copies will be sent for Two Shillings postage paid. Terms for larger quantities on application.

Send at once for a Supply

Issued for the Secular Society, Limited, by
the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon St., E.C.4
LONDON

220 pages of Wit and Wisdom

BIBLE ROMANCES

By G. W. Foote

The *Bible Romances* is an illustration of G. W. Foote at his best. It is profound without being dull, witty without being shallow, and is as indispensable to the Freethinker as is the *Bible Handbook*.

Price 2/6 Postage 3d.

Well printed and well bound.

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

LETTERS TO THE LORD

Chapman Cohen

This work shows Mr. Cohen at his best and his wittiest.

Price 1s. By post 1s. 2d. Cloth, by post 2s. 2d.

Issued for the Secular Society, Limited by
the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon St., E.C.4
LONDON