

# 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. 39

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1923

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
Religion and Science.—The Editor - - - - -	609
The Resurrection of the Body.—J. T. Lloyd - - - - -	610
A European Poet.—Minnermus - - - - -	612
Red Cabbage.—Victor Neuburg - - - - -	612
American Religion.—W. Mann - - - - -	613
Charles Bradlaugh—Iconoclast and Reformer.—Arthur B. Moss - - - - -	614
Our Sustentation Fund.—Chapman Cohen - - - - -	617
John (Lord) Morley as a Freethinker.—G. W. Foote - - - - -	619
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

## Views and Opinions.

### Religion and Science.

"There is no real quarrel now between science and religion." We are indebted to a leading article in the *Daily News* for that delightful sentence, and we hasten to give it whatever immortality it lies within our power to confer. It is a first rate example of that kind of cerebral activity which with the average journalist passes for thinking. The reader will observe that there is no quarrel between the two now, which implies that there was a quarrel then, and one is left wondering what change has taken place in the nature of religion and in that of science which should end the quarrel. If religion and science were antagonistic yesterday they must remain antagonistic to-day. The antagonism between two things does not cease to exist because one of them is no longer capable of inflicting damage or of dictating terms to the other. One cannot say there is no antagonism between the geocentric and heliocentric systems of astronomy because one of them no longer commands the respect of the educated mind. The antagonism remains. There is not less antagonism between geology and Genesis because the case for the scientific theory is established and the genesaic one demolished. The antagonism is there, but parsons are no longer honest enough to earn their salaries by preaching what Genesis teaches. And the dear *Daily News* only makes its muddle-headedness the more pronounced when it adds the brilliant comment that there is no quarrel "of any consequence between the professors of the one and of the other." But we are not concerned with the mere *obiter dicta* of either parsons or professors. There may be mental confusion on the platform as well as in the pulpit. There may be time-serving and timidity and the desire to stand well with the majority with the one as with the other. We are not concerned with whether men of science and preachers of religion shake hands and give each other their blessing. What we are concerned with is whether they are both acting up to their principles, and whether science and religion logically and honestly support what they say.

\* \* \*

### The Essential Issue.

What is the issue between science and religion? It is the quarrel between two opposite and contradictory theories of the world. Religion takes its rise in a

conception of the world to which all science is completely opposed. The primitive intelligence, from which all religion springs, pictures the world as being the theatre of living forces. All that occurs is directly referable to the action of living beings akin to man. That is the root conception of religion, and so long as the belief is genuine one is bound to hold that view. It matters not how it is expressed, whether it be in the crude fashion of the savage and the evangelist preacher, or in the more refined but substantially similar religious beliefs of Dean Inge. So long as it is honest religion remains the same throughout, and when it loses the magnified man of the savage it ceases to be religion. Science starts from an exactly opposite point of view. It commences in the belief that some portion of the world is the matrix of forces that are definite, determinable, understandable, and non-vitalistic in their nature. It takes no concern of the interference of supermundane intelligence, but accepts the world as a problem to be mastered and explained in terms of invariable causation. This does not mean, of course, that right through there have not been professors of the scientific view who have adulterated their science with the religious conception, just as there have been many professors of religion who have of necessity acted in accordance with the scientific view of the world. We are not dealing with the way in which people have confused the two conceptions, but only in what way these two views are opposed to each other. Logically, one may hold either one view or the other. But you cannot with any valid claim to scientific accuracy hold both. The issue is there and the quarrel between the two remains eternal, indestructible. It can only be removed by the kind of intelligence that puts a little doll on a motor-car in order to avert a collision, or arranges a thanksgiving service because a king survives an attack of influenza. It is true this type of mind is very common, but that is just one more illustration of how much of the savage there is with us in spite of the boasted advance of our civilization.

\* \* \*

### The Church and the B.A.

The *Daily News* leader was written apropos of the meeting of the British Association and the sermons preached in connection therewith. Among these preachers was Canon Barnes, who some time ago showed his dare-devil courage and brilliant mental capacity by saying that he could not accept—without reservations—the tale that woman was manufactured from a bone out of the side of a man, or that death and disease, and parsons and creeds, and other evils came into the world because the first man and woman ate an apple. We said at the time that so original a thinker was bound to go far, and he has been much in the public eye since. As a paid official of a Church which teaches in its creed that God gave man a revelation thousands of years ago, which revelation told him the truth about religion, Canon Barnes believes that religion is a thing which is always growing, and things which are believed to be true to-day may turn out to be untrue to-morrow, just as those that were

believed to be true yesterday we know are not true to-day. The form of mental honesty represented by Canon Barnes is, we are pleased to say, less common in other walks of life than it is in the pulpit. Of course, the purpose of Canon Barnes is to put religion on a level with science where truth is being constantly enlarged and accepted ideas constantly overhauled and modified or rejected as it is found necessary. But science does not come before the world with a "Thus saith the Lord!" It claims only to say what it believes to be true, and announces its conviction that there is more to be said upon the matter. But the Christian revelation was given by God, and he knew all about it. Therefore honest Christians accepted it at its face value. They felt that if God told them so it must be so. There was nothing to add and nothing to take away. So in all sincerity and trust they accepted a story of creation that was an elaborate lie. They took a mass of indecencies, murders, brutalities, and intolerances and accepted them all as good ethics and true history and sound science. One pities them for the mistake they made, but they were at least honest. They did not take a salary from a Church and then straightway turn round and say that everything about the religion was allegorical or symbolical. The only concrete thing insisted on nowadays is the salary. If prophecies have fallen into disrepute, the profits are still high in favour.

\* \* \*

#### The Unchanging Creed.

There is a truth in what Canon Barnes says in the following passage, although we do not see that it is one which does Canon Barnes much good. He says:—

Religious thought and feeling alike are influenced, for good or ill, by contemporary political, social, and intellectual movements. In the domain of politics, for instance, Christianity was in mediæval times held to justify the claim of ecclesiastics to control secular princes. Subsequently it was regarded as a bulwark of the divine right of kings. Some now believed it to sanction the divine right of democracy.

Now that is exactly what we have always been saying in these columns, but we certainly never imagined that in saying it we were bolstering up Christianity. Nor do we believe we were doing so. For just what Canon Barnes' statement amounts to is this. Christianity comes before us with an account of man and the world which it says it got direct from God Almighty. It built a Church upon that, it assumed power over the people both in this world and the next on account of this alleged truth. It killed or tortured men and women who denied the truth of its revelation, and it suppressed all teaching that ran counter to it. But in spite of its efforts, in spite of a gigantic record of lies and forgeries, killings, suppressions, and general rascalities, it has been compelled to modify one teaching after another or reject them altogether. And one would like to know from Canon Barnes—if this cleric has the courage to answer a straightforward question—just what is the use of a revelation which is compelled to take its teaching from contemporary social, political, and intellectual life only when it can no longer oppose these currents of contemporary thought? A Church which at one time champions the divine right of kings—and does so still in some cases—and at another is willing to teach the divine right of democracy, and it is pretty certain would teach again the divine right of kings if a wave of unreasoning devotion to the king were to sweep over the country, cannot be of so great a value that we need fear what will happen in its absence, or pay many millions yearly for its support. Canon Barnes says that "amid all change" Christianity has "preserved its essential character." Well, it all depends upon

what we regard as its essential character. It has not preserved its essential teachings. Its teachings about witches, disease, the origin of man and of the world, and of a number of other things have all gone. It has preserved many of its essential features, I admit. It is as cowardly as ever, and given the opportunities it is as intolerant as ever. It is as lying as ever, it is as time-serving as ever, and it is as great an adept as ever in presenting falsehoods to the people under the guise of truth. I really do believe that these essential features of Christianity remain unchanged, and that is the principal reason why I believe that all talk of improving or reforming Christianity is so much idle chatter. There is only one thing to do with the "Infamous"—it must be crushed.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### The Resurrection of the Body.

THE resurrection of Christ was the cardinal principle in the Pauline theology, though Paul himself is represented as changing his view as to the nature of his resurrection. The general impression among believers was that Jesus had risen in identically the same body as that in which he had been buried. He is reported as favouring this view himself. He exhibited his wounds to the doubting Thomas. When with his disciples on one occasion, he called their attention to his flesh and bones, and said: "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold me having." He ate fish with them. "And yet," Dr. Briggs admits, "his risen body had properties which no other human body ever had—he appeared and disappeared at pleasure; he was recognized or not recognized as it pleased him; he entered a room without regard to doors; he rose from the earth into the sky, and disappeared when he finally left his disciples" (*Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 146). Origen, inferring from the resurrection of Jesus a general resurrection at the end of the world, firmly rejected the crass conception of its nature held by many in his day, and expressed the view that there is "a living power, a germ, in the present body, which gives it shape and form, and will give rise to a spiritual organism conformed to the nature of the particular soul, be it good or evil, that receives it." Augustine held the doctrine of everlasting punishment for unbelievers and of endless bliss for believers, and in both body and soul were to be united. This great Father was a notorious literalist, and his advocacy of the resurrection of the body was characterized by grotesque and startling adherence to the mere letter. In recent times, however, the tendency has been to "spiritualize" the conception of the resurrection, though less than a hundred years ago a literalism quite as grotesque and absurd as that held by Augustine still prevailed among ignorant and ordinary people. Fifty-five years ago the present writer heard a sermon on the resurrection of the body, in which a preacher of fifty gave an eloquent description of the Archangel's diligent search for bodies. The Archangel's job was by no means an easy one. He had to reconstruct bodies which no longer existed but had long ago become undistinguishable dust. The preacher mentioned an eminent soldier who had lost a leg in France, an arm in Russia, and got buried in England. The Archangel had superhuman power. He reconstructed the body at the grave and then went to France and Russia to recollect the missing limbs. This was grotesque enough in all conscience, but the congregation sat entranced, believing that their minister was speaking from information directly received from his Divine Master.

To-day the famous Creeds of the past are all in the melting pot, and men like Bishop Gore are endeavouring to "construe the Christian Faith in terms of modern thought." The Bishop is not at all successful in the project; nor is the Rev. A. Boyd-Scott, M.C., B.D., any more successful in his well-known little book, *Nevertheless We Believe*. In the twenty-fifth chapter Mr. Scott makes a bold attempt to restate the belief in the resurrection. This chapter is entitled, "Our unconceived belief in the Resurrection of the body." What exactly the reverend gentleman means by "our unconceived belief" we are not informed, but he mentions several interpretations of the belief. One is that when a Christian dies, while his body passes to the grave, his soul enters into a condition like sleep. Another interpretation is that when a Christian dies his body passes to the grave and there decays, whilst his soul passes immediately and consciously into the presence and company of his Saviour. Another interpretation is that at his death a Christian's soul "goes immediately and completely to the glory of Christ's presence," whatever that may be; but what becomes of his body? This is the answer:—

His body, that cold, inert, and shrunken relic of a stage of life now done with decays in the grave and is of no more account. He is well done with it, thankfully done with it, and done with it for ever (p. 161).

Mr. Scott candidly admits that this third interpretation is accepted by many to-day as the true view of the resurrection, as it was by not a few in the Primitive Church, but he rejects it on the ground that the soul cannot exist apart from a body. He attributes the belief in the soul's dependence on a body to the Apostle Paul, who altered his belief on the subject more than once. As Mr. Scott says:—

He now declared that the soul at death immediately and consciously passes to Christ. But does it thus pass in a disembodied state? Paul could not believe this. It must have a body. He could not tolerate the thought that at death he would be what he calls a "naked" soul (p. 63).

And this is Mr. Scott's view of the resurrection of the body and of the resurrected body. He asks:—

But what is this so-called spiritual body? Has it any relation to the body of this earthly life? Paul replies, it has something of the same relation to what we call this earthly body, that an ear of wheat has to the grain of wheat that is planted in the ground. That is to say, the spiritual body in which the Christian at death passes in full life to the open Communion of Christ, face to face, grows and develops out of this earthly body, which is an integral part of me in this present stage of my existence (pp. 163-4).

All this is sheer speculation, obviously absurd when analyzed. Mr. Scott realizes this when he uses the phrase "this so-called spiritual body," well knowing that there cannot be any such thing as a spiritual body. How can one spirit be the dwelling place of another? And by what process can a physical body become a spiritual? Both Paul and Mr. Scott are equally guilty of building an argument on the sand of hypothetical and metaphysical dreaming, and the latter is bound to recognize the essential weakness and absurdity of the reasoning, for he cannot claim any scientific authority whatever for it. The truth is that Mr. Scott believed in the resurrection with all his heart, but was anxious to satisfy his doubting friends that the belief in it was scientifically sound, instead of which his reasoning has been so conspicuously unscientific that to a scientist the conclusion at which he arrives at is simply ridiculous. Now, on the assumption that the reasoning is scientifically accurate and the conclusion reached logically unassailable, what is it that has been really accomplished? Some-

thing of which the author never dreamed, something which if he even suspected himself of having done would break his heart. He has succeeded in placing Jesus in the same category as Pagan Saviour-Gods. These also died for the good of the world, and they also rose again for the redemption of mankind. Their rituals are practically the same as those of Osiris, Adonis, Attis, Dionysus, and others. They were put to death, sometimes violently, and their worshippers deeply lamented their absence and greatly rejoiced when on the third day they reappeared, risen from the dead. We may be told that the story of Jesus' death and resurrection is infinitely better told than those concerning the same events as related of Pagan Saviour-Gods. Granting the essential truthfulness of that claim, the superior literary quality of the Gospel story by no means establishes its superior credibility. And yet commenting on I Cor. xv, 49, Mr. Scott says:—

I am convinced that Paul has here a view of what happens to us at death, that is no mere fantasy of antique philosophy, but a view that fits in closely with the requirements of modern thought or personality and life; a view that is full of comfort and hope in our times of bereavement and questioning of death; and at the same time, a view that is very serious for us in the life we are living in this stage of our existence (p. 164).

That is dogmatism pure and simple. Mr. Scott produces no evidence whatever that Paul was anything higher and better than an antique philosopher. His view of what happens to us at death is of no greater practical value than the views of men who fundamentally differ from him. It is false to state that the requirements of modern thought necessitate the belief in the immortality of personality and life. According to all probability personality lasts no longer than the organism in which it has been developed, and there is absolutely no element in it which shows the least capacity for survival, nor has it ever been demonstrated that a simple personality has actually survived the death of its body. The so-called Great Beyond has never broken its most significant silence, nor allowed a single one of its denizens to revisit this sub-lunar sphere. In other words, immortality is a dream that has never come true, and the spiritual world a region of the actual existence of which there is not the shadow of substantiated proof. It is an exceedingly curious fact that all believers in a future life teach the duality of man, and most of them are convinced of the independence, though during its short residence here it has to use the body as its organ, and even those who, like Mr. Scott, are convinced that the soul cannot exist without a body, still declare that soul and body are two different entities. Now, to us who regard the soul as utterly non-existent as an independent spiritual entity, but as existing only as a form of specific neural activity, the belief in immortality and the resurrection is the silliest and most groundless belief that man ever cherished.

J. T. LLOYD.

A FACT.

Commercial Traveller (meeting customer in West of England Town): "Terrible news this from Japan."

Customer: "Yes, but its in *His* hands, and you see Japan was getting stronger and stronger and might make war on America, and now she can't for years."

Commercial Traveller: "What a brutal God."

Customer: "I don't see it."

Commercial Traveller: "Suppose you had a family of ten children and your brother the same, and you knew in ten years' time the children would quarrel—would you cut the throats of your ten?"

Customer: "Oh, no—"

Commercial Traveller: "Well, think it over."

## A European Poet.

I claim no place in the world of letters; I am, and will be alone.  
—Landor.

The like will never come again; he is inimitable.  
—Goethe.

BYRON is one of the most fascinating figures in English literature. He flashes through his brief life with a disastrous glory. An aristocrat, he championed the cause of the people. He was the Napoleon of passion and poetry, and, not only his own countrymen, but all Europe admired him. His life was a melodrama, and he caught the public fancy. When he died a soldier's death at Missolonghi, Byronism became a fashion. From Moscow to Madrid armies of young men lengthened their hair, shortened their collars, and were in love with poetry and their neighbours' wives. Both supremacy in genius and personality belong to Byron. Astonishing, perhaps, but what a man, what a poet!

There was nothing narrow or insular in Byron. His genius crossed all frontiers. He commanded attention throughout Europe. He moved the aged Goethe and the youthful Victor Hugo. What, said Castelar, does Spain not owe to Byron? Mazzini sounds the same note for Italy. Sainte Beauve, Stendhal, and Taine, speak of his power in France. He was the intellectual parent of Pushkin and other Russian writers, and the revival of Polish literature dates from Byron. Eckermann and others, in Germany, help to complete the verdict of the Continent. Why? Byron was a great poet, and he was easy to understand. He deals rhetorically with elemental emotions, and he enjoyed the fame of being a rebel, an exile, and a champion of the democracy. Eloquence makes the widest appeal for it expresses with vigour the simple feelings of men. "Give me liberty, or give me death," that is the kind of thing; a sonorous and impassioned phrase flung out at white heat to thrill the hearts of thousands. Byron's verse has this rhetorical quality. Verse upon verse of *Childe Harold* reads like oratory, grandiose and sweeping:—

Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll!

You can almost see the outstretched arm, hear the resonant voice. The effect is enormous. *The Isles of Greece*, and *Ode to Napoleon*, and *Lines on Completing My Thirty-sixth Year*, and many another poem, have the oratorical note and ring. Listen:—

The sword, the banner, and the field,  
Glory and Greece, around me see,  
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,  
Was not more free.

There is music in it; the trumpets sing to battle. Nor is this all, for Byron had a Voltairian gift of wit and satire, a command of mocking phrase and rhyme. There he was no actor, but all that was sincere in him became triumphant, and the writer of *Beppo* and *Don Juan* is a deathless delight. At least, he was a man. Like one of the Greek heroes, he was youthful and resplendent. His poetic rivals carved cherry-stones, he chose to hew granite. Byron sang of Freedom, took up arms in her cause, and died in her defence. What would you have? Even his stolid countrymen were captivated, whilst his heroic attitude fascinated a continent.

This gift of satire was perfectly natural and overflows into his private letters, which are among the best of their kind in the language. Who has not laughed at the description of his mother-in-law, "who has been dangerously ill, and is now dangerously well again"? And how good is his happy quotation of Shakespeare, after a crush at the Opera at Venice: "I almost beat a Venetian, and traduced the State." Byron had many facets to his rare genius.

Of course, Byron was a Freethinker. His sympathy

with the revolutionary spirit showed his Freethought, and he tells us that all forms of faith are of equal uselessness.

Foul superstition, howso'er disguised—  
Idol, saint, virgin, prophet, crescent, cross,  
For whatsoever symbol thou art prized—  
Thou sacerdotal gain, but general loss,  
What from true worship's gold can separate thy dross?

*Childe Harold* is saturated with the nature-worship of Rousseau, the same Jean Jacques whose books were condemned solemnly by the Archbishop of Paris. In this rare atmosphere the petty religions of man dwindle and disappear, "like snow upon the desert's dusty face."

Even gods must yield; religions take their turn;  
'Twas Jove's, 'tis Mahomet's, and other creeds  
Will rise with other years, till man shall learn.  
Vainly his incense soars, his victim bleeds—  
Poor child of doubt and death, whose hope is built on reeds.

Byron may have dreamt, like so many poets, of immortality; he certainly did not believe in it. How finely he apostrophises this longing:—

Still wilt thou dream on future joy and woe?  
Regard and weigh yon dust before it flies,  
That little word saith more than thousand homilies.

*The Vision of Judgment*, in which Byron's genius for satire has full force, is startling in its blasphemy. From its saucy opening, with the angels singing out of tune, to its close with old King George practising a hymn, it is full of mordant satire of the Christian religion. Every epithet hits, every line that does not convulse with laughter, stings. In the preface to *Cain*, a poem as full of profanity as an egg is full of meat, Byron remarks caustically that it is difficult to make the Devil "talk like a clergyman," and that he has endeavoured to restrain Satan within the bounds of "Spiritual politeness."

Leigh Hunt, his friend, says Byron was "an infidel by reading." Tom Moore, who knew him well and wrote his life, admits that the poet was "to the last a sceptic." Apparent as his heresies are in his poetry, his letters, particularly those to his friend, Hobhouse, show that he was no Christian. In his correspondence with the Rev. Francis Hodgson he is even more emphatic. His scepticism deepened as he grew older, but far too early came "the blind fury with the abhorred shears."

Few men so impressed themselves upon their generation. Tennyson has told us that when Byron died it was as though the firmament had lost some mighty star, in whose vanishing the world was left to darkness. When Byron went flashing and glowing down the troubled skies, trailing clouds of glory, his sudden quenching affected men as with the sense of some elemental phenomenon.

MIMNERMUS.

## Red Cabbage.

HELIOTROPE—O Sun-turn!—with emerald-purple veins,  
The great Red Cabbage laughs in her Sun, upon her openest plains;

Here's to the red-and-purple, awake in the sunny rays!  
Here's to the vast vermilion Pot that lightens the winter days!

Heliotrope and emerald, lighting the luscious mould,  
Here's to the opulent purple leaves, sprawling-curling bold:

Fleshful-strong in the sunlight, on the shelf dark-crimson-true;

Here, my brave Red Cabbage, here's to your purple-blue!

Miracle-cry of colour, radiant-redly-warm;  
Here's to the summer leafage, July in her lucent-storm;  
Brave and efficient and splendid, violet-veined and tall,  
Here's to the purple-hearted, with the great green leaves asprawl!

VICTOR B. NEUBURG.

## American Religion.

While the avowed creed of the enlightened minority is constantly changing under the influence of reflection and enquiry, the real, though unavowed, creed of the mass of mankind appears to be almost stationary, and the reason why it alters so little is that in the majority of men, whether they are savages or outwardly civilized beings, intellectual progress is so slow as to be hardly perceptible. The surface of society, like that of the sea, is in perpetual motion; its depths, like those of the ocean, remain almost unmoved.—Prof. J. G. Frazer, "Psyche's Task," 1913, p. 171.

THE denunciation of Darwinism, by Mr. Jennings Bryan in the United States, caused quite a sensation. It was reproduced and commented upon by our own Press quite as much as in the States. The general opinion here leans to the view that Mr. Bryan was a modern Rip Van Winkle just emerging from a fifty years sleep. It appears that the immediate occasion of Mr. Bryan's outburst was contained in a lecture delivered by Professor Bateson, the eminent Cambridge Professor of Biology, at the Toronto meeting of the American Association. In *Nature* (September 1, 1923) Professor Bateson gives, at the invitation of the editor, an account of the whole affair, which gives us some insight into the popular religious ideas ruling in America.

Professor Bateson says:—

I was addressing a scientific gathering, mainly professional. The opportunity was unique inasmuch as the audience included most of the American geneticists, a body several hundred strong, who have advanced that science with such extraordinary success. I therefore took occasion to emphasize the fact that though no one doubts the truth of evolution, we have as yet no satisfactory account of that particular part of the theory which is concerned with the origin of *species* in the strict sense. The purpose of my address was to urge my colleagues to bear this part of the problem constantly in mind, for to them the best chances of a solution are likely to occur. This theme was of course highly academic and technical.

But to guard against misrepresentation, by the advice of a friend, whose judgment proved sound, though the Professor regarded it as superfluous, he added the following paragraph:—

I have put before you very frankly the considerations which have made us agnostic as to the actual mode and processes of evolution. When such confessions are made the enemies of science see their chance. If we cannot declare here and now how species arose, they will obligingly offer us the solutions with which obscurantism is satisfied. Let us then proclaim in precise and unmistakable language that our faith in evolution is unshaken. Every available line of argument converges on this inevitable conclusion. The obscurantist has nothing to suggest which is worth a moment's attention. The difficulties which weigh upon the professional biologist need not trouble the layman. Our doubts are not as to the reality or truth of evolution, but as to the origin of *species*, a technical almost domestic problem. Any day that mystery may be solved. The discoveries of the last twenty-five years enable us for the first time to discuss these questions intelligently and on a basis of fact. That synthesis will follow on analysis, we do not and cannot doubt.

Professor Bateson, however, reckoned without the American Press which, always on the watch for a sensation, ignored the last paragraph, pounced upon the statement as to our ignorance of the origin of *species*, and went off in full cry with scare-headings, "Darwin Downed," and the like. Not from any sudden inspiration of religious emotion, but purely in the way of business, just as they would make the most of a Mermaid, or a Sea-serpent, if such were discovered.

Mr. Jennings Bryan, the leader of the Democratic Party, who has three times been a candidate for the presidency of the United States, and held office as Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson, now took a hand in the game. In a lecture delivered at Columbia City, Indiana, on July 24, before an audience of 3,000 people, Mr. Bryan declared:—

The greatest menace to civilization to-day is the theory that man is a brute, with brute blood in his veins and ancestors in the jungle.

And further:—

Darwinism is as false and ridiculous as nothing else has ever been. It enthrones selfishness as the controlling principle of the world, and judges man by brute standards and then closes the door of heaven against him. Darwin is the man whose birthday is celebrated in universities whose professors do not recognize the birthday of Jesus Christ.....We must drive the falsehood of Darwinism out of the public schools, or teach the children in our Sunday-schools that they are little apes.

The immediate effect of this tirade, to return to Professor Bateson's article again, was that:—

In Kentucky a Bill for suppressing all evolutionary teaching passed the House of Representatives, and was only rejected, I believe, by one vote, in the Senate of that State. In Arkansas the lower House passed a Bill to the same effect almost without opposition, but the Senate threw it out. Oklahoma followed a similar course. In Florida, the House of Representatives has passed, by a two-thirds vote, a resolution forbidding any instructor "to teach or permit to be taught Atheism, Agnosticism, Darwinism, or any other hypothesis that links man in blood relation to any form of life." This resolution was lately expected to pass the Senate. A melancholy case has been brought to my notice of a teacher in New Mexico who has been actually dismissed from his appointment for teaching evolution. This is said to have been at the instigation of a revivalist who visited the district, selling Mr. Bryan's book.

It is safe to say that no political leader in this country would make a public defence of Genesis to-day, even if one could be found holding such views. Mr. Gladstone, the last great defender of the science of the Bible, received the most terrible castigation, from the pen of Professor Huxley, ever publicly inflicted upon a great public character. That was more than thirty years ago. To-day bishops and other dignitaries of the Church proclaim with fervour, and an insistence which is becoming positively monotonous, their entire disbelief in the Bible stories of the Creation, the Deluge, and the Tower of Babel. Any attempt to galvanize them into life again would be met with derision by the democracy. In this respect we seem to be much ahead of the United States, although this outbreak seems to have been confined to the Southern States and did not affect the great cities.

Professor Bateson assumes rather a high-brow attitude over the matter; he says the chief interest of the proceedings consists in indications they give of what is to be expected when democracy throws

.....off authority and has begun to judge for itself on questions beyond its mental range. Those who have the capacity, let alone the leisure, to form independent judgments on such subjects have never been more than a mere fraction of any population..... Nor is it, perhaps, of prime importance that the people of Kentucky or even of "Main Street" should be rightly instructed in evolutionary philosophy. Mr. Bryan may have been quite right in telling them that it was better to know "Rock of Ages" than the ages of rocks. If we are allowed to gratify our abnormal instincts in the search for natural truth, we must be content, and we may be thankful if we are not all hanged like the Clerk of Chatham, with our ink-horns about our necks.

It is not true to say that the masses are lacking the "mental range" and "capacity." What they lack is the training and education, which we have yet to learn that Professor Bateson has done anything to help them to attain. What the Professor means by saying that Mr. Bryan may have been right in the matter of the "Rock of Ages" we do not know, unless he means that any old myth and legend is good enough for the people, if so, then it is a very contemptible sentiment, and reveals a complete lack of sympathy with the masses. How different was Professor Clifford's attitude when he declared: "If a thing is true, let us all believe it, rich and poor, men, women and children."

W. MANN.

(To be Concluded.)

### Charles Bradlaugh—Iconoclast and Reformer.

Born September 26, 1833—Died January 30, 1891; It seems almost incredible to me that the famous Charles Bradlaugh has already been dead thirty-two years, and that many of the present day Freethinkers never had the privilege of seeing or hearing that wonderful man. I first saw him when he was quite a young man, in the year 1874, and I was only a youth of nineteen. In the same year I heard him lecture at the Hall of Science, and I was at once captivated by his wonderful personality and irresistible logic and eloquence of his address. About this time I remember that the famous Charles Haddon Spurgeon, the great Baptist preacher of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington Butts, had referred to Mr. Bradlaugh in one of his publications as the "infidel lecturer" who addressed his followers in "a corrugated iron shed in Old Street, City Road," to which statement Bradlaugh retorted in a clever article in the *National Reformer* that though it was quite true that he did lecture in a hall so constructed, the working people who came to listen to him were induced to do so "by their passionate love of truth," whereas those who crowded the Tabernacle were drawn there, for the most part, "by the fear of Hell." That was one of my earliest recollections of the great Freethinker. Later in the year I heard Mr. Bradlaugh debate with the Rev. Brewin Grant at the Bow and Bromley Institute. It was a six nights' discussion, or rather it should have been, but the reverend gentleman indulged in such a tirade of abuse against his opponent that some very exciting scenes took place, and on the fifth night the North London Railway Company, to whom the Institute belonged, closed the Hall, and the rest of the proceedings took place on some waste ground a few hundred yards away. I followed the crowd to this outdoor pitch and heard Dr. Moncure D. Conway and the Rev. Arthur Mursell deliver short speeches condemning the method of disputation adopted by the Rev. Brewin Grant, but though Mr. Bradlaugh was ready to continue the debate under very disadvantageous circumstances, his reverend opponent did not think it judicious to put in an appearance, and so the proceedings came to a premature conclusion.

As an example of the kind of spirit manifested in those days, I remember when at the close of one of Mr. Bradlaugh's wonderfully powerful speeches dealing with some of the obviously immoral teachings of the Old Testament, I ventured to applaud, several elderly Christians scowled at me, and one said I ought to be ashamed of myself for applauding such sentiments. As I remember him at that time Mr. Bradlaugh, who was just over forty years of age, was a fine looking man, over six feet in height with a massive head, a clean shaven face, and a striking countenance, altogether a most distinguished looking

personage, indeed, no man I ever saw carried upon his face more clearly the impress of his great character. Already he had established his reputation as a consummate orator, a wonderful debater, a skilful lawyer, a politician, a statesman, and a social reformer. When I think of the marvellous versatility of his talents, and of his extraordinary power over an audience, I cannot help rejoicing as a Freethinker in the fact that he devoted all the talents of his trained intellect and his wonderful oratory to the cause of intellectual liberty and social progress.

As a Freethought lecturer he first appeared before the public under the name of "Iconoclast" (the breaker of idols). It was a name he chose for himself, and he certainly lived up to it. The Bible was the great idol of the Christians in his early days. The clergy regarded it then as God's inspired word—from the first line in Genesis to the last in Revelation.

Charles Bradlaugh set himself the task of attempting to shatter this belief and idolatry of the Bible, and before he finished his career this part of his work was well nigh accomplished. The clergy were compelled to modify their beliefs, and many of them confessed, no doubt with reluctance, that the Bible or at all events the Pentateuch could no longer be regarded either as scientific, historic, or, in some of its passages, as even moral. Well, that was a great advance, and Bradlaugh both as a lecturer and a writer had contributed largely towards that result. But Charles Bradlaugh did not limit his iconoclastic work merely to the destruction of the alleged inspiration of the Bible; he carried his warfare further and showed that some of the Bible saints were very far from perfect characters, and his new Lives of Abraham, Jacob, and David did much to shatter further idols of the Christian Faith.

When he was able to give up his employment in the office of a solicitor, after he came out of the army, and devote himself entirely to public work, he gave up the name of "Iconoclast," and henceforth lectured under his own name, but he had not finished with his iconoclastic labours. He turned his attention to the New Testament and did his best to destroy another and more important idol of the Christian Faith, *viz.*, the belief in the Jesus of the Gospels as the very God, and in his pamphlet, *What Did Jesus Teach?* he sought to show that Jesus, if he ever lived, was a weak kind of character, and that most of his teachings were either impracticable, or mischievous, or both.

Bradlaugh was a great dialectician and could debate the abstract question of "Is there a God?" with as much skill as any controversialist I have ever heard, but as a debater he preferred to attack the anthropomorphic conception of the God of the Bible, and in this form of controversy he was invincible. In the numerous debates in which he took part he discussed such questions as "Can miracles be proved possible?" with a skilled mathematician like Mr. Walter R. Browne, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and found an opponent worthy of his steel. He also debated with George Jacob Holyoake on the question of whether Secularism did or did not include Atheism. With the Rev. A. J. Harrison, Father Ignatius, the Rev. R. A. Armstrong, the Rev. W. M. Westerby, and many others he discussed various phases of the Christian religion; he also debated with a Mr. Burns on the question of Spiritualism. But to get some idea of the versatility of Mr. Bradlaugh's talent the reader should consult the splendid record of her father's life's work in the two volumes by Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner (*Charles Bradlaugh—His Life and Work by His Daughter*), and also a later volume, *The Life of Charles Bradlaugh*, by his friend and late co-worker, the Right Hon. J. M. Robertson (Watts & Co., Johnson's Court). In this brief article I am merely giving a few slight

## Acid Drops.

We are pleased to see a reviewer of Mr. W. G. Waters' *Suffolk in Literature* saying in the *Eastern Daily Express*, in reply to the author's deprecatory comments on Paine:—

Mr. Waters is somewhat critical of Paine, and apparently unaware of the researches of Dr. Moncre D. Conway and others or he would not have repeated legends as to his "brutal temper," and "this very unsavoury person," which had no foundation save the malice of his opponents. Reference is made to his "defective education," which was that of Thetford Grammar School, and the assertion that "even among those who more or less favoured his views apologists have been few," is probably accounted for by the fact that they could see little for which to apologise.

That is very well said, but more might be said. In the first place there is the lack of a sense of moral obligation shown by so many writers when dealing with unorthodox persons. Everyone must know that these are the very ones who suffer most from the slanders of their opponents, and it is therefore a matter of plain duty to see that stories about their character and their life are carefully examined. In the case of others this would be done. In the case of men like Paine it is felt that one may be as careless as one pleases, the wilder the story the better pleased will be the orthodox believer. And even though the narrator is proved to be an unscrupulous liar, as so many evangelists have been shown to be, the very pious will not fail to sympathize with them. They were lying for the glory of God, and no good and genuine Christian will bear hardly upon them for that fault.

Secondly, the slander on Paine—one of many that might be cited—is an illustration of the immoral consequences of a fervent belief in Christianity. These lies all originated in a fervent Christian belief. They were circulated by fervent believers, from the evangelist in the gutter to the Bishop in his palace. Good Christians of all kinds paid for their distribution, and even where Christians are compelled to admit that the stories are lies, and nothing but lies, there is seldom a word of condemnation of those who manufactured them, and never of the religious belief that motived their creation. In all seriousness we know of no other form of belief that has so effectively confused, weakened, and undermined man's sense of moral obligation and particularly of truth-speaking as Christianity has done.

The piety of Woking is to remain unbroken. By a majority of eighteen votes to two the Urban Council decided not to permit games on the public grounds on Sunday. There is a prevalent superstition that England is a civilized country. The prevalence of the belief shows the power of persistent advertising.

The progress of Christianity in England does not please the Rev. F. C. Spurr, according to his remarks at Grimsby. "England is a heathen country with a certain number of Christians in it." We always thought that England was an island surrounded by water, but probably the falling off in the collection plates would be a correct diagnosis of the reverend gentleman's complaint.

The Rev. E. Lees, of Brentwood, Essex, says that clerical dress is too gloomy. It ought to be more like that of a wedding guest, or something really cheerful. We suggest, prayerfully, the form of dress worn by racing touts at Newmarket. Or, perhaps, the younger curates might prefer to wear boating "blazers."

In the Anglican Church papers a discussion is being carried on as to why so few boys from our public schools take Holy Orders. Various reasons are assigned, but one or two of the writers venture to affirm unhesitatingly that the real cause is the inability of most intelligent young

impressions of Bradlaugh as I knew him and the influence he had upon the masses of the people who came to hear him, whether on politics or religion. In 1880 he was returned as one of the members of Parliament for Northampton, and when he presented himself to take his seat, there was the question of whether he would be allowed to do so without going through the form of taking the oath. He asked first of all to be allowed to affirm on the same grounds as the Quaker, the Moravian, or the Separatist, but he was not allowed to do so. He then said that he was willing to take the oath as the law required, and that the oath would be just as binding upon his conscience as any form of affirmation; but he was not allowed to take the oath either. One day he presented himself at the table of the House, took a New Testament from his pocket, read the words of the oath and kissed the book, and to the consternation of the Tory minority, took his seat. Sir Stafford Northcote then moved that he be expelled from the precincts of the House, but he stood at the table and refused to budge an inch, and Sir Stafford finally moved that he be sent to the Clock Tower, which motion was carried.

Charles Bradlaugh went to the Clock Tower, and his name was immediately flashed broadcast all over the world. It is usual when a member is sent to the Clock Tower for him to apologise before he is allowed to come down, but Sir Stafford Northcote found that he had made a mistake, and he had to find a means of getting the member for Northampton down himself. Four times was Charles Bradlaugh elected as member for Northampton before he was allowed to take his seat, and the four speeches which he delivered at the bar of the House stand as a permanent record of the finest arguments ever delivered in such an assembly in favour of a duly elected member of Parliament being allowed to take his seat who was willing to take the oath as the law required, though he would rather as a Freethinker have made an affirmation. Those who followed Bradlaugh during these exciting times will never be likely to forget them if they live to be a hundred. Bradlaugh was a practical man of the world besides being a politician and a statesman. As soon as possible after he had taken his seat he introduced a Bill making it lawful for all persons who had a conscientious objection to taking an oath, whether Christians or non-Christians, to make an affirmation. And that Bill became Law. But I regret that even to-day Freethinkers do not all avail themselves of this most rational and beneficent Act. If, however, Freethinkers of the rising generation could only realize the amount of persecution to which Charles Bradlaugh and other Freethinkers had been subjected before this Act was passed they would assuredly avail themselves of every opportunity of taking advantage of an Act that puts them on an equality with their Christian brethren before the Law.

Bradlaugh proved himself a real statesman while he was in the House of Commons, and did most important and useful service, and we all have to deplore his early death. He died when he was only fifty-seven years of age, and his death was brought about very largely by the rough treatment he received when trying to take his seat as the duly elected member for Northampton. But he played a noble part in life, and has certainly won the admiration and respect of the majority of his fellows. On his grave may we not respectfully place this epitaph, which most fittingly describes his character and purpose in life?—

Honour to him who, self-complete if lone,  
Carves to the grave one pathway all his own,  
And heeding nought that men may think or say,  
Asks but his soul, if doubtful of the way.

—First Lord Lytton.

ARTHUR B. MOSS.

men of to-day to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles. One writer condemned those Articles as containing intolerable and humiliating stuff.

The Great War is ancient history and is now written down by all thoughtful people as being in the nature of a civil war in the house of Europe. We see that the second volume of Mr. Winston Churchill's opus magnum for pale people, entitled *The World Crisis*, is coming out towards the middle of next month. Many of our readers who only read placards, which is the correct way of reading newspapers, will notice that we are having a crisis seven days a week in these happy times. With our blessing we wish this second volume a speedy transit to the twopenny box, or as an alternative to be given away with a relief ticket. It used to be from "Log Cabin to White House." That is all changed now to read, from "Downing Street to Fleet Street"; with ex-politicians and deans writing for the papers, etc., we trust that the economic boot will pinch so hard that these people will realize why unfortunate people choose the Thames instead of Christian charity.

What theologian is writing on "Ignorance and Discipline" in the *Times Literary Supplement*? He, or should it be she, remarks upon unspecified people "treating sin as an antiquated invention of the theologians." By the invention of sin Nietzsche said that the priest was enabled to rule. If you do not care for this foreign opinion of sin, try this English brand, taken from Bagehot's *Literary Studies*, Henry Crabb Robinson's *Memoirs*. "One day when someone remarked 'Christianity is part and parcel of the land,' Lord Crawworth said to me, 'Were you ever employed to draw an indictment against a man for not loving his neighbour as himself?'"

It is possible to see reflected in a dewdrop the immensity of clouds and sky; it is also possible to see the mighty and complex problems of existence reduced to a simple answer. When the traffic of London was thundering by St. Paul's, and the papers were shouting at an inoffensive public about the capers of Mussolini, men, women and children could be seen feeding the pigeons on the steps of the Cathedral. The general atmosphere of trust surrounding these birds is wonderful; one hopes that this reconciliation between man and the lower kingdom might be imitated between man and man.

There have been volumes written on a more slender thesis than the following one contained in this true story. Pat was the pet name of a little daughter of a Catholic father, and a mother who was "nothing" in religious matters. Pat wished to see some rabbits belonging to the young woman Mary, who came to her home to assist in the housework. "Mary has asked me to see her rabbits," ventured Pat to her mother. "Are you quite sure she asked you?" inquired the sceptical mother. This direct question cornered Pat, for she had allowed her curiosity the privilege of invention. Found out in this fib, Pat was refused; she cried, stamped, and then in desperation called out, "If I go upstairs and say eight 'Hail! Marys' can I go?" She is still waiting to see the rabbits. Freethinkers are often called upon in the name of morality; we have here an instance of the quick-witted child taking advantage of what she doubtless believes to be a perfectly straightforward manner of disposing of a lie. *Ex pede*, etc., at later years this belongs to lying for the glory of God.

The King recently attended a Presbyterian Church service at Crathie. As he has visited the Pope at the Vatican, and he himself is the head of the Established Church of England, he may safely describe himself as "undenominational." And the Articles of the Church Service tell us what happens to those very unfortunate persons.

A good story is going the rounds concerning the Bishop of London, who is said to have told a meeting that when

he first went to Bethnal Green it was a "sink, a morass, a cesspool of sin," but when he left it after some years of work it was "God's own fair garden." A listener, seated next to the Rector of Bethnal Green, asked if this were a true description. "It wasn't," answered the rector, "when I left at half-past eleven this morning."

The Rev. J. E. Wakerley died suddenly while attending a reception meeting at Castleford, Yorkshire. No moral!

St. James's Church, Kennington Park, S.E., has been turned into a canteen. This is a conversion which will not be talked of in religious circles.

Enforcement of prohibition in the United States this year has cost £16,400,000. Evading prohibition has probably cost more.

There is a popular saying that those who live in glass-houses should not throw stones. Most people are guided in their actions by these admirable crystallizations of common-sense, but the parsons, we are afraid, are notoriously stupid in this respect. They learn nothing from experience, and the wisdom of the ages has seemingly no meaning for them. The other day we had a bishop, Dr. Welldon, bitterly depreciating the intelligence and culture of the teacher in our elementary schools. This ill-mannered cleric was at one time, we believe, the headmaster of Harrow, an aristocratic and exclusive institution absurdly described as a public school. Naturally from his exalted position as a pillar of the English Church and ex-mentor of our youthful snobs and barbarians, he has an unlimited contempt for the men who have elected to train the workers' children in what a friend of Mr. H. A. L. Fisher called our "Damned Board Schools."

Frankly the teachers in our primary schools are, in the main, much more intelligent than the devisors of the system under which they are forced to work. They can see what is wrong with the system, and why it is an elaborate and expensive failure. When they happen to be economically independent and sufficiently courageous they put their indictment in plain English. We know of nothing better in the way of vigorous criticism of official stupidity than Mr. George Sampson's little study of national education, *English for the English*. Mr. Sampson, we are satisfied, does but give expression to the opinions of the majority of his fellow teachers. Dr. Welldon's depreciation is only another example of clerical abuse. If he wants a comparison between the average intelligence of the clergy and that of the maligned primary teachers he can have it. We can promise him that the parson class would show up very badly.

During a service at Hemmingbrough Church, Selby, Yorkshire, the congregation was startled by a blinding flash followed by a loud explosion. Perhaps some of the excitable people in the pews thought that Satan was at large again.

A boycott of British goods has been proclaimed by a large gathering of religious devotees in Teheran, Persia. Trouble and theology always seem to run in double harness.

Civilization is not an unmixed blessing. The imports of raw spirits into Sierra Leone, West Africa, for 1922 amounted to £68,145, states a Colonial Office report.

Italian newspapers report a conflict of opinion between some of the Fascismo and the Roman Catholics. We hope that this does not portend that some Fascists will call upon Papa at the Vatican with a pint bottle of castor oil.



## Our Sustentation Fund.

WE have received many congratulatory letters on the striking response to what was said in the *Freethinker* for September 16. It looks as though our readers intended to break records with the promptitude of their reply. Probably the feeling of most of the letters sent is expressed in the following from Mr. H. Dawson: "When the millionaire comes along he will no doubt be very welcome, but I'll be — if I should be prouder than I was to-day to see the prompt and ready response, and the kind words of the first seventy-nine gallants. More power to ye!"

One of the old London stalwarts, Mr. A. J. Fincken, sends his cheque for £5 and adds the following: "Our late chief used to say that every public man must create his own audience. Last week's *Freethinker* is indisputable evidence you have created yours. A record! But how deserved! Always creating new converts while holding the esteem and admiration of the old ones must help to make your mental pillow comfortable. Here's to your very good health and all those near and dear to you and to the success of the Cause which you so admirably lead, and to which I always feel proud to belong."

Mr. Vincent J. Hands writes: "I feel increasingly the value of the *Freethinker*. It has been more than a 'guide, philosopher, and friend' to me. Not only does it help me to keep a stiff upper lip in the battle of life, but it consoles me in the bitter hours of affliction. The tragedy of human life does not admit of a moral justification, but the associates that gather round a cause such as ours help us in no small degree to compensate for the ills that flesh is heir to."

So from an Ayrshire friend, Mr. S. Scott: "Your relation towards your readers, it seems to me, is different from that of most other editors. I think all your readers would agree with me when I say that we regard you as a personal friend, helper, and adviser—every one of us. We seem to form one great united family, yourself being the head and centre of it."

"John's Grandpa" says: "Let me thank you for giving your readers a chance to do what they can to help you. You have no idea in what esteem the *Freethinker* is held by its readers. Your appeal to them is not like other appeals for money or help. We are all anxious to have the chance.....I intend taking four copies of the *Freethinker* weekly for the whole of next year, giving three of them to my newsagent and paying him a commission if he sells them."

We fancy if all were ready to do something in that way there might soon be an end of our financial troubles.

H. M. Hall tells us that "Every Thursday is Holy Thursday to me, but it does not come often enough."

An old Scottish, Freethinker, Mr. J. Ralston, says: "I consider you have done magnificently. It should be an honour to the rank and file of your readers to be given the opportunity to show their gratitude for the weekly treat you and your contributors give them."

Many other readers have written in similar or warmer strains. The appreciation shown for what has been done is heartening to all concerned. We do indeed feel that *Freethinker* readers form one great family. The pity is that there are not opportunities for some sort of a periodical family gathering. One day, perhaps that may be managed. For the present I will only say that work for the Freethought Cause has always been with me a labour of love, and it will continue to be so. And I am proud of the men and women who are with me in that work. Their esteem adds a fresh incentive to renewed effort."

"Cine Sere," from whom we acknowledged a cheque for £5 5s. last week, is so encouraged by the first list

that he writes: "I have decided to double my donation and enclose cheque for a further five guineas. You, Sir, I have never met, nor would I trespass on your valuable time, but judging from the fearless expression of opinion in your journal I feel it is but a dutiful tribute to assist in supporting its maintenance. It must be kept going, and it is quite evident that you have a number of supporters who possess what Christian doctrinaires frequently call 'vision.'" Our time is never so taken up that we have not some time to spare to meet anyone who is interested in the Cause.

"A Cleric" says, "I love your masterly arguments and Mr. Lloyd's exposures, and see nothing for it but rubbing it in week after week. Things are not moving slowly either." "It sounds paradoxical," says Mr. S. Clowes, "to say that it is a pleasure to feel we are doing something in common with other *Freethinker* readers to keep the old paper going." We are delighted to find that this feeling is very general, much as we regret the occasion that gives it opportunity for expression in this way.

L. Rawlinson writes: "I was interested in the suggestion made by Mr. Bush, and also in the one that came from Mr. Easterbrook: If it were possible to raise a substantial sum of money, sufficient to produce once for all enough to cover the yearly loss on the *Freethinker*, they who give would give once for all, and all trouble on that head would end. And if the business of raising this sum of money was given over to a sort of financial committee that would leave the editor's hands and brain free for other and worthier work."

I greatly appreciate Mr. Rawlinson's motive in making this suggestion, but I am afraid that short of one or two very wealthy Freethinkers coming forward, the sum of money that would be required to produce £300 or £400 annually would be too large for me or a committee to attempt to raise. There are enough Freethinkers in the country to do it if they were so inclined, but —. As to the other suggestion, I can only repeat what I said last week, namely, that if any select committee could be formed for the purpose of seeing to the financing of the paper, it would relieve me of much trouble and worry, and leave my mind free for other work. Both matters are really in the hands of those who are interested in the welfare of the paper and in the progress of the Cause.

We are obliged to again hold over some letters till next week.

Second list of acknowledgments: Previously acknowledged, £253 6s. 6d. Preston Branch N.S.S. (per Miss Vance), £1 11s. 6d.; W. S. Ambrose, 2s.; C. F. Simpson, £1 1s.; J. Crompton, £5; G. Watter, £5; W. Booth, 10s.; V. Wilson, 5s.; S. Scott, 10s.; H. King, £5 5s.; H. L., £2 2s.; S. H. Waite, £2; J. Ralston, £1; H. Tucker, £1; W. Robertson, £5; A. G. Lye, £1; H. M. Hall, £1; Dr. C. R. Niven, £2; A. S. Dowding, 10s.; S. Holman, 2s. 6d.; R. Blakely, £1 1s.; R. V., 5s.; A. F. Wey, £1; J. Capon, £1; William May, £1; A. W. Davis, £2 2s.; "John's Grandpa," £2 2s.; J. Seddon, 10s.; V. J. Hands, £1; A. H. Deacon, 5s.; W. Wilmer, £2; Mrs. E. Adams, £2 2s.; Thomas Dixon, £2 2s. 6d.; Cine Sere, £5 5s.; A Cleric, £2; J. R. Lickfold, 10s.; S. Clowes, 5s.; J. Breese (in memory of F. W. Walsh), £1; J. Breese, £2; G. B. Church, 5s.; W. E. Pugh, £1 1s.; E. Lechmere, 2s. 6d.; A. Bullock, 5s.; H. Rawlinson, £1; Maydue, 7s.; R. Young, £1; Stuart Musty, 5s.; Mrs. S. Musty, 2s. 6d.; T. Musty, 2s. 6d.; A. E. Maddock, £1; A. J. Fincken, £5; H. Boll, 15s.; J. A. Reid, 5s.; J. Thompson, 5s.; H. Good, £1; W. Howells, £2 2s.; A. R. Clark, 10s. 6d.; G. Smith, £1; R. Daniell, 5s. 6d.; Dr. A. W. Laing, £5 5s.; F. Shaller, 10s.; A. H. Dingwall, £5; J. Roberts, 10s.;

Dr. J. Laing, £3 3s.; Robson Paige, 2s. 6d.; W. Williams, 2s. 6d.; M. Barnard, 10s.; T. Sharp, 5s.; C. H. B., 5s.; Two Derby Freethinkers, 5s. Total, £340 os. 6d.

Correction: A subscription of £5 from Mrs. C. M. Renton was omitted from last week's list.

We shall be obliged if subscribers will point out any omissions or inaccuracies that appear.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### 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.

D. W. ALLEN.—We are pleased to learn that there is every prospect of the sales of the *Freethinker* being increased locally. That is the very best way of helping us, since it brings us nearer the point when we shall be paying our way. If a thousand of our readers took only one copy extra per week, and resolved to find during the year one new reader, we should find things at this end wearing a very different complexion. What is needed is so many in each locality to see that this side of the work receives attention.

H. L.—We should very much like to advertise, but until advertisers will allow us to pay them out of profits, and wait for payment till the profits are made, we do not see where the means to do so are to come from. The reply to D. W. Allen gives a very cheap and effective form of advertising if our readers would only settle down to it.

W. BOOTH.—Superstition, as you say, is rampant. But we pride ourselves that what we are doing has some effect in limiting its power.

A. W. DAVIS.—Sorry to learn that you have had illness in the house. Glad to know that the operation was successful. Best wishes for a quick recovery.

W. WILMER.—Thanks. Every time the paper is brought before the public it stands a good chance of getting a new reader, and a new subscriber is a potential worker for the Cause as well as an extra item towards putting the paper on a paying basis.

J. STEWART.—We have not the address, but it will be left at the office as we expect him to call.

R. BLAKELY.—We wish you a pleasant holiday in Switzerland, but no neck-breaking, please.

J. CAPON.—We did not willingly undertake the responsibility of debt, and until we made ourselves responsible for the *Freethinker* had nothing of that kind to bother us. But the paper had to be kept going. One contributor to the Fund said that England without the *Freethinker* would be unthinkable. We are quite certain it would be undesirable.

ELEMENTARY STUDENT.—Next week.

W. A. HOLROYD.—We hope to see you many more times before you say good-bye to this world. Don't bother about the smallness of your contribution. We trust we shall never be guilty of valuing a giver in terms of his gift. It is the spirit behind that tells, whether the sum be large or small.

A. E. MADDOCK.—We do not see in what way the situation would be bettered if the N.S.S. made itself responsible for the upkeep of the *Freethinker*. The loss would still have to be made good.

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.

Mr. Cohen had a first rate meeting at Birmingham on Sunday last. The large Town Hall was comfortably filled, and the greatest attention was paid to the lecture from the first sentence to the last. As this was the opening of the lecture season for the Branch, as well as Mr. Cohen's first meeting this season, the result may be taken as a happy augury for the rest of the year. In the absence of Mr. Williams, who was prevented being at the Town Hall in time owing to some difficulties with the trams, the chair was taken by Mr. F. E. Willis, J.P. There were a number of questions asked at the close of the lecture, and we believe there was a fair sale of literature.

On Sunday next (October 7) Mr. Cohen will deliver two lectures in the Salford Town Hall. It will be remembered that there was some little excitement in Salford some time since over the exclusion of the *Freethinker* from the public library. Mr. Cohen will deal with the matter in the course of his lectures, and the visit, we understand, is creating some little local interest.

The death of Lord Morley removes a figure from English life, and but for want of a little strength in his character it would have meant the removal of a great figure. But his was not the type that fights a forlorn hope in the face of the world, and when this was required there was a certain readiness to compromise that served as a satirical comment upon a great deal that he wrote in the best of his books *On Compromise*. Still, he was a clean fighter, and undoubtedly exercised an influence for the better on English political life. It cannot be said that he lived to see that influence grow. Politics were never more sordid than at present, and could "Honest John" have been brought to publish his undiluted opinions on the proceedings of the past ten years they would have been worth reading. But we add our tribute to one who stood head and shoulders above most of the politicians with whom he perforce mixed.

As was to be expected our contemptible Press maintained a steady silence as to Lord Morley's opinions on religion. The only paper we have seen that made any reference to it was the *Evening Standard*, which spoke of him as "a professed unbeliever." The rest kept silent, and so told their usual lie by simply not telling the truth that should have been told. Had Lord Morley been a Christian we should have been told of the church he attended and the minister he sat under. Unfortunately this policy of the Press is rendered easier by the silence that so many of our public men maintain about their religious, or irreligious, beliefs. They pave the way for misrepresentation. To do something to counteract the silence we are reprinting in these columns G. W. Foote's essay on *John Morley as a Freethinker*. We think our readers will appreciate it, and it may serve as a suitable occasion on which to introduce the paper to new readers.

To-day (September 30) Mr. Lloyd pays a visit to Fails-worth. He will speak twice in the Secular School, Pole Lane, in the afternoon at 2.45, and in the evening at 6.30. Subjects, "Love of Life," and "Whirligig of Time." The Committee announce that this will be Mr. Lloyd's last visit, owing to "his advancement in years," and so wish to make the meetings something of a special character. We do not know whether this announcement is made with Mr. Lloyd's sanction or not. We presume it is. But on that point we know nothing definite. Mr.

Lloyd has spoken to us once or twice about giving up the platform, but we did not know that he had come to any definite decision on the matter.

The West Ham Branch concluded a very successful open-air season with a Freethought demonstration on Sunday last. There were seven speakers, which included one lady, who put the Freethought case in a way that commanded the appreciation of the audience. The Branch has not yet managed to secure a hall for its regular winter meetings, but accommodation for Branch meetings has been kindly provided by Mr. and Mrs. Walker at 89 Claremont Road, E. Concerning the position of the Branch, Mr. R. H. Rosetti writes: "I feel sure that you will be glad to know that during my membership of West Ham, fifteen years at least, the membership has never been higher or more alive, the finances of the Branch never more healthy than to-day. Believe me it gives me great pleasure to be able to report this to you, but I am still not satisfied." We should have been disappointed had Mr. Rosetti been content. There is always room for growth, and with such a band of workers as West Ham possesses growth is assured.

Mr. Whitehead writes us that the weather at Plymouth during the first week of his visit has been very bad, but in spite of this he managed to hold seven meetings, all of which went off well. He is looking for better weather during the last week of his visit, and we hope he will not be disappointed.

The Glasgow Branch is bringing its series of summer rambles to a close to-day (September 30) with a visit to the Art Galleries. Friends will meet at the Old Galleries at 2 o'clock. After this the Branch will settle down to its work for the winter. Mr. Cohen will give the first lectures of the session on October 14.

We must impress upon those who are interested that admission to the N.S.S. Social will be by ticket only, application for which must be made to the Secretary. This condition is necessary owing to the limited accommodation and also to facilitate making the necessary arrangements. Full particulars will be found on the back page of this issue. It is hoped to arrange more of these gatherings later in the season.

#### DEATH OF MR. F. WOOD.

Just as we are going to press we learn of the death of Mr. F. Wood, one of the oldest of members, a Director of the Secular Society, Limited, and for many years a member of the National Secular Society's Executive. Mr. Wood had been ailing for some time, so that his death was not unexpected. The cremation is fixed to take place at West Norwood Crematorium, on Thursday, September 27, at 11.30. Probably this issue of the *Freethinker* will be in the hands of London readers in time to apprise them of the fact. Mr. Moss will conduct the service, and we understand that a tramcar (No. 83) will take travellers from the foot of Blackfriars Bridge to the gates of the Crematorium. A full obituary notice will appear next week.

#### COURAGE.

Let us be brave!  
 What use to flinch? We have no ground to spare.  
 Flinch not be dare!  
 Outstep slow time audaciously, and have!  
 Let us be brave!  
 Bold, no foolhardy; bravely self-controlled  
 To strike or hold,  
 To advance or bide—howe'er to headstrong rave.  
 Let us be brave!  
 The true man falters never; come what may  
 He treads away  
 The same straight path towards his hero-grave.

—W. J. Linton.

### John (Lord) Morley as a Freethinker.

THE following estimate of John (Lord) Morley was written some years ago by the late G. W. Footc. It is reprinted here as of likely interest to readers.

Only a few people, relatively speaking, have read Mr. Morley's writings. There is consequently no general acquaintance with his opinions outside the sphere of politics, although the readers of rabid Tory journals may have noticed occasional sneers at his "Agnosticism," or his "Positivism," or his "Freethought." But as Mr. Morley's opinions are the result of deep study and long reflection, they are really convictions, and as such they should be of interest to his admirers.

Mr. Morley resembles Charles Bradlaugh in one respect; he is to a great extent a disciple of John Stuart Mill, whom he has described as "the wisest man I ever knew, or am ever likely to know." He is also, but to a less extent, a disciple of Auguste Comte; and we believe he is not averse to being considered a Positivist.

John Stuart Mill was a complete sceptic with regard to Christianity, nor had he any positive belief in Theism. He thought there *might be* a God of limited power and wisdom, but certainly not a deity who is all-wise and all-good. Auguste Comte went farther. While opposed to continued critical attacks on theology, he still set it resolutely aside as a mark of the childish stage of human development. He proposed to re-organize Society without God and without King by the systematic cultus of Humanity. "All theological tendencies," said Comte, "whether Catholic, Protestant, or Deist, really serve to prolong and aggravate our moral anarchy." He even denied sincerity to the more zealous theological partisans. "God to them," he said, "is but the nominal chief of a hypocritical conspiracy, a conspiracy which is even more contemptible than it is odious. Their object is to keep the people from all great social improvements by assuring them that they will find compensation for their miseries in an imaginary future life."

Mr. Morley is not a militant Freethinker after the fashion of Charles Bradlaugh. He is of different temperament and mental constitution. Mr. Bradlaugh, for instance, was a *popular* man in the best and fullest sense of the word. When Mr. Morley began public life he had to deliberately set himself to acquire a platform style. Popular work is not natural to him; he does it by an effort; and as he is a man of resolute intellectual training, he is achieving success in this direction; but he will never possess the electric quality of a great orator. There is, so to speak, a touch of pedantry about his writing and speaking. It is not exactly offensive, but it shows the scrupulosity of the scholar, as opposed to the audacity of the propagandist.

Nevertheless, in his own way, Mr. Morley has been an effective propagandist. He has addressed other classes than those reached by Charles Bradlaugh. His method is not that of direct attack, but of patient sapping and mining. We shall not attack you (he once said to the priests, though he put the expression into the mouth of Chaumette), we shall explain you. In the long run this is indispensable. It completes the work of destruction. It banishes any lurking suspicion that the falsehood may be true. When a superstition is once explained, when its origin and development, in conditions of imperfect knowledge, have been traced out, there is an absolute end to its power of imposture. Until this is done the task of criticism is only half finished and even the first half of it may have to be done over again.

Let us not quarrel with Nature. Let us be grateful for all her gifts. There is room for both Bradlaugh and Morleys in the great temple of Humanity.

During Mr. Morley's editorship of the *Fortnightly Review*, it was the organ of the most advanced minds in England. Mill, Tyndall, Harrison, Huxley, and Clifford contributed to its pages. Clifford took to spelling God with a small g, and the *Spectator* retaliated by spelling Clifford with a small c.

A great deal of Mr. Morley's best writing appeared in the *Fortnightly*. Profoundly attracted by the great men who prepared the French mind for the Revolution, he composed admirable monographs on Turgot, Condorcet, Rousseau, Voltaire, and Diderot—besides minor studies of such moralists as Vauvenargues. Most of them, if not all, have been republished. Rousseau and Voltaire have a volume each, and two volumes are devoted to Diderot.

Mr. Morley's is the best book by an Englishman on Voltaire. Without glossing over Voltaire's failings, he sees in the Heresiarch of Ferney a brilliant liberator of the human spirit, and a resolute friend of the victims of injustice and oppression. He does honour to Voltaire's heroism in the vindication of Calas, and defends him from the charge of levity, brought against him by men without a tittle of his passion for humanity. He justifies Voltaire's attack on the superstition of his age, and points out that he never ridiculed men of sincerity, who lived good lives in spite of a barbarous faith. But it can hardly be said that Mr. Morley is quite successful in his purely literary criticism of Voltaire. Strange as it may appear to Mr. Morley's enemies, he is overweighted by his convictions; and thus he brings a too great seriousness to the treatment of Voltaire's lighter and more fantastic work. When the great wit deliberately skins an enemy alive, it spoils the sport to be too considerate of the loftier motives of philosophy. The performance is done with such exquisite skill, and in nearly every case the victim deserved skinning.

All good readers know that Matthew Arnold quotes and adopts from Joubert as to Voltaire's want of seriousness. Carlyle also, in an early essay on Voltaire, saw little in him but a master of *persiflage*, a judgment, by the way, which was greatly modified many years afterwards in the *Life of Frederick*. Such unfavourable criticism of Voltaire is due to the fact that his brilliant wit was allowed to play upon Christianity, but it overlooks the *character* of Christianity in France in the eighteenth century. "There are times," Mr. Morley says, "when the inhumanity of a system stands out so red and foul, when the burden of iniquity weighs so heavy, and the contagion of its hypocrisy is so laden with mortal plague, that no awe of dilettante condemnation nor minute scruple as to the historic or the relative can stay the hand of a man whose direct sight and moral energy have pierced the veil of use and revealed the shrine of the infamous thing." It may be regretted that Voltaire's attack on Christianity was not full of gentleness and patience,

But the partisans of the creed in whose name more human blood has been violently shed than in any other cause whatever, these, I say, can hardly find much ground of serious reproach in a few score epigrams. Voltaire had no calm breadth of wisdom. It may be so. There are moments which need not this calm breadth of wisdom, but a two-edged sword, and the deliverers of mankind are they who "come to send fire on the earth."

Voltaire wielded that sword with tremendous effect. Carlyle himself says, "he gave the death-stab to modern superstition," and so religious a poet as Robert Browning apostrophises him—

Ay, sharpest shrewdest steel that ever stabbed  
To death Imposture through the armour-joints!

Mr. Morley, after all, is not in such very bad company.

Mr. Morley's study of Diderot is more satisfactory. Diderot was more a thinker than a *littérateur*. His was a mind of extraordinary fecundity. Comte called him the greatest genius of the eighteenth century, and certainly his anticipations of the leading ideas of modern Evolution were simply marvellous. Diderot was an Atheist, and it is difficult to read Mr. Morley's book without feeling that he is in thorough sympathy with the great Frenchman's rejection of all forms of supernaturalism. In one sentence, at any rate, he speaks out clearly and decisively. Referring to the "licentiousness from which the philosophic party did not escape untainted," he perceives in it "one of those drawbacks that people seldom take into account when they are enumerating the blessings of superstition." "Durable morality," he remarks, "had been associated with a transitory religious faith. The faith fell into intellectual discredit, and sexual morality shared in its decline for a season. This must always be the natural consequence of building sound ethics on the shifting sands and rotten foundations of theology."

This is a sufficient reply to those who would make out Mr. Morley to be, in a certain sense, a friend of religion. If religion means supernaturalism, he is profoundly irreligious. Nothing could be more stern and sweeping than the close of that last sentence—the *shifting sands and rotten foundations of theology*.

Being so far gone himself on "the road to ruin"—as pious persons would call it—Mr. Morley does not lose his head for a moment in his long and fine chapter on Holbach's *System of Nature*. "It gathered up," he says, "all the scattered explosives of the criticism of the century into one thundering engine of revolt and destruction." He perceives its defects, but he is also sensible of its merits. He especially praises "the inexorable logic with which the author presses the Freewillier from one retreat to another, and from shift to shift," leaving him at last "naked and defenceless before Holbach's vigorous and thoroughly realized Naturalism." He also remarks that, in the chapter on the Immortality of the Soul, Holbach "examines this memorable growth of human belief with great vigour, and a most destructive penetration." Above all, he points out the great ideas of political progress that were an inseparable part of Holbach's Atheism. The denunciation of the social evil of superstition is "an incessant refrain that sounds with hoarse ground-tone under all the ethics and the metaphysics of the book."

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be Continued.)

## Correspondence.

### RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Sir Oliver Lodge, in his address at the British Association service in the Sefton Park Presbyterian Church, Liverpool, is reported to have said that if man had no power of going wrong he would be merely perfect mechanism and would not have a kinship with the Divinity.

Now, if any orthodox theologian were asked if God could sin, he would indignantly deny the possibility, the very idea of which he would consider blasphemous. But, if having no power of going wrong is the mark of just a perfect mechanism, surely that definition fits the Theist's idea of God exactly, and just so far as man can go wrong he differs from, rather than is akin to, his deity. What the seeker after truth wants to know is, if it is right for the divine nature to be incapable of sinning why is this an unworthy attribute of human nature? and also, if God needed "no labour or sacrifice or pain" (to quote the speaker again) in order to acquire this impossibility of sinning, why should these be necessary to produce the same state of perfection in man?

Sir Oliver Lodge is further reported to have stated that his own researches have led him to a firm conviction of (the truth of) the fundamental beliefs of Christianity. Now, according to the premier Church of Christendom, these fundamental beliefs most certainly include, amongst others, the doctrines of eternal punishment, vicarious atonement, as well as of the virgin birth and physical resurrection of Jesus. Have Sir Oliver Lodge's researches really led him to a conviction of the truth of these?

Finally, he alludes once more to the inferiority of a mechanical universe to one which contains creatures who go right not because they must but because they will. But, according to this theory, the nature of God is inferior to that of man, since orthodox theology says that God cannot sin while man can.

Sir Oliver's explanation of the above problems would much interest

A SEEKER AFTER TRUTH.

WHAT IS MATERIALISM?

SIR,—Referring to your comments upon my letter published in your issue of September 16th instant, may I say that:—

(1) You here reiterate that the meaning of the expression "Materialism" depends upon an examination of its historical function, which is that of applying the principle of causation throughout Nature. This generalization you do not attempt to elaborate by citing its actual historical expressions, but I note with satisfaction your promise of a further exposition.

You do not attempt to explain how Hume, in spite of his accepting and teaching a thorough-going Determinism, is never described as a Materialist. The confusion of mind you say accounted for Huxley's repudiation of Materialism I am unable to notice, but the mysterious contributory factor you "fancy" assisted him to that conclusion I certainly am not aware of, and probably never shall be until you unburden yourself of such imaginings. If, however, this remarkable factor caused Huxley to describe his "own" Atheism as Agnosticism is it not possible that it also operates to make people who state that matter is no more than a methodological device used to describe a category of experience, describe themselves as Materialists?

(2) Because Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and J. Edwards believed that everything proceeded from the will of God it may be inclusive on my part to say that in no ordinary sense could they be described as Materialists yet still being Determinists; it all depends on one's point of view and the use of words. If "the essence of Materialism is Determinism" it seems to me that, since these theologians agreed with the "essence," it is no more stretching the meaning of Materialist in describing them as such than describing the whole of physical causal relationships as Determinism—an expression usually applied to an aspect of mental life.

I do not understand how it makes your position any clearer when you say that those theologians fellow religionists frequently accused them of Materialism. Why should one allow the felicity of a label given by opponents, any more than permitting them to state the case for the other side? The religious critics of Thomas Paine and Voltaire called those respectable Theists Atheists. In any case most religionists are Materialists, what with material heavens, hells, the literal reality of sacramental body and blood, and a Chief of Police God who occasionally stops the effect following the cause in the cosmic traffic.

(3) I am glad to notice that you think that "our language is bound to be more or less anthropomorphic." It does not make any difference whether we find goodness and badness, highness and lowness in the universe, or having manufactured, place them there. It is all man-made or man-like. Man is literally the measure of all things.

(4) When you say that "Nature, apart from ourselves, knows nothing of high or low, of goodness or badness," it seems to me that you are anthropomorphising in exactly that crude way that characterizes the believers in a material God. I know that it is difficult to avoid, but the statement that Nature, externally objective Nature, does not know certain things, implies a possibility of knowledge in other directions which is an excellent example

of that verbal god-making which in this case is not due to "permitting the Christian to state the problem."

I did not suppose that you knew what would "happen" when conscious beings cease to exist, but if you are "unable to picture the world in terms of sentience with no sentient being present" I gather that you have reason to believe that nothing will, and I hope to read one day in your columns a castigation of the emotional outburst of the scientists who occasionally make our flesh creep with stories of a dead world rolling round a blood red sun.

PERCY S. WILDE.

[We do not care to "cut" a letter, but this is of undue length seeing that it merely repeats the same statements as were previously made. With the simple comment that the fact of "matter," being a methodological device used to connote a category of experience, is quite familiar and universally admitted by all who are acquainted with the philosophy of scientific method, we must leave the matter to the judgment of our readers—at least for the present. We would remind Mr. Wilde that to make a "God" of "matter" is not a great advance on the intellectuality of the Theist. As Spinoza would have said, it is floundering in the same bog without knowing in which direction lies solid land.—EDITOR.]

A NOTE ON THE DOUGLAS SCHEME.

SIR,—It is very kind of Mr. Alan Tyndal to ask me my opinion of the Douglas Scheme. I must confess, however, that I have not read very much on the subject, so that perhaps what I am about to say has been thoroughly answered. In no book or article on this question that I have studied has there been any reference to the Malthusian Law or Birth Control. If, therefore, the Social Credit Scheme of Major Douglas is going so to revolutionize things as to do away with slums and poverty, going to regulate the cost of food, housing, clothing, etc., in fact going to make this difficult old world of ours approximate the ideal we are all striving for, then obviously the birth rate is bound to go up and the death rate to go down. Hence a rapid increase of population, and all I ask (with the Malthusians) is how is this increase going to be fed? Population, said Malthus, tends to increase faster than means of subsistence, and if you do away with such positive checks as war, poverty, epidemics, and the other dreadful things which help to keep the population from increasing too rapidly, you are faced with this question of providing everybody with food and plenty of it, too, otherwise the Douglas Scheme will not bring about the prosperity it claims it will. Will, therefore, some Douglas enthusiast let us know how the necessary food required for, say, the doubling of the population every twenty-five years, will be grown?

The only reference to the Malthusian position I have come across on the question is in the letter of "Y. C." in the issue for August 26. This gentleman admits that if you could settle the food question it would be the "death-knell of the infernal Malthusian fallacy once for all." It is distinctly rich to read "the infernal Malthusian fallacy" again. I have read that sentence scores of times, but I am still waiting for proof of the fallacy. I sincerely hope it will not be the slogan so beloved of the street-corner Socialist, Communist, and Bolshevist—"We will put you on the land." H. CUTNER.

FEAR.

SIR,—The short article entitled "Thoughts on Fear," by E. N. Thornton is a praiseworthy effort to get at essentials. In the world of thought organized religion uses the weapon of fear and our task is to bring this disreputable business to an end by explaining it. The well-dressed crowds on Sundays in the parks look on at the people playing games—and nothing happens to the sportsmen although it is the seventh day of the week. The workmen repairing the roof of a cathedral pass part of their dinner hour away by playing at cards on the top of the sacred edifice—and nothing happens. At a Sunday League concert people enjoy themselves, and the fire of wrath does not come down upon them.

In the words of John Morley to priests, "We will not quarrel with you; we will not fight you; we will explain you"; and to the present writer all the elaborate ceremony of churches is a "mysterious carriage of the body to cover up the defects of the mind." W. R.



**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.

**REALISTIC APHORISMS AND PURPLE PATCHES.**

Collected by ARTHUR 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.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON 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.

*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.

*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.

LIFE AND EVOLUTION.

By F. W. HEADLEY.

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

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

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.

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.

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

## A New Ingersoll Pamphlet

**WHAT IS IT WORTH?**

## A Study of the Bible

By Colonel R. G. INGERSOLL

*(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited)*

This essay has never before appeared in pamphlet form, and is likely to rank with the world-famous *Mistakes of Moses*. It is a Bible handbook in miniature, and should be circulated by the tens of thousands.

*Special Terms for Quantities.*

Orders of 24 copies and upwards sent post free.

**PRICE ONE PENNY**

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

A

## SOCIAL GATHERING

*(Under the Auspices of the National Secular Society)*

IN THE ROOMS OF

**The Reform Food Company**  
2 FURNIVAL STREET, HOLBORN, E.C.

ON

**Thursday, October 4, 1923**

From 6.30 to 9.30 p.m.

**Music. Conversation. Speeches. Dancing.****ADMISSION FREE**

Tickets may be obtained from THE SECRETARY,  
N.S.S., 62 Farringdon Street, E.C.4.

EVENING DRESS OPTIONAL

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

**Four Great Freethinkers.**

GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE, by JOSEPH McCABE. The Life and Work of one of the Pioneers of the Secular and Co-operative movements in Great Britain. With four plates. In Paper Covers, 2s. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d. (postage 2½d.).

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL, by C. T. GORHAM. A Biographical Sketch of America's greatest Free-thought Advocate. With four plates. In Paper Covers, 2s. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d. (postage 2½d.).

CHARLES BRADLAUGH, by THE RIGHT HON. J. M. ROBERTSON. An Authoritative Life of one of the greatest Reformers of the Nineteenth Century, and the only one now obtainable. With four portraits. Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d. (postage 2½d.).

VOLTAIRE, by THE RIGHT HON. J. M. ROBERTSON. In Paper Covers, 2s. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 3s. 6d. (postage 2½d.).

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

**THE "FREETHINKER."**

The *Freethinker* may be ordered from any newsagent in the United Kingdom, and is supplied by all the wholesale agents. It will be sent direct from the publishing office post free to any part of the world on the following terms:—

**One Year, 15s.; Six Months, 7s. 6d.;**  
**Three Months, 3s. 9d.**

Those who experience any difficulty in obtaining copies of the paper will confer a favour if they will write us, giving full particulars.