

# The FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper

VOL. XLIII.—No. 24

SUNDAY, JUNE 17, 1923

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
More About the Blasphemy Laws.—The Editor -	369
Olive Schreiner's Posthumous Works.—J. T. Lloyd -	370
Emerson's Golden Message.—Mimnermus -	371
Luther in the Light of To-day.—W. Mann -	372
"Tertium Organum"; An Examination.—William Repton -	374
Christopher Marlowe.—J. E. Truby -	378
Five Thousand Years Ago and More.—E. Anderson -	379
Blasphemy Laws Amendment Bill -	380
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

## Views and Opinions.

(Continued from page 354.)

### More About the Blasphemy Laws.

The majority of Christians when dealing with such a thing as the Blasphemy Laws appear to lack either the courage that leads to honesty or the honesty that develops courage. There is thus, as we have seen in the House of Lords' discussion, the usual attempt to confuse the issue by talk of decency and indecency—as though the Blasphemy Laws ever had the slightest connection with decency! It is perhaps as well to recall the names of such as Paine, Carlile, Taylor, Hetherington, Holyoake, Matilda Roafe, Hone, Holyoake, Bradlaugh, Mrs. Besant, and Foote—to name only the better known ones—to appreciate the value of the assertion that the Blasphemy Laws are maintained in the interests of decency. All of these were either indicted or imprisoned for blasphemy, and one wonders what equal number of contemporary Christians can be said to have done more and suffered more for the cause of human progress than these? There is not one of them who, if he or she had kept their opinions on religion to themselves or satisfied themselves with laughing at religion in private, might not have risen to eminent positions, enjoyed good incomes, and some might even have become judges and sentenced men in public for holding opinions which they endorsed in private. For laws against opinions cannot alter opinion; they can only make for hypocrisy and cowardice—and the support of the Christian Church.

\* \* \*

### An Archbishop's Apologia.

To return to the discussion. An early speaker in the debate was the Archbishop of Canterbury. He admitted that if there were no Blasphemy Laws on the statute book, or no offence of blasphemy at common law, he would not come there asking for such laws to be passed. Most ingenuous! A man who really did not want these laws to guard his religion would have supported Earl Russell in his demand for their abolition. What the Archbishop is saying is that these laws are quite out of touch with the life and the best thought of to-day, so much so that neither House of Parliament would enact them to-day. But, he says, as they are there we must take advantage of what a bigoted and ignorant generation has bequeathed us,

and it would be a mistake to get rid of them. He adds the curious argument that to alter the law would be to give the impression that Christians needed this protection. I rather fancy it would give the impression that some Christians believe that their religion needs no other protection than is given other forms of opinion. The House was also informed that the Blasphemy Laws were not pressing upon a number of people to-day who were prevented by them from saying what they wished to say. Well, it is true that leading Freethinkers, and men in position, may say what they wish to say about religion with a degree of safety. But that is because of the cowardice of Christians who dare not attack at the moment well-known men, and are obliged to confine their attentions to humbler individuals who conduct a popular propaganda. And his Grace might have remembered that this law recently enabled a judge to pass the vindictive sentence of nine months' hard labour on a dying man for using illustrations concerning Jesus and Christianity such as are daily used in our newspapers concerning prominent politicians. These laws while they exist are a menace. There is no telling when they may be revived and against whom they may be used. Quite recently we have had an illustration of the Government denying the most elementary of rights to British subjects on the strength of certain emergency acts, which never need have been passed at all, and which many thought had passed away with the occasion that gave them birth. And it is necessary to inform this Christian legislator that the question of justice does not at all depend upon the number or the position of those affected.

\* \* \*

### What the Blasphemy Laws do.

The Archbishop said that it would make no difference to organized Christianity whether this law was passed or not. That is very ingenious, but it does not quite square with his anxiety to prevent its being even discussed by a committee. And it is not true. The Archbishop recently signed a memorial protesting against what he was pleased to call the persecution of Christians in Russia. Now with the exception of the debatable question of preventing religious instruction to any child in any school whatsoever, the substantial offence of the Russian Government appears to have been that in a country where the Christian Church had hitherto been a tyrannical monopoly, brutally suppressing all forms of antagonistic opinion, the government has disestablished religion, has swept it out of the schools—precisely as France has done—and has given to anti-religious opinion the same rights of propaganda as religion has. If Christians have a procession in favour of religion, it gives to all others the right to have a procession against it. The Archbishop calls this persecution, and underlying that is the recognition that unless in the modern State Christianity is given a position of privilege it is likely to drop out of the minds of the people even more rapidly than it does at present. That is one thing which the Blasphemy Laws do. It gives Christianity a position of privilege and of unusual importance in the eyes of

the unthinking. It makes the upholding of Christianity part of the function of the State; it makes the law say that however men may be permitted to talk in politics, or in art, or in other directions, religion is too sacred, too important a subject to be placed on the same level. What the Archbishop, Lord Salisbury, Lord Onslow, and Lord Phillimore—all Christians—do not realize is that the demand for the abolition of the Blasphemy Laws is the demand that *all* opinion—no matter what the subject—shall be placed on exactly the same level. The Archbishop dare not admit that. If he did it would mean the withdrawal of the support of the State in the matter of Sunday observance, of religion in the schools, of the endowment of the Churches by remission of taxation. In short it would make Christianity depend for its existence upon the power of its appeal to the modern mind—and his Grace of Canterbury is not quite such a fool as not to see what that means.

\* \* \*

#### Christianity on Trial.

Several friends have written me saying they are disappointed at the result. I am not. From one point of view it helps our attack on Christianity. It stands now on record that out of an assembly of seventy-eight peers only eight could be found in favour of placing all opinions upon an equality before the law. That is something we should not forget, and should not let others forget. Sixty-eight peers voted solidly in favour of the perpetuation of this relic of mediæval intolerance. It was Christianity that was on trial in the House of Lords, not Freethought, and it came badly out of the case. Out of seventy-eight peers sixty-eight registered their solemn conviction that their religion was not safe unless it had a policeman ready to close the mouth of the "blasphemer." That is exactly what—according to the New Testament—the old Jewish priests said about that other blasphemer and "dangerous criminal," Jesus Christ. In the next place it comes as a reminder that Freethinkers will never get from Christians a larger measure of justice than they can demand. There are plenty who think that if we were more jesuitical in our methods, if we called the "Freethinker" by some name that might mean something or nothing, or if we would not call ourselves by the horrible name of Atheist, but adopted some other title—which again might mean something or nothing—we might soon bring Christians round to our point of view. Christians are not such fools as that kind of advice implies. A rose by any other name smells as sweet, and it is not the name that the Christian hates, but the thing. He hates what the "Freethinker" stands for, hates it and fears it, and he would not hate or fear it the less under any other title. We do not gain strength by jesuitry or compromise. We only inspire contempt in our hereditary enemies.

\* \* \*

#### Crush the Infamous.

Finally, it is the past strength of Christian theology in the life of the European nations that gives to the Christian Churches the power they possess. It has placed the Cross in the schools, it has placed it in our public offices, it has settled it on the backs of the people, and those who wish to see these things altered have only one policy that promises success. This is to go on making Freethinkers. Not merely to go on making what is usually called liberal-minded men. There is plenty of liberal thought in the world, but a mere broadening of thought is not in itself good. It may be so broad as to be worthless. It is definiteness of thought that is required to-day, thought that is clear enough to know itself, and strong enough to express itself without apology or procrastination. It

is the Church that must be broken, the influence of theology that must be weakened. We must go on making Freethinkers. That is the only sure way of getting justice done to all, of sweeping religion out of the schools, of abolishing the Blasphemy Laws, of making it possible for men to be honest in the expression of their opinions, and getting them to realize that their opinions are the most valuable of their possessions. No, I am not at all disheartened at the vote in the House of Lords. I am not even disappointed. I feel more than ever justified in my work. I shall go on making Freethinkers, and I trust to have the help of every reader of this paper in the task.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

## Olive Schreiner's Posthumous Works.

(Concluded from page 356.)

THE avowed object of *Thoughts on South Africa* is to show the Boer as he is and so defend him against the attacks often made upon him through ignorance and prejudice. Well does the present writer remember the depth of ignorance and the violence of prejudice that existed forty years ago when he first visited South Africa. Olive Schreiner, born and bred in the country, confesses in her Introduction to this great work that as a child she shared the hatred of the Boer to the full. When she was only four years old a Boer family outspanned their ox-wagon on the veld near her father's mission house. In that family there was a little girl about her own age, wearing, like herself, a great white cotton capje. This Boer girl came towards Olive, "holding out her hand. In it was a fistful of dark-brown sugar, a treat to up-country children in the wilds where sweet meats were rare. She held it out to me without saying a word. I was too polite to refuse to take it, but as soon as I had gone a few steps, I opened my hand behind me and let it drop. To have eaten sugar that had been in the hand of a Boer child would have been absolutely impossible to me." On another occasion the minister of a Dutch Reformed Church, but a Scotsman by descent, came to spend a night at their mission. Accommodation at an up-country mission being necessarily very limited, Olive had to give up her bed to him. Olive says:—

On the night following, when bedtime came, I enquired if fresh sheets had been put on my bed; on being told they had not, and that the clergyman had only slept in them one night and I might as well use them, I absolutely refused to get in. Nothing, I said, would ever induce me to sleep between sheets a Dutchman had slept between (p. 16).

Such unreasonable prejudice against the Boer, if not directly of religious origin, was certainly tolerated if not formally encouraged by the religion of the day. Olive Schreiner admits that she "started in life with as much insular prejudice and racial pride as it is given to any citizen who has never left the little Northern Island to possess." Summing up on this point she says she "cannot remember a time when she was not profoundly convinced of the superiority of the English, their government and their manners, over all other people." Now, whatever part religion took in the generation of this racial pride and prejudice it is certain that it had nothing whatever to do with its discouragement and removal. A time came when Olive Schreiner was thrown into close personal contact with the South African Boers. She lived among them as a teacher. "Sometimes for eighteen months I did not see an English face and was brought into the closest mental contact with them which is possible—the

mental contact between teacher and taught." Then the following inevitably occurred:—

Watching them in all the vicissitudes of life, from birth to marriage and death, I learnt to love the Boer, but more I learnt to admire him. I learnt that in the African Boer we have one of the most intellectually virile and dominant races the world has seen; a people who beneath a calm and almost stolid surface hide the intensest passions and the most indomitable resolutions. Among the peoples of Europe I have been thrown into contact with, the Swiss and the Tyrolese of remote alpine villages most resemble the African Boer; but there is a certain quiet and high-spirited indomitableness and an unlimited power of self-control which is characteristic of the average Boer man and above all the average Boer woman, which I have not met with in an equal degree in any other races, though individuals in all races may be found possessing it, and certain Boers, of course, have it not (p. 19).

As a result of cherishing that high estimate of the Boer character, Olive Schreiner did her utmost to prevent the last Boer War by writing a series of papers, in which among other things, she stated, "that if England made war on the Republics, she would have to send out at least one hundred and fifty thousand soldiers to attack these small States, and that even then there was a possibility that the red African mier-kat might ultimately creep back into its hole in the red African earth, torn and bleeding, but alive." Contrary to her prophecy, "military authorities, keen financiers and politicians held that at most twenty thousand soldiers and a few months would see the Republics crushed." How absolutely right Olive Schreiner's estimate proved to be, all historians of that lamentable war are fully aware. It lasted not a few months, but a couple of years, and the British losses were enormous. To the charge that Olive Schreiner cherished an excessive love of the Boer race and was blind to its faults, she replies thus:—

The Boer has to the full the defects of his qualities; that scintillating intellectual brilliance and versatility so common and so charming in the Frenchman and the Irishman, the Boer, even when highly cultured, seldom has; he is deep and strong rather than broad and brilliant; indomitable when he does act, it takes much to rouse him into action; he is slow and often heavy. And the Boer race has its Judases, as all other races have; nor do I know of a more sorrowful sight than the descendant of the old Boer, speaking English often with so foreign an accent as to be laughable, yet playing the part of the extreme Anglo-Saxon; losing thereby the charms of the Boer without attaining to the magnificent virtues which are characteristic of the best Englishman. But these persons are fortunately rare; and behind them lies the great, solid, self-respecting mass of the Dutch South African people (p. 20).

The problem which continually interested Olive Schreiner's mind was the formation and development of the South African nation, in the possibility of which she fervently believed. The British residents in South Africa are, on the average, not nearly so numerous nor so influential in South Africa as they are in Australia and New Zealand. Consequently our author reasons thus:—

Were to-morrow the entire population of purely or mainly British descent to leave Australia and New Zealand, those lands would at once be almost wholly depopulated. A few Maoris and quickly dwindling Australian aborigines, with a handful of Frenchmen, Germans, Swedes or Italians, and a sprinkling of Chinamen and other Asiatics would be all that would be left. Practically the lands would have been transformed into almost primeval solitudes.....In South Africa, on the other hand, a condition entirely the reverse would be maintained.....In eighty years' time there will be a great and independent nation,

but it will be unique. It will be wholly unlike any other in the world. It will not be French nor Dutch, though a large proportion of the blood in the veins of the white inhabitants will descend from these races; it will not be Russian nor Jewish, though Russian Jews are plentiful here; it will not be German, though German merchants, missionaries, doctors, and agriculturalists are to be found in every corner of the country; it will not be Scotch nor Irish, and assuredly it will not be English, though the blood of all these nationalities, Celtic and Teutonic, will be blended in the veins of the white South Africa of the future—it will be simply *South African* (pp. 368-9).

In the author's opinion there will be "in South Africa for a long time to come a *Dark Race*, coming into only occasional contact with the *White Race*. And yet these great blended varieties, dark and white, will form the South African nation of the future, their true streams of life, keeping, it may be, racially distinct for ages, but always interacting side by side and forming our South African nation."

*Thoughts on South Africa* is a book full of original, witty, and suggestive passages. To three chapters, entitled "The Boer and his Republics," "The Psychology of the Boer," and "The Englishman," we would draw special attention. Perhaps "The Englishman" is one of the most brilliant essays ever written on the subject.

It is a most significant fact that in none of Olive Schreiner's books is religion recommended as an essential factor in the growth and development of a man or a nation. Nowhere has she made a definite attack on religion, but she has often described religion in such terms as cannot be regarded as a testimonial to its virtues.

J. T. LLOYD.

## Emerson's Golden Message.

Religions do not die; they change.

—Charles Bradlaugh.

Emerson is the sweetest memory of his land and century.

—G. W. Foote.

The books which help you most are those which make you think the most.

—Theodore Parker.

No less a critic than Matthew Arnold has told us that Emerson's works are the most valuable prose contribution to English literature of the nineteenth century. If this be true, Emerson's well of inspiration will run for many a long day. Of all his contemporaries he is now the strongest, the most influential, the most read. The modern voices in philosophy, like Nietzsche, simply repeat in varied language the golden message of Emerson, and send us all back with renewed interest to the cultured American's writings.

It is natural to feel curious concerning the evolution of a great literary force. To watch Shakespeare's genius as he grows from *Venus and Adonis* to the masterpieces of the world's literature, or to trace Shelley as he progresses from *Queen Mab* to *Prometheus Unbound*, form the best introduction to a re-reading of the works of these authors. Nor is such curiosity wasteful in the case of Emerson.

This great Freethinker first saw the light in a parsonage, and he had clericalism in his blood. His father and his grandfather were clergymen. At first he followed in the footsteps of his ancestors, and was ordained as a Unitarian minister. Even in those early days he showed his true bent, and his preaching was ethical rather than devotional. Emerson did not care for the threshing of old straw. There is a suspicion of chafing at Hebrew old clothes, and the bent towards Secularism. The prime duty, he thought, was honesty, and he revolted early at the clerical caste associated with the ministerial position.

Then came open rebellion. There was a question of the rite of the Communion, and his mind was brought to a pause. His elder brother, William, was even more rationalistic, and declined altogether to enter the ministry. Emerson put his ethics into practice, and opened his church to anti-slavery agitators. He also made the acquaintance of Thomas Carlyle, whom he visited at his Scottish home. This was the germ of a great friendship, notable in the history of literature.

Emerson's first book was, characteristically, a volume on "Nature," and it revealed the fact that he found the Unitarian fetters none the less real for being simple and few. From the publication of his first book Emerson became a power, and his subsequent career is familiar to all who care for the best things in literature. Lowell, a shrewd observer, says:—

Those who heard him while their natures were yet plastic, and their mental nerves trembled under the slightest breath of divine air, will never cease to say:—

Was never eye did see that face,  
Was never ear did hear that tongue,  
Was never mind did mind his grace  
That ever thought the travail long,  
But eyes and ears, and every thought  
Were with his sweet perfections caught.

Since that eulogy was written, time has only more assured Emerson's position among the seminal writers. Those who have read his pages with attention know that his real and essential religion was the religion of humanity. He tells us plainly that the day will come when Churches built on supernaturalism will be entirely superseded and left behind by the conscience of the race:—

There will be a new Church founded on moral science, at first cold and naked, a babe in a manger again, the algebra and mathematics of ethical law, the Church of men to come; without shawms, or psaltery, or sackbut; but it will have heaven and earth for its beams and rafters; science for symbol and illustration; it will fast enough gather beauty, music, picture, poetry.

Is it not the trumpet of a prophecy? The fifty thousand priests of this country may well have long faces, for daily they are discarding their dogmas and barbarities, and heading their Churches towards the Emersonian ideal.

What distinguishes Emerson from so many philosophers is that he had a shrewd Yankee head on his shoulders. Long before Ruskin declared "There is no wealth but life," Emerson said: "The best political economy is care and culture of men." Years before attention was paid to ethics as a serious factor in religion, Emerson wrote: "I look for the new teacher that shall see the identity of the law of gravitation with purity of heart, and shall show that duty is one thing with science." This great American thinker foresaw vaster accomplishments and nobler victories than man has yet witnessed. "We think our civilization near its meridian," he exclaims, "but we are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star." It is difficult to give the quintessence of the Emersonian philosophy in a sentence. It is unquestionably individual. "Be yourself" is the keynote. "Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind." Emerson's counsel of perfection is like that which Shakespeare puts in the mouth of Polonius:—

To thine own self be true;  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not be false to any man.

Despite his transcendentalism, Emerson was a Free-thinker. Golden thoughts face us on every page he has written:—

"A world in the hand is worth two in the bush."  
"Who shall forbid a wise scepticism?" "So far as a man thinks, he is free." "Whoso would be a man

must be a Nonconformist." "Let us deal with men and women, and not with ghosts." "Knowledge is the knowing that we cannot know."

Certainly few writers stimulate and hearten like Emerson. His golden maxims are a perpetual antidote to the insidiousness of custom and tradition—form a pocket philosophy for the worst of times.

MIMNERMUS.

## Luther in the Light of To-day.

### VIII.

(Continued from page 341.)

An abounding dogmatism, resting on an absolute confidence in the infallibility, practically speaking, of his own judgment, pervades his [Luther's] writings, no indulgence is shown, no pause allowed to the hesitating.—Hallam, "Introduction to the Literature of Europe," p. 377.

The Reformation was a change of masters; a voluntary one no doubt, an exercise for the time of their personal judgment. But no one having gone over to the Confession of Augsburg, or that of Zurich, was deemed at liberty to modify those creeds at his pleasure. He might, of course, become an Anabaptist or an Arian, but he was not less an heretic in doing so, than if he had continued in the Church of Rome.—*Ibid.*, p. 382.

LUTHER is held up for our admiration as the great apostle of freedom and toleration *par excellence*, the great hero who fought for, and won, the religious liberty we enjoy to-day. This evangelical claim is utterly and demonstrably false. It is true that at the commencement, when the secular powers supported the authority of the Church of Rome, the leaders of the Reformation denounced persecution and used language resembling that of the friends of toleration:—

"Princes," says Luther, "are not to be obeyed when they command submission to superstitious errors, but their aid is not to be invoked in support of the Word of God." Heretics must be converted by the Scriptures, and not by fire, otherwise the hangman would be the greatest doctor. At the time when this was written Luther was expecting the bull of excommunication and the ban of the empire, and for several years it appeared doubtful whether he would escape the treatment he condemned.<sup>1</sup>

This was the language of Luther while under the fear of being condemned for heresy, but it did not represent his real belief. When the danger had passed away, Luther displayed, towards those who differed from him, the very same intolerance which he had condemned in the Church of Rome when displayed towards himself.

It is also claimed that Luther took the Bible out of the hands of the Church, which claimed to be the sole interpreter of it, and placed it in the hands of the people to read and interpret for themselves. He did, with one important qualification, which rendered the gift quite valueless if it could have been rigidly enforced.

It will be remembered that Luther, in all his disputations with the authorities of the Catholic Church, with Cajetan, Miltizt, and lastly at the Diet of Worms, had taken his stand upon Scripture. He declared that if the Church could prove him in error out of the Bible he would submit to her authority, but not without.

The Church, through its representatives, declined to argue the points raised by Luther. They declared that the Church, by the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, constituted the only authority qualified to determine the meaning of the Scriptures, and demanded his submission upon all those points where he

<sup>1</sup> Lord Acton, *Essays on Freedom*, p. 154.

diverged from the rule of faith recognized by the Church. Luther declined, and this refusal is described by Protestant writers as Luther's great vindication of "the right of private judgment." But what Luther really vindicated was the right of private judgment for himself. He had not the slightest idea of bestowing the same right upon others.

Luther having, with the support of the secular princes, asserted his right to interpret the Bible in a manner different to the Church, other men openly availed themselves of the same privilege, and, greatly to Luther's surprise and indignation, they did not always agree with the interpretation which he had arrived at. Some of his own friends and colleagues were among them. Schwenckfeld, a Silesian of noble birth, who had been converted by Luther's teaching, later on, differed from Luther as to the presence of Christ in the Sacrament; so did Carlstadt, Zwingli, Bucer, Bullinger, and many others. Like Luther, they all took their stand upon the Bible, and claimed the right of private judgment. Luther was furious. When, on October 11, 1531, Zwingli, the leader of the Swiss Protestants, was killed at the battle of Cappel while leading the Protestant army of Zurich against the five Catholic Cantons, a false rumour got abroad that Carlstadt and Pellicanus had also been slain, upon which Luther observed: "Oh, what a triumph is this, that they have perished! God indeed knows His business well." Later he declared, "Zwingli died like a brigand"<sup>2</sup> and that his death was a "just judgment":—

Zwingli, so he (Luther) will have it, was a complete unbeliever. In his newly published sermons of 1530 he had shown that Zwingli, like Carlstadt, by his attacks on the supper (the Eucharist) had denied all the articles of the faith. "If a man," says Luther, "falls away from one article of faith, however insignificant it may appear to reason, he has fallen away from all and does not hold any of them aright. For instance, it is certain that our fanatics who now deny the Sacrament, also deny Christ's divinity and all the other articles of faith, however much they protest to the contrary, and the reason of this is that when even one link of the chain is broken the whole chain is in pieces."<sup>3</sup>

But this was the very argument of the older Church itself. The Church of Rome presented her immutable doctrines, and unchangeable dogmas to the world, and declared: "This is my infallible teaching. This you must accept without reservations, in its entirety. If you reject one smallest part of this 'Rule of Faith,' you reject the whole and are an heretic." Luther, in fact, merely substituted his own dogmatism for the dogmatism of the Romish Church. He argues that

The sectarian or fanatic can never be certain at all; not one of his gainsayers is sure of his cause; not one has "felt the struggle and been at grips with the Devil" like himself. But I, "I am certain that my word is not mine but the word of Christ," and "every man who speaks the word of Christ is free to boast that his mouth is the mouth of Christ."<sup>4</sup>

But only on condition that it agreed with the teaching of Luther; if it did not, then it was inspired by the Devil.

To those who objected that the teaching handed down by the Church from the beginning was more likely to be right than this new, and hitherto unknown Evangel, Luther replied:—

We are sure of our faith, hence we may and must demand that everything yield to it; the Emperor and his party (the Catholics) on the other hand have no such assurance and can never reach it.<sup>5</sup>

Directly he emerged from the Wartburg, where he had been concealed after the Diet of Worms, he published a tract in which he describes himself as "Ecclesiastes by the grace of God," and declares:—

"I am convinced of this, that Christ Himself, who is the Master of my teaching, calls me thus and regards me as such"; his "Word, office and work" had come to him "from God," and his "judgment was God's own" no less than his doctrine.<sup>6</sup>

Later on Luther claims equal authority with the apostle Paul. He says:—

"Like Paul I declare with the utmost certainty every doctrine to be anathema which differs from my own.....Its founder is the messenger of Satan, and is anathema."

This position Luther maintained to the very end. In his last sermon, preached on February 14, 1546, he says:—

"If anyone teaches another gospel contrary to that which we have proclaimed to you, let him be anathema."<sup>7</sup>

Luther's great gift then, of the right of private judgment, amounted to this. Luther took the Bible out of the hands of the priest and put it in the hands of the layman, saying, "You are now at liberty to interpret the Word of God for yourselves, but if your interpretation does not agree with mine, then you are an heretic and a child of Satan, and as such, you must expect no toleration from me." As Adolf Harnack observes:—

It is an altogether one-sided view, one indeed, which wilfully disregards the facts, to hail in Luther the man of the New Age, the hero of enlightenment and the creator of the modern spirit.<sup>8</sup>

How Luther dealt with those who diverged from his teaching may be judged by his treatment of his friend and colleague Schwenckfeld when he dared to differ with Luther over the Sacrament. In conversation Luther spoke of him as Swinesfield, and, in his writings, still more commonly as Stinkfield. Driven from house and home, he lived a wandering life for thirty years, among strangers. As Ecke, the Protestant historian of Schwenckfeld observes:—

The well-known intolerance of the Reformation and of its preachers, could not endure in their body a man who had his own views on the Sacraments and refused for conscience sake to take part in the practices of their Church.....He wandered, like a hunted deer, without hearth or home, through the cities and forests of South Germany, pursued by Luther and the preachers.<sup>9</sup>

And yet on many occasions, even till his death, Schwenckfeld expressed the highest esteem for Luther, and gratitude for his services to theology; Luther had nothing to fear from him to excuse his persecution.

W. MANN.

(To be Continued.)

#### WOMEN AND CHRISTIANITY.

A Church Army van spent a week in a Cornish village. One of the missionaries told his audience that wherever the light of the gospel does not shine, women are slaves and beasts of burden. Next day was seen the two missionaries walking off to conduct a magic-lantern service in the next village. They carried nothing. Some hundred yards behind walked a much older man and his elderly wife. Both carried heavy parcels. These contained the lantern apparatus. The old couple are pious and may have been "beasts of burden" quite willingly, but it looked funny.

<sup>1</sup> Grisar, *Luther*, Vol., III, p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 384.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 349-350.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 341.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 139—Vol. V, p. 239.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 72.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 82.

## "Tertium Organum"; An Examination.

I have enough guesses of my own; if a man write a book, let him set down only what he knows. —Goethe.

To the blithe spirit of the mechanical reviewer who can reel off yards of print on books ranging in subject from cosmogony to the destruction of the house-fly, Mr. P. D. Ouspensky's book would offer no serious difficulty. In this book the author makes an attempt to read the riddle of the Sphinx, and if it is to be read, Freethinkers will not shrink from the answer. Their history is one of hard labour in the work of clearing away the *imposed* bogeys on mankind. Christianity, through its reliance and protection of faith, is at once out of court in a consideration of the riddle of life. Its retreat to faith is a waving of the white flag; its history is one of obstinacy towards reason, which is science in action, and its record of bloodshed and cruelty has added to the miseries of man. It has smitten with the sword those whom this weapon should have protected, and used the lily of innocence to conceal its villainy. It is and has been in close companionship with death, and its geographical position in the world of thought is that of fetid swamps and quagmires; it is a "no saying" to life, and a subtle friend of sadism. Mr. Ouspensky does not overlook these indictments for his conclusion is "all that arrests the motion of thought is false." Proof of this? Witness the burning of Bruno, when ruffian priests tried to arrest thought by burning a body. What is dogma of any kind but the expression "we have arrived"—or in other language, being instead of becoming?

The first nine chapters of this book are devoted to hard questions in mathematics. To the present writer they do not appear to be quite convincing. In the tenth chapter our author states:—

By abstract reasoning, we have already come to the conclusion that the fourth dimension of space *must* lie in time, *i.e.*, that time is the fourth dimension of space.

This conclusion to us appears to have a close relation to Christian faith, but we have every reason to believe that we shall not be burned for failing to accept it. We may say of his conclusion, with Spinoza, "But if we have a knowledge of God (or the fourth dimension) equal to that which we have of a triangle, all doubt is removed."

In the compilation of this book, for it abounds with quotations and extracts, the author takes the universe for his library. He draws from the Upanishads, Plato, Plotinus, Schopenhauer, Madame Blavatsky, Mabel Collins, Dr. Bucke, Edward Carpenter, Max Müller, Professor James, and many more. His book which is a translation from the Russian, was originally written with the intention of introducing the philosophy of C. H. Hinton to the country of Russia, and *Tertium Organum* is greatly indebted to Hinton the author of *A New Era of Thought* and *The Fourth Dimension*.

When we sit down to a banquet we do not ask for a pedigree of the lobster in the mayonnaise; our taste is the *arbiter elegantiarum*. When we hear Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, we do not inquire the country of origin of the resin used by the violinists; our emotions are paramount. And in the same manner, when we read a book such as this one, full of that damnable word "if," yet sparkling with brilliant common-sense, we are grateful for the flashes of wisdom, and these make us look forward to Mr. Ouspensky's next book which we may read without the intermediary of a translation. As it is possible to write for ever on the subject matter of *Tertium Organum*, we give a few extracts to enable the Freethinker to

agree or disagree—but in either case, it will demand thought.

Chapter I.—The most difficult thing is to know what we do know, and what we do not know.

Chapter VI.—If one speaks in terms of evolution, it is more correct to say that the cat and dog are animals of different evolutions, just as in all probability, not one, but several evolutions are simultaneously going forward in humanity.

Chapter IX.—The animal is not in a position to understand that the sun is the same yesterday and to-day, exactly in the same way that we probably cannot understand that the morning is the same and the spring is the same.

Chapter XIV.—Our misfortune consists in the fact that we regard the chemical composition of a thing as its most real attribute, while as a matter of fact its true attributes must be sought for in its functions.

Chapter XV.—On earth there are living two entirely different races of men, and the difficulty of making psychological distinctions depends, in a great measure, upon the fact that we endeavour to impose on *all men* common characteristics which they do not possess.

Chapter XVII.—Logically, we must either recognize life and rationality in everything, in all "dead nature," or deny them completely, even in ourselves.

Chapter XVIII.—Creation and destruction—or more correctly, the ability to create or the ability *only* to destroy—are the principal signs of the two types of men.

Violence in the name of freedom; violence in the name of love; the Gospel of Christianity with sword in hand; the stakes of the Inquisition for the glory of the God of Mercy; the oppression of thought and speech on the part of the ministers of *religion*—all these are incarnated absurdities of which humanity only is capable.

In any case, because of this new morality and those forces which it will engender, the contradictions of life will disappear, and those biped animals which constitute the majority of humanity will have no opportunity to pose as men any longer.

Chapter XXIII.—For the manifestation of cosmic consciousness it is necessary that the centre of gravity of *everything* shall lie for man in the inner world, in self-consciousness, and not in the outer world at all.

The above list is a sample from bulk. Our author has a leaning towards mysticism of which by the way there are some thirty definitions by different mystics. When these thinkers can tell us how to endure toothache, how to use their brilliant metaphysics by the bedside of a sick child, how to prevent war, or in other words justify their words by deeds, there are none to give them a more hearty welcome than Freethinkers who keep their feet on the ground, knowing that there is no necessary connection between an idea of space, or any other reality, and the nature of space, or any other reality.

The Renaissance was a looking without. From that period to this, mankind has set eyes on *things* with the result that we are almost smothered with them. From the outside world to introspection is the reaction, and the secret of life if ever found will be within us. In the search reason, love, and freedom may smooth the rough way for those with bodies like animals and faces like gods, but the "blood and tears" of Mabel Collins in *Light on the Path*, and the imperious nonsense of Madame Blavatsky are simply a changing of gods, and nothing is so laughable as the humility of the modern Cassandras. Mr. Ouspensky's appeal to these two authors leaves us unmoved—the vacuum carpet sweeper has done more for domestic servants than either of these two ladies, and we refuse to be a party to saving the world in classes. Mrs. Annie Besant will be remembered for her efforts on

behalf of Home Rule for India rather than for her wanderings in theosophy, and we for one, will honour the person—a chance for a mystic—who will by one stroke banish for ever poison-gas and superstition in religion and finance. The economic factor is not mentioned in *Tertium Organum*, which, in our opinion is an important omission. The book is a book of the New Age in which we live among the wreckage of old values of life, and for reason alone, we congratulate Mr. Ouspensky, convinced that it is assured of an old man's boycott from university professors, for the keynote is the same as that in Schopenhauer's introduction to *The Will in Nature*.

WILLIAM REPTON.

(*Tertium Organum, A Key to the Enigmas of the World*, P. D. Ouspensky. Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd.; 20s. net.; 68-74 Carter Lane, E.C.)

## Acid Drops.

A paragraph in the *Times* informs readers it is reported that an institute in Moscow is to be opened for "the study of Atheism." We do not know what it means, but if true it probably means an institute for the study of religions on non-theistic grounds, or an institute which bans theology. And either to a Christian is infamous. It is downright persecution. It is true that in Scotland a bequest was left by Lord Gifford to pay for lectures on religion which should be delivered by all sorts of people, including Atheists, but the Christians who had charge of its operations took care, with characteristic Christian honesty, that no Atheist should ever have a chance of airing his views. It prefers the safe banalities of Lord Balfour.

As we have said, we do not exactly know what is meant by the study of Atheism, but there is certainly one sense in which the impartial and enlightened study of life and knowledge of science must promote science. Science yields nothing in favour of the belief in God or a soul. The most that anyone can say in this connection is that it leaves these beliefs alone. And in tracing the social conditions amid which religious ideas are born, science effectually cuts the ground from all claims as to its validity. It is really this fear that lies at the root of the Christian objection to any course of education—elementary or advanced—being permitted without the inclusion of religion. They know that it involves the inevitable decay of their creed.

From the *Letters of Lord and Lady Wolseley* it seems quite clear that Lord Wolseley was a very religious man. And like most men of his type he was quite convinced that "the Lord" was always with him in his battles, and that in slaughtering others he was carrying out the will of God. That is quite in line with the spirit of the Bible and bears evidence of how much civilization owes to the "blessed" book. We are not sure what his attitude was towards Sunday observance, but there was one thing he did think Sunday good for, and that was a fight. "Sunday," he said, "is the day for a real battle." Probably he felt that "the Lord" would take a greater interest in his followers if they were fighting on the "Day of Rest."

An amusing incident comes from a town near Naples. It is the annual custom to place the statue of a saint in the centre of the cathedral. This year the statue was placed in a side chapel, and this was considered disrespectful by the faithful. Some fanatics tried to place the doll in its usual place, the clergy interfered, and a riot took place, at which the bishop's palace was attacked. There's a nice little row over a doll.

The Salvation Army is displaying on the hoardings a large portrait of General Booth the Second with letter-press saying: "I am going about the world to make men

think—about God and his claims." We knew there was a catch somewhere.

The king has presented a magnificently bound Bible, inscribed by himself, to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst. What will they do with it? Use it as a rifle-target, or, reverently, stand a flower-pot on it.

The *Church Register* asks: "Why do so many people want to get divorced?" If we may be allowed to answer without being charged with blasphemy, we would humbly suggest it is because they are married.

We admire the pure patriotism of the gramophone company responsible for the record of speeches by the King and Queen. This record can be purchased by the public for the sum of five shillings and sixpence. The profits go to the children's hospitals or wards. It is just possible that the gramophone company could have subscribed direct—and lost the advertisement.

An elected churchwarden who fails to attend the Archdeacon's Visitation Court is not legally entitled to eject a person from church. We should imagine that this information is rather superfluous as, judging by the groans heard from the fraternity, means will have to be devised to inject a congregation into the place to sit six feet below contradiction. If this does not interest you reader, "Eat More Bananas," as per advertisement next to the above item of information taken from the *Daily Telegraph*, May 25.

Canon A. Lukyn Williams asked an audience at the Victoria Institute the other day when should we learn that falsehood injured the cause of religion. We suggest it will be when people cease to be religious. Hitherto it has in practice been taken as one of its most useful aids, for in religion truth is generally taken to mean anything that helps my religion, and falsehood anything that injures it. That may be the reason why preachers so often speak of Christian truth in order to mark it off from the ordinary kind of truth which has no sectarian label.

Harrogate is in the throes of a very serious dispute. It involves no less a question as to whether tea shall be provided in the valley gardens. Of course the Churches see grave danger to the morals of the town if people are provided with this dangerous beverage on Sunday, and as a religious precedent it may be pointed out that "Our Lord" did not drink tea. So far as the New Testament can guide us, he did not turn water into tea, but into wine.

If the Rev. L. S. Wainwright, of Stepney Borough Council, is capable of adding two and two together, we submit the following sum in common-sense arithmetic. The Parish of St. Pancras announces that five of its young citizens (average age fifteen years) will be shipped to the Colonies. Stepney Borough Council has decided on the motion of the reverend gentleman that information on birth control shall not be given at welfare centres. But is it really worth our while to ask these simple questions of gentlemen who specialize in figures of the Trinity, and touch nothing practical only to show their profound ignorance?

The Turkish Press states that the Young Men's Christian Association have established branches in different parts of Turkey without proper authority, and have been trying to make converts by very questionable methods. Christian charity usually covers a multitude of sins.

In discussing the domestic servant problem, the Rev. E. M. Vaughan, of Nottingham, declared that the text "Blessed is drudgery" wants preaching in and out of season." Whether or no, it seems to come with a bad

grace from a member of a profession which works one day weekly instead of six.

More blasphemy! The new Prime Minister will shortly be made an Elder Brother of the Trinity.

Many villages were devastated and hundreds of inhabitants killed by a violent earthquake at Tarbat-I-Haidari, Persia. "Our Father!"

A statue of "Saint" Joan of Arc has been dedicated in Winchester Cathedral. It loses nothing in irony by being erected near the chantry of Cardinal Beaufort, who was one of her judges at Rouen when she was condemned to be burnt as a witch.

Bishop Gore is travelling in Greece. Many other prominent ecclesiastics are holiday-making on the Continent. The way of the Cross seems very hard.

Mr. Lloyd George declares that he "does not know a better training for politics than Sunday-schools." A politician would consider "Blessed be ye poor" suitable training for intellectual infants.

In the course of an action at Westminster County Court, it was stated that a film, entitled "The Confession," was banned by the Coventry Watch Committee, said to be largely composed of Roman Catholics. The judge, Sir Alfred Tobin, said that the film was perfectly fit to be exhibited, and had been shown in a number of towns. Be it noted, this is what Roman Catholics do in a Protestant country, where they are in a minority.

Describing a sea-monster alleged to have been captured off the Florida coast, a flamboyant American journalist remarked that it could easily have swallowed Jonah. But not, we think, without severe indigestion.

If your memory, oh reader, is nine miles long, or if it isn't Mr. Lloyd George said in July, 1914: "The Insurance Act is doing the work of the Man of Nazareth." Budding politicians will please note. We trust Mr. Lloyd George will have something better than the Insurance Act to recommend him for a seat in heaven, but it *now* appears even a poor sort of compliment to the Man of Nazareth that he invited comparison with Panel doctors. But there—perhaps the English people like their politics to be religious.

Clare Sheridan, in the *Daily Herald*, makes the statement that "Europe is waiting for a new religion." The writer is in too much of a hurry; Europe has not yet recovered from the spectacle of Christian nations slaughtering each other, and Christianity is not dead yet. The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, who professes to believe in Christ who was born and died some two thousand years ago, cannot find a vestige of evidence in favour of the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws. J. W. Gott died last year.

Mr. Thomas Hardy was born in 1840. The choristers from Holy Trinity Church, Dorchester, wishing to pay their respects to this old warrior, sang several hymns and an anthem to him. He was deeply moved. We suggest, with the sure and certain hope that they will not take the advice, that the best way of showing their respect is to read his books. We are afraid, however, that Mr. Hardy's tragic conception of life would be small comfort to choristers—assuming that they could understand it.

If man had only *John Bull* announcements to exist on he would be in a very bad way. The Bishops say that man is fallen; *John Bull* placards plus Christianity will keep him in that state. One would like to see the genius in the flesh who is responsible for telling inoffensive

citizens how bad other people are—along with naps for Newmarket and other towns that sleep.

The Rev. F. H. Gillingham, of Lee, South London, has inaugurated a series of twice-nightly Sunday services at his church. Strange, is it not, that a religion, supposed to be supported by Omnipotence, should require the mundane methods of the music-halls?

An East London place of worship has the touching inscription, "This church is God's public-house," prominently displayed at the entrance. The clergyman ought to have added that spiritual intoxication was permitted.

Christians are taught that "God is love." A grim comment is furnished by the Registrar General, who states that during the past four weeks 474 people died of cancer in London. This means that seventeen people die of the disease every day, and in more than that number growth of the disease begins.

Emily Stephens was sentenced to six months' imprisonment at Hull for stealing carpets from three churches. She could have got a praying-carpet at less cost.

Stocks and a whipping-post, of sixteenth century origin, were included in a sale at Sotheby's auction rooms. They came from an Oxfordshire village. A gentle reminder of civilization in the "good old times" of the Age of Faith.

More Hindu-Moslem religious riots have taken place at Amritsar, fifty Hindus being wounded. The Moslems also tried to destroy a number of Hindu shops, two being totally destroyed by fire. The town was in a state of terror. God-intoxication appears to be as much a nuisance as that caused by cheap whiskey.

A fox-terrier at Barnsley took its stand in a church porch and prevented many of the congregation entering for service. And yet there are some who would deny intelligence to the dog!

The seventh South London church fire this year occurred at Holy Trinity Church, Tulse Hill. Since 1920, at various intervals, there have been fires at South London churches, ranging from Brixton to Putney.

The Rev. W. W. Fowler, Vicar of St. Peter's, Earley, Reading, fell dead in the vestry at his church. Had he been a lecturer about to deliver a Freethought address, the journalists would have made a sensation of the occurrence.

Negroes in Montreal have been frightened into a belief that the end of the world was at hand by a pall of smoke cast over the city by huge forest fires in the Laurentian Mountains. Yet the Christian religion is popularly supposed to be a civilizing influence.

The clergy seldom take part in favour of reforms. A Labour Member of Parliament, the Rev. H. Dunnico, surprised his colleagues by opposing a Bill before Parliament for sex equality in matters of divorce.

Father Degan declares that "Puritanism transformed Englishmen into icebergs." As most of them had to go to Hades, perhaps it was as well.

The Rev. J. Donne, Vicar of Llantarnum, Wales, declares that a brighter Sunday "opens the door to the Devil." It sounds uncommonly like the utterance of a South Sea Island medicine-man.



## The National Secular Society.

THE Funds of the National Secular Society are now legally controlled by Trust Deed, and those who wish to benefit the Society by gift or bequest may do so with complete confidence that any money so received will be properly administered and expended.

The following form of bequest is sufficient for anyone who desires to benefit the Society by will:—

I hereby give and bequeath (*Here insert particulars of legacy*), free of all death duties, to the Trustees of the National Secular Society for all or any of the purposes of the Trust Deed of the said Society, and I direct that a receipt signed by two of the trustees of the said Society shall be a good discharge to my executors for the said legacy.

Any information concerning the Trust Deed and its administration may be had on application.

### To Correspondents.

Those Subscribers who receive their copy of the "Freethinker" in a GREEN WRAPPER will please take it that the renewal of their subscription is due. They will also oblige, if they do not want us to continue sending the paper, by notifying us to that effect.

**E. LECHMERE.**—The ways of the bigot, like those of the Lord, pass understanding. We are obliged for your activity and watchfulness concerning the *Freethinker*. It is always well to let the enemy know that his actions are watched.

**W. RICHARDS.**—We are not aware that Sir James Young Simpson, the pioneer of chloroform as an anæsthetic, said that his greatest discovery was Jesus. The better plan is to enquire of your friend what authority he has for the statement. In any case we do not see that the matter is of very great importance.

**J. REYNOLDS.**—We do not at all dispute that many Christians may be seeking the truth about religion as earnestly as we are. But we are convinced that they are in the same position as a man looking for an escape in his gas-meter with a lighted match. It is a bad day for the Christianity of the truth-seeker when he finds it.

**C. O.**—You do not believe there is any reason why Christians should be afraid of dying. And as they give Freethinkers very little cause to regret their dying, there seems very little for either of us to worry about.

**H. ELMES.**—Another volume of Mr. Cohen's *Essays in Freethinking* may be published towards the end of the year.

**C. B. WARWICK.**—Thanks. Shall appear as soon as possible. Pleased to hear of your determination to help in the work. There is room and need for all.

**T. FISHER.**—It is well to have written Lord Onslow. It certainly makes such men aware that there are others beside themselves in existence. But they are not likely to be drawn into a discussion. It is quite evident from his speech that he is very ill-equipped for such a venture.

**A. W. COLEMAN.**—Received. Will appear as soon as possible.

**SEARCHLIGHT.**—Jottings to hand, and hope to publish next week. Thanks for enclosure, which is being held over till later. The suggestion of a leaflet such as described is distinctly good. Will bear it in mind.

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

*The Secular Society, Limited, office is at 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.*

*The National Secular Society's office is at 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.*

*When the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary Miss E. M. Vance, giving as long notice as possible.*

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

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

*All Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to "The Pioneer Press" and crossed "London, City and Midland Bank, Clerkenwell Branch."*

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

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

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

## Sugar Plums.

With regard to our "Special" in last issue, Mr. Cohen desires to take this method of acknowledging the letters received, and to say that for the present he purposes leaving the matter where it stands. We have had several well-intentioned jacketings for remaining silent for so long, but it is naturally not a topic on which we love to dwell. Still, we appreciate the kindly tone of the letters received. At a later date we may recur to the topic.

Freethinkers in North London may note that Mr. F. L. Coombes, of 8 Kentish Town Road, displays the *Freethinker* regularly, and will get for customers any of our publications that are ordered.

We have received a copy of the photograph taken of the Conference delegates at Leeds on Whit-Sunday last. It is a very good photograph, measuring 15 in. by 12 in. The photographers are the Washington Studios, 11 New Station Road, Leeds. The price of the group is 3s. 6d.

We are pleased to learn that Mr. Corrigan's Sunday morning meetings in Finsbury Park show continuous improvement. The audiences grow in number, attention and interest are sustained, and there is a growing sale of propagandist literature. Finsbury Park was always a very good station for Freethinking propaganda, and we trust that those Freethinkers who live in the locality will remember that the meetings are being held.

Mr. Whitehead spent a very successful week at Stockport. The meetings were large and attentive, and their success may be gauged by the fact that one Christian minister made an attempt to get them stopped by the police. Christianity—genuine Christianity—does not alter much with the passing of the years. Mr. Whitehead will be at Manchester for a week, after which he will proceed to Barnsley.

The *Freethinker* is presented weekly to the Chiswick Public Library by one of our lady readers, but for some time it has been missing from its usual place in the newspaper stands. On the lady making enquiries, she was informed that owing to the *Freethinker* being stolen on more than one occasion, it is now placed in charge of an assistant who supplies it on demand. We cannot imagine a Freethinker stealing the paper, so must assume that it is stolen by a good Christian. To lie for the glory of God is a very old practice, and to steal for him is also tolerably common. So we are afraid we cannot commend this unknown Christian for his originality.

In aid of the funds of the Manchester Branch of the N.S.S., Mrs. Mapp, of 1 Leopold Avenue, West Didsbury, is holding a Freethought Tea on Saturday, June 16, from 5 to 8. There will be many useful articles on sale, and gifts of goods or cash will be much appreciated by the Branch treasurer.

Mr. A. B. Moss had a large and appreciative audience at Regent's Park on Sunday last. Mr. Moss's enthusiasm in the Cause should serve as a spur to the younger members of the party. Open-air work is not an easy task for one who has been for more than forty years engaged in fighting the master superstition. We only hope that he will not over do it. It is far more serviceable to live for Freethought than to die for it. For all that we are the more pleased to find these efforts meeting with the appreciation they deserve.

## Christopher Marlowe.

ON JUNE 1 we commemorated the death of Christopher Marlowe, the father of English tragedy and the instaurator of dramatic blank verse.

But Marlowe was more than a great poet and dramatist; he was the most daring of all those brilliant men who in that age of genius defied orthodoxy and openly declared themselves Atheists, even though this step incurred the risk of being stretched on the rack or slowly burnt to death. That Marlowe only escaped being arrested and brought before the Privy Council by his untimely death we shall see later.

The eldest son of a shoemaker of Canterbury, he was born in that city on February 6, 1564, and was christened in St. George's Church on the 26th, a few months before the baptism of Shakespeare. He received his early educational training at the King's School, Canterbury, passing on to Cambridge, where in 1584 he qualified for the Bachelor of Arts degree, and some few years later for the M.A. One of his masters may have been the notorious Francis Kett, the mystic, burnt in 1589 for heresy, and might have developed young Marlowe's anti-religious beliefs.

In 1586 or perhaps 1587 "Kit" joined the Lord Admiral's company of players, under the leadership of Edward Alleyn, one of the greatest tragedians of the Elizabethan period. He seems to have begun (as dramatists of that time usually did) by preparing plays for production, but soon began to write plays himself. His reception was somewhat mixed: Nashe severely criticized his verse, Greene professed to be shocked at his startling philosophy (but afterwards made use of his work), and Gabriel Harvey attacked him on every possible occasion, even continuing to malign his memory long after the dramatist's death.

Despite such animadversion, however, Marlowe continued writing, and when only twenty-four produced his first great play, the famous *Tamburlaine the Great*, written in a passionate, rhetorical form of blank verse.

Blank verse had occasionally been used by earlier dramatists in an exceedingly rude form, but, says Sir Sidney Lee:—

Marlowe gave it a new capacity. In his hand the sense was not interrupted at the end of each line, the pause and the force of the accents were varied, and the metre was proved capable for the first time of responding to the varying phases of human feeling.

It is a tragedy in ten acts, and its very opening scoffs at the older dramatic forms, and was consequently received with adverse criticism by the poet's revilers. Nevertheless, it was a great success, and is now classed as one of the world's greatest plays, and has prompted some fine tributes, notably one from Swinburne:—

In its highest and most distinctive qualities, in unflinching and infallible command of the right note of music in the proper tone of colour for the finest touches of poetic execution, no poet of the most elaborate, working with ease upon every consummate resource of luxurious learning and leisurely refinement has ever excelled the best and most representative work of a man who had literally no models before him and probably, or evidently, was often if not always compelled to write against time for his living.

Then came *The Tragedy of Dr. Faustus*, another fine dramatic achievement, and containing many passages of exquisite beauty and splendour. The story of Faustus's suffering, and particularly his great soliloquy in the very face of death, is indubitably of the highest rank of poetic drama.

This was followed by the famous *Jew of Malta*, of especial interest to us as an indictment of the selfish-

ness of the religionists in power. The opening scenes contain some of Marlowe's greatest work, but during the last acts the play degenerates into an indescribable something which is worse than caricature, although it seems very highly probable that this represents the work of playhouse hacks.

The early part, however, portrays the Jew as a hunted and despised creature, and furnished Shakespeare with most of the material for the *Merchant of Venice*, which is now becoming to be regarded in its true light, viz., a play intended to show the merciless manner in which Jews were persecuted by Christians in the Tudor period.

Other works followed, too numerous to be mentioned in this brief survey.

We know that Shakespeare owed much to him, and there seems to be much of his work in *Richard III*, *Henry V*, *Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus*, and even in *Julius Cæsar*.

Much of his Freethought is displayed in his works, and provoked Greene's mournful question: "Why should thy excellent wit, God's gift, be so blinded that thou shouldst give no glory to the giver?" Marlowe did not even deign to reply, and even to-day the great master is tabooed owing to his strong anti-religious sentiments. He was surpassed only by Shakespeare himself, and if you would read poetry which except for Shakespeare would have been regarded as the best which this fruitful tongue has produced, read Marlowe. What more could be said?

His death came at the age of twenty-nine, and was attended with tragic events. As a result of statements made by the dying dramatist Thomas Kyd, under torture, the Privy Council issued a warrant calling upon Sir John Pickering, lord keeper, to arrest Marlowe and to bring him forthwith before the Council to answer any charges which might be preferred against him, but before the order could be executed the news reached London of the poet's death. He was slain in a brawl by a man variously named Archer or Ingram, although the former is now accepted as the more probable.

Naturally his death was received with joy by the religionists. Some divines made much use of it as a warning to those who defied God; and accordingly to many of them Marlowe was accidentally slain while he was about to commit an unprovoked attack upon an innocent and Godfearing person, but the true facts were finally published and helped to vindicate the dead man's character.

And so ended the short but exceedingly fruitful career of Marlowe, who,

Bathed in the Thespian springs,  
Had in him those brave translunary things  
That the first poets had; his raptures were  
All air and fire, which made his verses clear;  
For that fine madness still he did retain,  
Which rightly should possess a poet's brain.

J. E. TRUBY.

### THE BLASPHEMY LAWS.

It is not very likely that a Tory Government will lend the least assistance to the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws. Nor, for that matter is much to be expected from the orthodox Liberals. We regret to see a man like Mr. Augustine Birrell, who is a lawyer by profession, and who actually received Mrs. Bonner's biography of Charles Bradlaugh, professing not to know that Secularists labour under any disabilities. His legal knowledge is very imperfect if it does not extend to the laws relating to blasphemy and heresy. We hope he will take the trouble to learn the truth, and do something to promote the great principle of religious equality. It is not enough to extend the area of privilege. What is wanted is one level of freedom of all forms of opinion.—G. W. Foote, "Freethinker," October 7, 1900.

## Five Thousand Years Ago and More.

### A BRIEF STUDY OF THE "EGYPTIAN BOOK OF THE DEAD."

Perhaps the Egyptian was the greatest capitalist civilization which the world has ever seen, and the *Book of the Dead* gives us a very close knowledge of the psychology of its people of 3,000 to 10,000 years past, helping one also to understand many of the modern religious ideas. Coloured reproductions of the vignettes (drawings) and writing on the papyri have been issued by the Trustees of the British Museum and other similar authorities on the Continent, and many of our public libraries have copies, but it is a tedious work to study them, and few persons have the inclination to spend the necessary time to gain a fair knowledge of the subject, so perhaps this short account will be welcome to the general reader. To such I offer this little brochure trusting it will afford them some pleasure and profit, and convey a simple, clear, true and concise impression of the original.—Ernest Anderson.

The *Book of the Dead* is a Burial Service chanted by priests at the funeral of kings and powerful officials for more than five thousand years. The text was altered and added to in the course of time, and some of the original wording was lost or corrupted and its meaning forgotten, but the bulk is understood and has received the careful study of some of the best informed of our day. A number of versions have been brought to Europe. Each one has the name of the person to be buried inserted into the text. Evidently the priests prepared the service and sold it to the relatives of the deceased, and then wrote in the name. The completest or longest version yet discovered was found at Thebes. This is the papyrus of Ani, the Governor of the Granary of the Lords of Abydos and a Scribe of the Lords of Thebes.

This papyrus was purchased by the Trustees of the British Museum in the year 1888. It measures seventy-eight feet in length and is fifteen inches wide. The date when it was written is unknown, nor does it give any indication when Ani was buried, but it is not later than 1400 B.C. Neither have we any trace of the early history or origin of the *Book of the Dead* or whence came the ceremony of chanting texts at the graveside, though certain sections plainly belong to an immensely remote and primeval time. Internal evidence of the oldest texts indicate that parts were in existence at the time of the first king of Egypt, Mena (Menes of the Old Testament), about 7,000 to 8,000 years ago.

Some of the chapters of the book have been found written upon tombs, pyramids and monuments, and have been compared with the papyrus. A similar version to that of Ani is the one used at the burial of Hunefer, also a royal scribe; a third is that of Quenna, a merchant; and a fourth is in the name of Nexht, a captain of soldiers. Generally the texts of all these are similar, the variations being errors in copying and omissions or intentional contraction of the work, perhaps for the purpose of meeting a smaller fee.

*Legends of the Gods.*—It is necessary for the purpose of understanding the *Book of the Dead* to have some knowledge of the legends prevalent among the Nile tribes prior to the foundation of the Egyptian nation. It would be out of place for me to go deeply into this matter, but I will give a few details which will be helpful. Some writers believe that the earliest tribes were mono-theistic, while others state that they originally had a number of gods and the religion had developed in two opposite directions; in one, the gods were multiplied by the addition of various local gods; and in the other, to a belief in one god only.

The Egyptians professed to believe in one supreme god, Ra. He was identified with the sun and all lesser gods and goddesses were forms of him. Another god

was Amen, who was originally the local god of Thebes, and when the Theban kings of the seventeenth dynasty conquered other parts of Egypt, Amen was bracketed with Ra and was addressed as Amen-Ra, the Lord of all the gods, "the being in whom every god existeth, the One in One, the creator of the things which came into being when the earth took form in the beginning, whose births are hidden, whose forms are manifold, and whose growth cannot be known." The god Ra was of great antiquity. The name was given to the sun as the visible emblem of the Supreme Being. The meaning of the name has been lost. He is represented in the vignettes by a human form, sometimes with the head of a hawk. In the papyrus text his hieroglyphic (or letter) is a circle with a dot in the centre. In astronomy, at the present time, that sign is used to represent the sun.

Another god of the earliest tribes was Osiris. We are indebted to Plutarch for his legend, which was then more than four thousand years old. It is plainly a sun myth. It states that, at one time, the year was 360 days in length but the god Hermes gained a further five days. On the first Osiris was born, and at the moment of his birth a voice was heard to proclaim that the Lord of Creation was born. He became king of Egypt and taught his subjects and surrounding nations husbandry, but Typhon plotted with seventy-two comrades and placed him in a chest which was taken to the mouth of the Nile. He returned from the other world and taught his son Horus the use of arms. Two battles were fought between Horus and Typhon, and Horus was the victor. Osiris was the god through whose sufferings, death and resurrection, the Egyptian hoped that his body might live again and to him who had conquered death and had become the king of the underworld, the Egyptian appealed in prayer for eternal life through his victory and power. Originally Osiris was the sun after setting and before he rose in the east, and the ox and the hawk were sacred to him, the latter being considered a good representative of the sun.

In the *Book of the Dead* the deceased is identified with the god Osiris. A man's osiris represented all the properties of a living person which consisted of body, soul, intelligence, and shade or ghost. This last, called Ka or image, received material form after death and to it all offerings were dedicated. It was also the osiris of the dead which was supposed to chant the hymns which form the Burial Service, in the person of the priest, and it was the god Osiris to whom some of the hymns were addressed. This kind of confusion of thought is common to other religions.

The god Heru or Horus was originally an entirely distinct being from the son of Osiris. We are told that "The visible emblem of the sun god was at a very early date the hawk, which was probably the first living thing worshipped by the early Egyptians" (Dr. Budge). This represented both Horus the great and Horus the child; from the earliest times the two were confounded. They were both warriors, the first waged war against night and darkness, the other against his brother Set or Typhon to avenge his father Osiris. Later the battle was on behalf of right against wrong and of life against death.

Isis, the wife of Osiris, was usually depicted as a female form surmounted by a seat, the hieroglyphic of which forms her name. She is frequently represented suckling her child Horus, and the cow was sacred to her. She was probably the deity of the dawn, a star being added to her crown in some aspects. Originally she was addressed as the great goddess, the divine mother, and later she is called "the mother of the gods."

E. ANDERSON.

(To be Concluded.)

## Blasphemy Laws Amendment Bill.

### II.

(Concluded from page 359.)

THE Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education (THE EARL OF ONSLOW): My Lords, as far as the Government are concerned we are somewhat surprised that the noble Earl should have introduced this Bill, because the only form of blasphemy which is punishable by the civil court is where there is an intention of abusing, insulting or misleading others by means of contumacious abuse of the Christian religion. The noble Earl fully admitted that point. That is the only part of the Blasphemy Laws which is in any way operative. The noble and learned Lord, Lord Phillimore, called attention to two cases, in one of which he sat as Judge and the other was decided by Mr. Justice Avory. I have a note of the advice which Mr. Justice Avory gave to the jury. He told them that they should ask themselves whether the instincts of a person of strong religious feelings, on seeing or hearing the words complained of, might be to give the man a thrashing or address him in such a manner as to provoke a breach of the peace. And this advice to the jury was approved by the Court of Criminal Appeal. The noble Earl quoted a passage from a ruling of Lord Coleridge in 1883 in which he said that ordinary criticism or an attack in intemperate language on the Christian religion was by no means an offence against the law.

The law is directed against those people who attack the Christian religion in an abusive and outrageous manner, or who distribute pamphlets in the same sense. The noble Earl referred to pamphlets and said that he thought they would be less offensive than the actual spoken word, but it is quite possible for pamphlets to be equally offensive as the spoken word. The people who distribute such pamphlets select public places where decent people resort, and in doing so they may promote a breach of the peace. I submit that language of this kind is most offensive to many people and that they ought to be protected against it. I think the noble Earl admits that. He tells us that the Common Law is at present sufficient, but nobody wishes to give any possible chance for anybody to use language of this kind, and as the Blasphemy Laws, so far as they are operative, are directed against language of this kind I cannot see any necessity for interfering with them.

Let me touch upon the question of schism, heresy, and atheism, mentioned in the Bill. These matters are no longer offences against the Common Law or against any existing Statute cognizable in any secular court. As the most rev. Primate has said, it is scarcely necessary at the present time to interfere with the law as it stands in regard to matters which are cognizable in ecclesiastical courts. As I said before, the offence which is noticeable by the secular court is the offence of blasphemy and blasphemous libel, which is certainly most offensive to everybody in the country, whatever their religious opinion may be. I trust, therefore, that your Lordships will agree that it is not necessary to proceed with any modification of the law, and that the House will not give a Second Reading to this Bill.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, I think it will be quite obvious to those who have listened to this debate that there is a very real element of difficulty in regard to this measure, and it arises chiefly from the use of language, and from the fact that we are not in this country always used to defining exactly what we mean by the words which we employ. There is a great deal of common ground between the noble Earl who has just spoken, the most rev. Primate and the noble Earl who has introduced this Bill. We are all of us agreed that blasphemy used with the intention of being offensive to other people ought to be prohibited and punished. I think we are also agreed that blasphemy, in the sense in which the word was used when the original Blasphemy Laws were passed, is not necessarily offensive in the same way. For instance, a great many works of philosophy have been written since the Blasphemy Laws were passed which to members of your Lordships' House to-day would not seem to be of such a character that they should be the subject of prosecution, although under the strict letter of the law, interpreted by those who passed the law at the time, those

works would have been a ground for prosecution and the people who wrote them would undoubtedly have been punished.

In these circumstances it is obvious that there is a great deal of common ground between noble Lords opposite and the noble Earl behind me, and it seems to me that it ought to be quite possible by a discussion in Committee to arrive at some kind of an agreed measure. As was pointed out by the noble Earl behind me, these laws, as they stand at present, often do not apply in cases when very offensive terms are used, terms, for instance, which are considered offensive by members of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. At present the Blasphemy Laws apply only when terms are used which are offensive to the faith and the feelings of members of the Church of England.

A NOBLE LORD: No.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: Surely if we wish to protect members of the Church of England who feel strongly in this matter against the use of terms of that kind we ought to be equally severe on those who use expressions offensive to members of the Roman Catholic or other faiths, and they ought to be punished equally with those who use terms offensive to members of the Church of England. I am bound to say that I did feel that the questions mentioned by the noble and learned Lord behind me might quite well have been dealt with in Committee.

One point was mentioned, I think, by the most rev. Primate, to which I hope he will allow me to make an addition. I refer to the opinion of Mr. Asquith, which he quoted, because I see that in the speech to which he referred Mr. Asquith said:

Although....the vote which I gave in favour of Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill—

which is the same as this Bill—

was given at a much earlier stage of my political existence, I see no reason to repent it, or to doubt that if the opportunity offered I should give a similar vote again.

There is another point in connection with this Bill which I think deserves some attention. Of late years these laws have been put into operation not by the central Government but by local authorities. Generally speaking, I should be very willing to trust in this matter to the enlightened opinion of the Home Office, but I am not quite sure that any of your Lordships would feel that the judgment exercised by local authorities is always so wise as the judgment exercised by the central authority here in London. In these circumstances I think that we might very well proceed further with this Bill and consider it in Committee. As time goes on circumstances change, and the circumstances of this question have changed so largely that I really think we might proceed to make some alteration in this particular law.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down rather suggested to your Lordships that this Bill is open to a considerable amount of criticism but that it could be properly dealt with in Committee. I should be rather sorry if your Lordships allowed this Bill to go into Committee, because there does not appear to be any real case for such a Bill. If the noble Earl in charge of the Bill, or, indeed, any other noble Lord, could show that what we are accustomed to call the legitimate expression of opinion upon these deep religious subjects is in any way restricted by the present law, and that men who do not agree with us upon these matters are prevented from stating their views even in the most extreme form in order that they may be read and considered by others—if it could be shown, in short, that the present law interfered with the freedom of expression of opinion, then there would be some case for action.

I have no real personal knowledge of this subject, but, as I understand the matter, there really is no such case. There is no difficulty in the way of anybody who forms an opinion which he thinks ought to be expressed upon religious matters of the deepest kind, even though it be most antagonistic to Christianity and to the beliefs to which most of your Lordships are passionately attached. There is nothing to prevent him exercising that view, as the law is now administered, and he is perfectly free to do so. But there is undoubtedly a kind of expression of

opinion on religious matters which is profoundly offensive to persons whom we are bound to protect—to all sorts of people who look to the law to protect them against what they regard as outrages, just as they are protected in other matters that have to do with decency. They look for protection, and if it were read in the newspapers to-morrow morning that your Lordships had accorded a Second Reading to a Bill which was going to relax in any degree the protection which these perfectly innocent persons enjoy, it would have a very unfortunate effect on the public mind, and I do not think it would be wise to take this course unless we hoped to achieve some useful purpose. If any useful purpose were effected by this Bill my argument would drop to the ground, but, if no useful purpose is served, it is surely much wiser to allow the law to remain as it is. I venture to suggest therefore that the wisest course for your Lordships to adopt is to refuse to read this Bill a second time.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, the trend of the argument shows, I think, the difficulty which confronts perhaps both the supporters and the opponents of a Bill of this character, because, as the noble Earl below me truly said, there is a considerable measure of agreement between us. The noble Marquess who has just spoken says that he would do nothing to prevent the freest expression of opinion. The most rev. Primate said, as I thought he would, that the last thing he wished to ask for was the protection by the secular arm of his or any other Church. We are also agreed that we object to language which is calculated to be so offensive as to wound feelings very deeply or to lead to a breach of the peace. This is a Bill which could perfectly well be amended, if amendment be necessary, in Committee. I think it is hardly necessary here to deal with the minor points of the noble and learned Lord behind me, because I was not really considering the question of contumacious Clerks in Holy Orders.

The Bill might be amended in Committee, if amendment be necessary, so as to protect us from those dangers which we profess to fear, and from which the opponents of this Bill want to be protected. That being so, I could not help asking myself when I listened to the speeches of those who oppose this Bill—Why this insistence upon maintaining a little bit of obsolete law? I will tell you why it is objected to. It is objected to because people who do speak and write—I am speaking of respectable people—against the Christian religion, dislike to think that under the Statutes as they stand they are liable to prosecution and indictment, and they dislike to think that one particular religion is favoured at the expense of others. It is all very well to talk about wounding people's feelings. There are in this country, at this moment, I am sorry to say, many sincere people who are devotees of a horrible thing called Christian Science, but I may say the most offensive things I can say against Mrs. Eddy on Clapham Common, and I cannot be prosecuted under the Blasphemy Laws, but only under those things which, as has been said, do defend us, because the question that has to be asked is whether what is said is calculated to cause a breach of the peace.

That is not the question which is involved in blasphemy. The question there is: Is this language which controverts my religious belief, which was, at the time when the law was passed, the religious belief of the majority of the people of this country? I cannot help feeling that there is some reason for retaining this law which goes beyond mere police measures, as has been suggested, and if those who are opposed to this Bill are sincere they can have no objection to giving it a Second Reading and to saying that they will not take proceedings on religious grounds, but limit such proceedings to grounds of social expediency, common decency, and public peace. In the circumstances I feel that it is my duty to press the Motion for the Second Reading to a Division.

On Question, whether the Bill shall be read 2a?—

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 8; Not-Contents, 68.

CONTENTS.

- |                       |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Beauchamp, E.         | Hemphill, L.             |
| Russell, E. [Teller.] | Raglan, L.               |
| Falkland, V.          | Rayleigh, L.             |
| Charnwood, L.         | Terrington, L. [Teller.] |

NOT-CONTENTS.

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Canterbury, L. Abp.                           | Braye, L.                   |
| Salisbury, M. (L. President.)                 | Chaworth, L. (E. Meath.)    |
| Bedford, D.                                   | Clinton, L.                 |
| Devonshire, D.                                | Cottesloe, L.               |
| Northumberland, D.                            | Cunliffe, L.                |
| Somerset, D.                                  | Desart, L. (E. Desart.)     |
| Ailsa, M.                                     | Donington, L.               |
| Bath, M.                                      | Dynevor, L.                 |
| Lansdowne, M.                                 | Ernle, L.                   |
| Cromer. (L. Chamberlain.)                     | Fairfax of Cameron, L.      |
| Albemarle, E.                                 | Forester, L.                |
| Ancaster, E.                                  | Glenarthur, L.              |
| Bradford, E.                                  | Harris, L.                  |
| Clarendon, E. [Teller.]                       | Hylton, L.                  |
| Derby, E.                                     | Kilmarnock, L. (E. Erroll.) |
| Doncaster, E. (D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.) | Marshall of Chipstead, L.   |
| Eldon, E.                                     | Mildmay of Flete, L.        |
| Harrowby, E.                                  | Monson, L.                  |
| Howe, E.                                      | Muir, Mackenzie, L.         |
| Lindsay, E.                                   | Oxenfoord, L. (E. Stair.)   |
| Lindsey, E.                                   | Penrhyn, L.                 |
| Lucan, E.                                     | Phillimore, L.              |
| Mayo, E.                                      | Pontypridd, L.              |
| Onslow, E.                                    | Redesdale, L.               |
| Astor, V.                                     | Saltoun, L.                 |
| Goschen, V.                                   | Somerleyton, L. [Teller.]   |
| Hood, V.                                      | Stewart of Garlies, L.      |
| Hutchinson, V. (E. Donoughmore.)              | Stuart of Wortley, L.       |
| Long, V.                                      | Sudeley, L.                 |
| Novar, V.                                     | Sumner, L.                  |
| Peel, V.                                      | Teynham, L.                 |
| Askwith, L.                                   | Vaux of Harrowden, L.       |
| Biddulph, L.                                  | Vivian, L.                  |
|   | Wharton, L.                 |
|   | Wigan, L. (E. Crawford.)    |

Resolved in the negative, and Motion disagreed to accordingly.

Correspondence.

PYTHAGORAS AND COPERNICUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—What I foresaw has occurred. I asked for a literal translation of any authentic and original passage from the classics giving a reasonable presumption that Pythagoras believed in the heliocentric theory. Mr. Turney says that one Buckley and one Moulton in *A Short History of Science and Introduction to Astronomy*, say that Aristarchus said that Pythagoras believed in the heliocentric theory—not a bit of it. That Aristarchus said that Pythagoras said that he thought the earth moved—not even that.

We have merely the assumption that Pythagoras believed the earth moved, and so "paved the way" to somebody else's belief in something else. We are not even with Coleman's sick man who threw up three black crows, and are justified in quoting S. Wesley's epitaph on Butler's bust:—

In emblem here the poet's fate is shown,  
He asked for bread and he received a stone.

On the other hand the highest Greek and Latin science of the early part of the Roman Empire period, with all the Latin and Greek literature then extant, much of which has since perished, at its fingers ends, and at least honest in its absurd cosmos and absurd deductions therefrom, unequivocally claims Pythagoras. He was a confirmed believer in the ridiculous notion of "the music of the spheres," and the whole of this theory is bound up with the geocentric dogma.

I do not wish to occupy your space with an elaborate reply, but I must point out that the rest of Mr. Turney's letter is *ad hominem*. It is not prejudice but a plain statement of fact to say that all or almost all the founders of modern science were neither Anglo-Saxons nor Germans. Not a single German nor Anglo-Saxon, so far as I am aware, risked his life in the pioneer period in the cause of truth. Mr. Turney is not happy in his list of scientific pioneers who are to prove the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon. I will take four of them—Newton, Herschell, Lyell and Darwin.

(1) So far as Newton is concerned, to call him a pioneer would be quite puerile. Without the previous astronomers of the Renaissance he could have done nothing. Again no one affirmed the laws of universal gravitation more explicitly than the geocentric astronomers of Greece and Rome. Only it was the earth that attracted everything else, including the divine soul-stuff of the "heavenly bodies." Newton accepted the idea and *decentralized* it. By so doing he paved the way to its collapse as an *absolute verity*. Gravity being dependent upon mass, mass being only electric charge, and electric charge varying according to the velocity of bodies, internal (molecular) or through space—what becomes of "gravity" except as a weak by-product of motion and electricity?

(2) In what can the German or rather German-Jew Hirsch or Herschel be considered as a pioneer? His starlists, etc., depended on his being like his fellow Jew Spinoza—good at practical optics. The pioneer work of inventing the telescope was Dutch—not Galileo's.

(3) Lyell, in the first chapter of his *Principles*, expressly disclaims being a "pioneer," and mentions the Italian founders of geology—not a few of them priests—as the real pioneers. In fact even in the time of Pope and Swift, Woodward had been scurrilously defamed by those two great writers as a blasphemer for popularizing the ideas of these Italian geologists.

(4) Darwin was I believe equally explicit in indicating Lamarck as the modern pioneer of evolution. Anyhow if Mr. Turney has any doubt about it he has only to wade through that dreary work *La Philosophie Zoologique*. "Science knows no paltry national boundaries, and the whole world has contributed." Perhaps. But the *qualities* of the contributions of the negroes and Malays, the Germans and English, and the Lamarcks, Galileo's and Giordano Bruno's are not the same but different.

The second letter, which I also greet with thanks, gives the words of the author of a history of science. But Mr. Routledge also *assumes* that Pythagoras believed *not* in the heliocentric theory, but that the earth moved without giving the shred of a proof of it. He does not even say whether the motion was that of *rotation* or translation or both.

W. W. STRICKLAND.

La Paz, Mexico.

May 5th, 1923.

#### A CORRECTION.

SIR,—In the issue dated June 3, under the heading "The Chosen People," two small typing errors occurred. The chapter in Isaiah should be xliii not xviii, and the word "brought" should read "bought."

E. ANDERSON.

#### TOO MUCH INOCULATION.

SIR,—I would not question for a moment the truth of Mr. W. H. Shepherd's statement that his son has been inoculated eleven times during twelve months. It is rather distressing though to read "as a rule they have no idea what they are inoculated against." Surely an inquirer would be told when he was having the operation performed.

It seems to me that Mr. Shepherd is taking the wrong course in the matter, for if his son has come to the conclusion that these repeated inoculations are undermining his health, the logical thing is to refuse to submit to the operation. No doubt a little petty tyranny would be exercised for a while as it was in the writer's case during the war, but a determined spirit will work wonders and is the sustaining factor until the battle is won. Further, he will have set a worthy example for which others will envy him, and he will have the satisfaction of knowing that his own effort means another blow at a crumbling medical imposture.

LALLY.

#### BREAKING IT GENTLY.

Uncle: "So you're learning religion at school, eh?"

Ted: "Yes, but I'm taught that we all come from Adam. Joe's in a higher class, and he's taught we all come from monkeys."—*Sydney Bulletin*.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

### LONDON.

#### INDOOR.

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7, Mr. William Kent, "Charles Lamb."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11, John A. Hobson, M.A., "The Limitations of Economic Science."

#### OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 6.15, Mr. Moss, "The Bible and Evolution."

FINSBURY PARK.—11.15, Debate: "Does Christianity Supply an Ideal for Life?" Affirmative, Mr. Wallis; negative, Mr. F. P. Corrigan.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH (Regent's Park, near the Bandstand): 6 p.m., Mr. J. J. Darby, a Lecture.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 3.30 and 6.30, Mr. F. Shaller will lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Outside Technical Institute, Romford Road, Stratford, E.): 7, Mr. F. P. Corrigan, a Lecture.

### COUNTRY.

#### OUTDOOR.

NEWCASTLE BRANCH N.S.S. (Town Moor, North Road entrance): 7, Mr. F. Carlton, "The Myths of Genesis." Also on Wednesday, June 20, at the Big Market at 7.

STOCKPORT BRANCH N.S.S. (Mersey Square): Friday and Saturday, June 15-16, at 7.30. Sunday, June 17, at 11 a.m. and 7. Mr. G. Whitehead will lecture.

**FREETHINKER** (48) seeks employment; 30 years' experience in the wholesale paper and stationery trade.—JOHN COOPER, c/o *Freethinker* Office, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

### *The Egyptian Origin of Christianity.*

## THE HISTORICAL, JESUS AND MYTHICAL CHRIST

By GERALD MASSEY.

A Demonstration of the Egyptian Origin of the Christian Myth. Should be in the hands of every Freethinker. With Introduction by Chapman Cohen.

Price 6d., postage 1d.

## THEISM OR ATHEISM?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

*Contents:* PART I.—AN EXAMINATION OF THEISM. Chapter I.—What is God? Chapter II.—The Origin of the Idea of God. Chapter III.—Have we a Religious Sense? Chapter IV.—The Argument from Existence. Chapter V.—The Argument from Causation. Chapter VI.—The Argument from Design. Chapter VII.—The Disharmonies of Nature. Chapter VIII.—God and Evolution. Chapter IX.—The Problem of Pain.

PART II.—SUBSTITUTES FOR ATHEISM. Chapter X.—A Question of Prejudice. Chapter XI.—What is Atheism? Chapter XII.—Spencer and the Unknowable. Chapter XIII.—Agnosticism. Chapter XIV.—Atheism and Morals. Chapter XV.—Atheism Inevitable.

Bound in full Cloth, Gilt Lettered. Price 5s., postage 2½d.

The "FREETHINKER" for 1922.

Strongly bound in Cloth, Gilt Lettered, with Title-page. Price 17s. 6d., postage 1s.

Only a very limited number of copies are to be had, and orders should be placed at once.

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

# NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

President:

**CHAPMAN COHEN.**

Secretary:

Miss E. M. VANCE, 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

## Principles and Objects.

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

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

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

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

The Funds of the National Secular Society are legally secured by Trust Deed. The trustees are the President, Treasurer and Secretary of the Society, with two others appointed by the Executive. There is thus the fullest possible guarantee for the proper expenditure of whatever funds the Society has at its disposal.

The following is a quite sufficient form for anyone who desires to benefit the Society by legacy:—

I hereby give and bequeath (*Here insert particulars of legacy*), free of all death duties, to the Trustees of the National Secular Society for all or any of the purposes of the Trust Deed of the said Society.

## Membership.

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

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

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

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

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

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

## A GRAMMAR OF FREETHOUGHT

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

Contents: Chapter I.—Outgrowing the Gods. Chapter II.—Life and Mind. Chapter III.—What is Freethought? Chapter IV.—Rebellion and Reform. Chapter V.—The Struggle for the Child. Chapter VI.—The Nature of Religion. Chapter VII.—The Utility of Religion. Chapter VIII.—Freethought and God. Chapter IX.—Freethought and Death. Chapter X.—This World and the Next. Chapter XI.—Evolution. Chapter XII.—Darwinism and Design. Chapter XIII.—Ancient and Modern. Chapter XIV.—Morality without God.—I. Chapter XV.—Morality without God.—II. Chapter XVI.—Christianity and Morality. Chapter XVII.—Religion and Persecution. Chapter XVIII.—What is to follow Religion?

Cloth Bound, with tasteful Cover Design. Price 5s., postage 3d.

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

## Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS. Price 2d., postage ½d.  
THE PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM. Price 2d., postage ½d.

WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS? Price 1d., postage ½d.

THE JEWISH LIFE OF CHRIST. Being the Sepher Toldoth Jeshu, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. With an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes. By G. W. FOOTE and J. M. WHEELER. Price 6d., postage ½d.

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

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CREED AND CHARACTER. The Influence of Religion on Racial Life. Price 7d., postage 1d.

THE PARSON AND THE ATHEIST. A Friendly Discussion on Religion and Life between Rev. the Hon. Edward Lyttelton, D.D., and Chapman Cohen. Price 1s. 6d., postage 1½d.

BLASPHEMY: A Plea for Religious Equality. Price 3d., postage 1d.

DOES MAN SURVIVE DEATH? Is the Belief Reasonable? Verbatim Report of a Discussion between Horace Leaf and Chapman Cohen. Price 7d., postage 1d.

By J. T. LLOYD.

PRAYER: ITS ORIGIN, HISTORY, AND FUTILITY. Price 2d., postage ½d.

GOD-EATING: A Study in Christianity and Cannibalism. Price 6d., postage 1d.

By A. D. McLAREN.

THE CHRISTIAN'S SUNDAY: Its History and Its Fruits. Price 2d., postage ½d.

By MIMNERMUS.

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

By WALTER MANN.

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

SCIENCE AND THE SOUL. With a Chapter on Infidel Death-Beds. Price 7d., postage 1d.

By M. M. MANGASARIAN.

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

By GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

JESUS CHRIST: Man, God, or Myth? With a Chapter on "Was Jesus a Socialist?" Paper Covers, 2s., postage 1½d.

THE CASE AGAINST THEISM. Paper Covers, 1s. 3d., postage 2d.; Cloth, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

THE SUPERMAN: Essays in Social Idealism. Price 2d., postage ½d.

MAN AND HIS GODS. Price 2d., postage ½d.

By A. MILLAR.

THE ROBES OF PAN. Price 6d., postage 1d.

By ARTHUR F. THORN.

THE LIFE-WORSHIP OF RICHARD JEFFERIES. With Fine Portrait of Jefferies. Price 1s., postage 1d.

By ROBERT ARCH.

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

By H. G. FARMER.

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

By COLONEL INGERSOLL.

IS SUICIDE A SIN? AND LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. Price 2d., postage ½d.

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

THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. Price 1d., postage ½d.

By D. HUME.

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

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

## PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS

*Spiritualism and a Future Life.*

### THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH.

*A Critical Examination of the Belief in a Future Life, with a Study of Spiritualism, from the Standpoint of the New Psychology.*

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

This is an attempt to re-interpret the fact of death with its associated feelings in terms of a scientific sociology and psychology. It studies Spiritualism from the point of view of the latest psychology, and offers a scientific and naturalistic explanation of its fundamental phenomena.

Paper Covers, 2s., postage 1½d.; Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d., postage 2d.

### LIFE AND EVOLUTION

By F. W. HEADLEY.

Large 8vo., 272 pp., with about 100 illustrations.

An Outline of the theory of evolution, with discussions of the later theories of Mendel, De Vries, etc., etc.

Price 4s. 6d., postage 6d.

### MODERN MATERIALISM.

*A Candid Examination*

By WALTER MANN

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited)

*Contents:* Chapter I.—Modern Materialism. Chapter II.—Darwinian Evolution. Chapter III.—Auguste Comte and Positivism. Chapter IV.—Herbert Spencer and the Synthetic Philosophy. Chapter V.—The Contribution of Kant. Chapter VI.—Huxley, Tyndall, and Clifford open the Campaign. Chapter VII.—Buechner's "Force and Matter." Chapter VIII.—Atoms and the Ether. Chapter IX.—The Origin of Life. Chapter X.—Atheism and Agnosticism. Chapter XI.—The French Revolution and the Great War. Chapter XII.—The Advance of Materialism.

A careful and exhaustive examination of the meaning of Materialism and its present standing, together with its bearing on various aspects of life. A much needed work.

176 pages. Price 2s. in neat Paper Cover, postage 2d.; or strongly bound in Cloth 3s. 6d., postage 2½d.

### DETERMINISM OR FREEWILL?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

NEW EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED.

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

Price: Paper, 1s. 9d., postage 1½d.; or strongly bound in Half-Cloth 2s. 6d., postage 2d.

*A Book with a Bite.*

### BIBLE ROMANCES (FOURTH EDITION)

By G. W. FOOTE.

A Drastic Criticism of the Old and New Testament Narratives, full of Wit, Wisdom, and Learning. Contains some of the best and wittiest of the work of G. W. Foote.

In Cloth, 224 pp. Price 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

*A New Propagandist Pamphlet.*

### CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

A Chapter from

*The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.*

By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

*An Ideal Gift-Book.*

### REALISTIC APHORISMS AND PURPLE PATCHES

Collected by ARTHUR B. FALLOWS, M.A.

Those who enjoy brief pithy sayings, conveying in a few lines what so often takes pages to tell, will appreciate the issue of a book of this character. It gives the essence of what virile thinkers of many ages have to say on life, while avoiding sugary commonplaces and stale platitudes. There is material for an essay on every page, and a thought-provoker in every paragraph. Those who are on the look-out for a suitable gift-book that is a little out of the ordinary will find here what they are seeking.

320 pp., Cloth Gilt, 5s., by post 5s. 5d.; Paper Covers, 3s. 6d., by post 3s. 10½d.

### COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANISM

By BISHOP W. MONTGOMERY BROWN, D.D.

A book that is quite outspoken in its attack on Christianity and on fundamental religious ideas. It is an unsparing criticism of Christianity from the point of view of Darwinism, and of Sociology from the point of view of Marxism. 204 pp.

Price 1s., post free.

*Special terms for quantities.*

### THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

*For Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians*

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

NEW EDITION

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited)

*Contents:* Part I.—Bible Contradictions. Part II.—Bible Absurdities. Part III.—Bible Atrocities. Part IV.—Bible Immoralities, Indecencies, Obscenities, Broken Promises, and Unfulfilled Prophecies.

Cloth Bound. Price 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

One of the most useful books ever published. Invaluable to Freethinkers answering Christians.

*A New Book at Pre-War Price.*

### ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

*Contents:* Psychology and Saffron Tea—Christianity and the Survival of the Fittest—A Bible Barbarity—Shakespeare and the Jew—A Case of Libel—Monism and Religion—Spiritual Vision—Our Early Ancestor—Professor Huxley and the Bible—Huxley's Nemesis—Praying for Rain—A Famous Witch Trial—Christmas Trees and Tree Gods—God's Children—The Appeal to God—An Old Story—Religion and Labour—Disease and Religion—Seeing the Past—Is Religion of Use?—On Compromise—Hymns for Infants—Religion and the Young.

Cloth Gilt, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

*A Book that Made History.*

### THE RUINS:

A SURVEY OF THE REVOLUTIONS OF EMPIRES  
To which is added THE LAW OF NATURE.

By C. F. VOLNEY.

A New Edition, being a Revised Translation with Introduction by GEORGE UNDERWOOD, Portrait, Astronomical Charts, and Artistic Cover Design by H. CUTNER.

Price 5s., postage 2½d.

This is a Work that all Freethinkers should read. Its influence on the history of Freethought has been profound, and at the distance of more than a century its philosophy must command the admiration of all serious students of human history. This is an Unabridged Edition of one of the greatest of Freethought Classics with all the original notes. No better edition has been issued.

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

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