

# The FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

*Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper*

Vol. XLIV.—No. 41

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1924

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>About God.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	641
<i>"The Church of To-morrow."—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - -	642
<i>The Napoleon of Freethought.—Mimnermus</i> - - -	643
<i>A Stupid Calumny.—W. Mann</i> - - - - -	644
<i>Instinct and Intelligence Distinguished.—Keridon</i> - - -	645
<i>Our Sustentation Fund.—Chapman Cohen</i> - - -	649
<i>Freud.—Arthur Lynch</i> - - - - -	651
<i>The Hand of the Potter.—H. Barnes</i> - - - - -	654
<i>A Sad Situation.—Howell S. England</i> - - - - -	654
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

## Views and Opinions.

*(Continued from page 626.)*

### About God.

If the Government were to deal with the use of mental narcotics, as they do with such drugs as cocaine or opium, there would be wholesale prosecutions for using the word "God." For with vast numbers of modern believers it is used as a narcotic and nothing else. It saves thinking, and it lulls curiosity. It enables the user to pose as one possessing knowledge without having to go through the painful process of acquiring it. To say that God does a thing is to say that no one knows exactly how it happens; if we did, no one would use the word in connection with it. Often very elaborate arguments really mean this, and no more than this. All the arguments, for example, that are used to prove the inability of science to explain the nature of life, or the origin of life, all the reasoning adopted to prove that human emotions and mental activities cannot be exhaustively described in exact scientific terms, are intended to establish invincible ignorance as a basis for the belief in deity. It never seems to strike these people that to establish our ignorance of certain matters only proves our ignorance. The statement that science cannot tell us this or that is a statement of ignorance. The statement that God does this or that implies knowledge, and one must have something better than ignorance on which to base an affirmation. It may be that with regard to some matters we are condemned to eternal ignorance, but how that can be made a basis for a knowledge of God it is not easy to discover.

### What is "God"?

The overwhelming majority are intensely conservative in habits, customs, and in ideas. Mental inertia lies at the root of this since just as it is easier to walk along a path that has been trodden by others than to strike out on a new road, so it is easier to use old words than to coin new ones or new relations between old ones, or to drop old conceptions and take up new ones in their place. And when to this natural disinclination of the mind to strike out anew we have a social pressure which deliberately aims at securing assent to established forms and beliefs, conservatism is doubly protected

against attack. One has to bear this in mind if one is properly to appreciate the change that has come over the use of the word "God," and to form some reasonable estimate of its value. To begin with, there is no doubt as to the original meaning which people gave to the word, and also the meaning which it bears in all the established religions of the world. "God" stood for the conception of some huge magnified man, one who was able to control natural forces, but not to create them, since the notion of the deity as a creator came comparatively late in the history of the idea. The conception was born, as we know, from the early speculation of the primitive mind upon subjective and objective phenomena, every one of which is now explained without the slightest reference to supernaturalism in any form. Legitimately "God" means, as Sir James Frazer points out, a being who is "the ruler of the world or some part of it, who resembles man in nature though he excels him in knowledge, goodness, and power." The only qualification I would introduce into this description is connected with goodness. The researches of Sir James himself prove that originally the notion of goodness plays no part whatever in the conception of God. The main thing is that he (or they) is there, he has power and knowledge greater than that of man, and so must be dealt with. To the primitive mind the gods are as much natural facts as other existing objects.

\* \* \*

### Two Gods.

So far, the ground is quite clear. But with the advance of knowledge the question becomes complicated. The aim of the scientist has always been to understand the nature of natural processes and to describe them in the form of fit generalizations. He is mechanistic or nothing. The aim of philosophy has been to find some formula that would completely express a conception of the world of man and of nature as a going concern. Neither has any necessary connection with "God." But by the time science and philosophy were old enough to begin to assert their own individualities "God" was established in the minds of all, it was implied in most, if not all, social institutions, and, above all, it was a dangerous thing openly to disown it. The consequence was that men managed to retain and to find a place for "God." Science made vague references to God as the causes of the phenomena it was studying, and philosophy also used the word to characterize the underlying or the unifying principle of which it was in search. In this way there came into existence two Gods—on the one hand there was the God of religion, who was the only genuine God, and the only one that mattered; on the other hand, there was the God of philosophy, which meant generally nothing at all but was a mere name conveying nothing more intelligible than that famous philosophical ghost, the "thing in itself." Had mental development proceeded on a purely logical course the belief in God would have come to an end when the facts upon which it was founded were shown to be cap-

able of a better and a different explanation. Had philosophy and science started in a world in which the idea of Gods was not already in possession neither would ever have used the term. For neither has anything for a genuine god to do. In both philosophy and science he is the most hopeless of the unemployables, and the most expensive of out-of-work employées.

\* \* \*

#### Ring the Changes.

The grand consequence of this historical situation is this. The God that religion requires is a personality, conscious, intelligent, one who loves and hates, who, as Lord Balfour says, takes sides, who not merely referees the game we are playing, but, in addition, determines which side shall win. But the God on behalf of which the advanced and apologetic theologian argues, is a mere abstraction, a symbol, something that exists, but it is impossible to say what he, or it, is like. We are told explicitly that he is not intelligent as we are intelligent, he is not conscious, as we are conscious, he is not personal as we are personal, all of which are so many different ways of saying that he is not intelligent, or personal, or conscious at all. For if things are not the same then they are different. This seems an obvious truth, but it is one of which Christians in this country need reminding. One set of theologians spend their time trying to prove the existence of something beyond phenomena. But if they succeed in this it will not prove God. For the belief in God depends, not upon the existence of something, but on what that something is like. Another group talks of establishing relations with a power that is not ourselves. But, again, it depends upon what the power is like, if we are honestly to build a religion on it. We cannot enter into personal relations with mere power, pray to it for help and look to it for counsel. One might as well talk of worshipping the law of gravitation. The fact is that the god the modern apologist argues for is not the God of religion, but a metaphysical abstraction which owes its existence to the fact that philosophers have not always been strong enough to make a clean break with an indefensible religious theory that held the field. Mr. F. H. Bradley is quite warranted in saying that those who insist on the personality of God while defending the existence of God with arguments drawn from philosophy are "intellectually dishonest." They desire one conclusion, and to reach it they argue for another." And the second answers their purpose only because the average man, so long as the same words are used, is quite content to assume that it is the same thing that is implied. It is the God that is created by the primitive savage mind alone that will serve the purpose of genuine religion. If there is no justifiable ground for believing in that, the God of religion must be dismissed as a mere illusion.

\* \* \*

#### The Need for Courage.

That is, I think, getting to the root of the matter, and it is an aspect of the subject which, so far as my memory serves, not a single defender of the belief in God has ever faced. And not merely these, but also those who prefer what I am compelled to regard as the pose of impartiality, and who assert that "in the face of the mystery of the universe we are compelled to decline saying yes or no, and to preserve an attitude of reverential agnosticism." I for one do not question the attitude. But if we face the god-idea in the light of what we know of its origin and history, what is there for us to suspend our judgment about? If we are asked whether we believe in the evil spirits with which the savage peoples the world around him, we do not reply that

we cannot say yes or no, but must remain reverentially agnostic. And if not in this case why is it otherwise in the case of the "big brother" of the spirit world? If men like Frazer and Spencer, and Tylor, and the whole host of modern anthropologists are correct when they derive the beginning of the God idea from the ignorance of primitive mankind, what is there left of the god of religion? The whole thing is reduced to pure myth, and all the apologies for the belief in God, all the attempts to import new meanings into the word, are so many efforts to deceive the unthinking, so many examples of that intellectual dishonesty and cowardice which is one of the greatest obstacles to rational reform and straightforward progress.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### "The Church of To-morrow."

THE fifty-ninth Church Congress has just been held at Oxford, and its subject was, "The Church of To-morrow." Of the Church of the past the clergy generally are profoundly ignorant, with the result that they either prudently leave it severely alone, or paint glowing pictures of its imaginary triumphs and achievements. Of the Church of the present there exists a wonderful diversity of opinions, some glorying with proud hearts in what they call its miraculous success, and others deploring with unspeakable sadness its undeniable failure. On the one hand we have the optimists who never look at the dark side, and on the other, the pessimists, who are blind to the bright side of things; and of necessity their views of the Church of to-day are fundamentally at variance. Even at this last Congress the Bishop of Ripon, for example, referred to the appearance of the *Origin of Species* in 1859 and to Bishop Wilberforce's attack on Huxley, and his words, as reported in the *Times* of October 1, were as follows:—

In the last sixty years or so the theory of evolution had been before the world. They said now that they were all evolutionists, and they spoke severely of those who in the early days raised objections and condemned it. He recalled the celebrated attack of Bishop Wilberforce on Huxley in Oxford in 1860, and remarked that there was no doubt that the Bishop said some things which he ought not to have said. He asked, however, if they ever tried to think what the Bishop ought to have said at that stage of the proceedings. Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published in November, 1859. Huxley and one or two others had been in close co-operation with Darwin in the development of the theory, and had become whole-hearted in their support of it. But persons to whom it came as a new thing even in the scientific world were not convinced. Could Wilberforce have been justified in swallowing whole a new and apparently subversive theory in those conditions? Certainly not. What had actually happened? The mechanistic philosophy with which Huxley combined the doctrine had not held its ground.

Now the fact to which we wish to call special attention is that the Bishop is radically mistaken when he ranks Huxley as a whole-hearted supporter of the Darwinian theory. We have the definite assurance of his friend, Sir W. T. Thiselton Dyer, in his interesting article on him in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, that "with the transparent candour which was characteristic of him, he never to the end of his life, concealed the fact that he thought it wanting in rigorous proof." Writing to Dr. Russell Wallace on November 13, 1859, Darwin himself says, in a P.S.: "I think that I told you before that Hooker is a complete convert. If I can convert Huxley I

shall be content." These quotations show conclusively that Huxley could not have been "in close cooperation with Darwin in the development of his theory." Furthermore we have Huxley's own testimony that he was not a Materialist. In his well-known lecture entitled "On the Physical Basis of Life," delivered, we believe, at Edinburgh in 1868, he says:—

Past experience leads me to be tolerably certain that, when the propositions I have just placed before you are accessible to public comment and criticism, they will be condemned by many zealous persons, and perhaps by some few of the wise and thoughtful. I should not wonder if "gross and brutal Materialism" were the mildest phrase applied to them in certain quarters. And, most undoubtedly, the terms of the propositions are distinctively materialistic. Nevertheless two things are certain; the one, that I hold the statements to be substantially true; the other, that I, individually, am no Materialist, but, on the contrary, believe Materialism to involve grave philosophical errors.

If Dr. Strong is so unreliable a guide for the latter half of the nineteenth century, it follows that we cannot trust him for the present and the future. Some of his arguments are ludicrous in the extreme. Take this one:—

I think we may start by saying that there are differences in value between various notions of the world. Some of them are true and some of them are not. I venture to think that our friends the evolutionists are liable to mislead us in regard to this point. The amœba, the ichthyosaurus, the nightingale, the gorilla, and William Shakespeare may be all connected together by an unbroken stream of development. But Shakespeare and his predecessors are just as different in themselves, whatever the evolutionary connection between them, as they were before the theory was put forward. If it be true—I do not think it is—that all religion began in magic, it is also true that Christianity is as widely different from savage magic since the evolutionary method of interpreting history was devised as it ever was before. One is true, the other is false religion, from which the Christian is bound, if he can, to relieve mankind.

We are astounded beyond measure to find a right reverend bishop resorting to such an obviously futile line of argument to establish the truth of Christianity. Evidently his lordship's acquaintance with biology and anthropology is of the slenderest character possible. There is clearly a vast difference between Shakespeare and a gorilla, but all naturalists know now that it is a difference of degree and not of kind. So likewise the differences between religions, even from Animism up to Christianity, are due to tribal, climatical, and cultural considerations, while in essence all religions are closely alike and aim at the same thing. No one ever dreams of saying that Christianity as a distinct religion began as magic, although every bishop is well aware that there are several magical elements embodied in it. The Bishop of Ripon's second point utterly destroys his first. He says that "the whole system of things, from the Christian point of view, is a manifestation of the action of God." *If this is true there can be no false religion, because every religion is of necessity "a manifestation of the action of God."* The Bishop committed blasphemy when he declared that there are false religions, "from which the Christian is bound, if he can, to relieve mankind." Curiously enough the Bishop of Ripon said scarcely anything about the Church of to-morrow, though he mentioned once or twice that that was the subject of the Congress. This was also true of the President of the Congress, the Bishop of Oxford, who, in his presidential address, warned his hearers "not to lay all

the emphasis on 'to-morrow,' if that meant that they were to ignore the present realities and the past."

On the second day of the Congress young people of both sexes were permitted to tell the audiences what they thought about the Church, and for the most part their utterances were not in any sense flattering. The Church of the past and the present does not seem to deserve a to-morrow. Mr. Stephen Neill, of Trinity College, Cambridge, a candidate for Holy Orders, speaking of the Church's duties and obligations, said:—

What are we to do if we find it a hot-bed of jealousy, intrigue, back-biting, malice, and all uncharitableness? What are we to think when one churchwarden's wife will meet the other churchwarden's wife on church committees and will cut her in the street? So long as Christians bite and devour one another and their unfortunate ministers, how can we be attracted to the Master whom they profess to serve? Youth is very critical and in its eyes no amount of churchgoing can atone for glaring inconsistencies of conduct. What are we to think when we see professing Christians gambling on the Stock Exchange, underpaying their employées, drawing revenues from slums? Forgive me if I speak bitterly; I speak as a fool; it seems to us that the Church has made its own the three Pharisaic virtues of comfort, popularity, and success, and that seems strange to us as we read the Gospels.

Others spoke in the same strain of bitter disappointment and loss of faith in the Church's claim to Divine origin and character. Religion bores the youth of to-day. After reading all the speeches delivered by young men and women, most if not all of whom are members of the Church, our only possible conclusion is that the Church of the past has committed so many crimes and set up so many barriers to human welfare and progress that the greatest boon to the world would be its being blotted out of existence and thereby prevented from having any to-morrow.

J. T. LLOYD.

## The Napoleon of Freethought.

The great Achilles whom we knew.—Tennyson.

Spirits are not finely touched

But to fine issues.

—Shakespeare.

AFTER Charles Southwell ceased to be the leader of popular Freethought in England, George Jacob Holyoake was regarded as a likely successor to the leadership. He had proved his courage, and it was hoped that he would prove his statesmanship. But Holyoake was not a great man; but a little man who had great moments. His greatest moment had already passed, and he lived on his reputation for over half a century. In the late Indian summer of his career, he was regarded as a veteran of the Old Guard, but there was very little resemblance between the petulant pantaloons of his old age and the courageous young soldier of his youth.

Holyoake was soon overshadowed by the dominating personality of Charles Bradlaugh, and Holyoake never forgot that circumstance. It is this which explains the bickering and quarrelling which disfigures so much of his career. Indeed, this envy shows itself in his autobiography, and leaves the reader gasping with the impression that all the people mentioned in those pages were rendered famous because Holyoake met them.

Bradlaugh, on the other hand, was not only a great man, he was a man of real distinction in aspect and carriage. The story of his meteoric rise from the position of a common soldier to a commanding position in the political world is like a leaf torn from the pages of old Plutarch; the story of his untimely death

is as moving and as poignant as a tragedy of Sophocles. Bradlaugh will live on history's page with Cromwell, Cobbett and Gladstone as one whom a vivid and forceful personality must always make interesting. The years since he died have quieted the shoutings and tumults of his strenuous time, but they have left the heroic figure of Charles Bradlaugh clear-cut for our regard. The fight he made in Parliament and outside for thirteen long years against an overwhelming majority of opponents was one of the bravest ever fought, and his triumph in the hour of death was as complete as that of Nelson on the deck of the shot-riven *Victory*. Thanks to Bradlaugh's leadership, heterodoxy is no longer a serious bar to the citizen, and the serpent of priestcraft has been scotched, if not slain.

It is strange that people are only now beginning to see that Bradlaugh's attitude to religion was actually forced upon him. He had no wish to fight the clergy and their supporters; he did not want to waste his time arraigning the mistakes of Moses, the barbarities of the Old Testament, and the absurdities of religion. But he saw quite clearly that priestcraft was the bulwark of tyranny. It was precisely because the Christian Religion was used by tyrants as the shield of injustice, that the Altar and Throne always supported each other, that he challenged Priestcraft. If he seemed to those outside of his influence a mere iconoclast, he has in this only shared the fate of the world's greatest reformers. He died early because of the ill-treatment that he received. Dead, he remains a living force by the courage of his life and the consistency of his example.

"Thorough" was his motto, and throughout life he acted up to it. Every issue of his paper, *The National Reformer*, contained the plain announcement of his being an Atheist, a Republican, and a Malthusian. He only had one dream in his life, and that was of his being the President of a British Republic. First and last, he was a man of action, and he never left others to translate his ideas into deeds. In his earlier days the Freethinkers were feebly led and fitfully inspired. When he died the Freethought Party was an accomplished fact, and as organized as it is to-day. Without his leadership their stay in the desert might have been prolonged many years. He was most ably seconded by men and women of real talent—Annie Besant, John Robertson, George Foote, Charles Watts—but, again, first and foremost, he it was who made Freethought as we know it.

What a price he paid for his leadership! The last time I heard him lecture at the old Hall of Science I realized that he was a broken man. For a whole generation he had led the forces of Freethought, but the Barbarians were too much for even his iron constitution. Brave to the last, he kept a Spartan front to the enemy, but he was bleeding to death beneath his armour. Some of his cheering audience nearly broke down, thinking of the fierce old fighting days, when there was no thought of anything but the battle itself. Had his assailants known Bradlaugh as he really was, they could never have hated him as they did. Jealousies, unkindness, and bitterness of spirit are in most human labours; but religion, with its insincerities and intellectual meannesses, seems to hold a poison of its own which narrows the vision and blunts the edge of principle.

Bradlaugh fought for Liberty, and his life struggle was as heroic as that of the Spartan heroes who held the pass of Thermopyloë against the Persian hosts. He stood like a stone wall against the hordes of Priestcraft. Bradlaugh grows to one's mental and moral vision the more distant he becomes. The best views of the Alps are to be gained from a distance, and we get the better view of Bradlaugh as we recede

from him. A hero in action, he was chivalry incarnate. He was never the man to shout to others, "Go on!" but he always said, "Come on!" Now he is no longer a presence, but a memory, we are free to look at him, free from controversy, and to estimate him at his true worth. Shall our lives not be nobler also because of his example? I have called him "the Napoleon of Freethought," but he was more than a soldier. He fell, prematurely, alas, worn out by hard work and harder usage in that great battle-field of humanity, whose soldiers fight not to shed blood, but to dry up tears; not to kill their fellow-men, but to raise them up. Labouring not for himself, but for others, he made an imperishable name, and gave the world "assurance of a man."

MIMNERMUS.

## A Stupid Calumny.

Few of the greatest men ever painted religious subjects by choice, but only because they were compelled by ecclesiastical authority, supported by its patronage, or invited by popular applause; that by all three influences their powers were at once wasted and restrained; that their invention was dulled by the monotony of motive and perverted by its incredibility.—John Ruskin, "Lectures on Art."

DR. T. R. GLOVER, as many of our readers doubtless know, contributes, every Saturday, to the *Daily News* an article upon religion. Probably the idea is to prepare the readers for the coming Sabbath.

Dr. Glover does not belong to the common or garden kind of advocate. He is a Doctor of Divinity and a Fellow and Classical Lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge. He is also the author of several theologico-historical works—some would place them under the heading of fiction—among which may be mentioned *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, *The Jesus of History*, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*.

In the *Daily News* (September 27) the weekly article by Dr. Glover is entitled "The Atheist Vice of Dulness." If it had not been signed, we should have attributed the authorship to a Christian Evidence lecturer, who, as Voltaire said of Habakkuk, are "capable of anything," or some gutter evangelist of Salvation Army mentality.

"Atheist dulness!" Why the standing complaint of believers is that the Atheists' methods are too lively. That he uses wit and humour to discredit holy and sacred things, which should only be dealt with reverently.

On the other hand, the Christian faith is not remarkable for its gaiety. No one in quest of humour and wit would think of searching the Scriptures for it. Mark Twain declared that the only facetious remark in the Bible was the command to Ananias to "go into the street which is called straight," in Damascus, which Mark describes as "straighter than a corkscrew, but not so straight as a rainbow." And adds parenthetically:

How he ever found his way into it, and after he did, how he ever found his way out of it again, are mysteries only to be accounted for by the fact that he was acting under Divine inspiration.

A Christian is generally witty and humorous in inverse proportion to the intensity of his faith. The founder of Christianity is reported to have wept, but never to have laughed, or even smiled. The authors of the *Imitation of Christ* and *The Pilgrim's Progress* could scarcely be described as jovial; and the same may be said of Calvin and Knox. Ingersoll declared that they fitted together like the upper and lower jaws of a wild beast. In fact, we might even go so

far as to say that Dr. Glover himself is not devoid of dulness; in fact, profiting by former experience, we should have passed over his contribution but for being arrested by the astounding title at the head of it.

Dr. Glover seems to have anticipated some questioning on the subject, so he puts the question himself, "Why class dulness with Atheism?" And replies:—

The dull mind obviously does not enjoy God; for, as Jesus shows in the Gospels, God abounds in interests. God clothes the flowers—and you don't look at them; God feeds the birds—and you don't think about them; God is interested in colours and shades and contrasts, in the thoughts of little children and the visions of great poets, in all the brightness and quickness and variety of human life. Then is not dulness Atheism?

Dr. Glover talks as if God lived just across the road, and had no secrets from him—"two minds with a single thought," as the Zanzigs used to claim. Dr. Glover tells us from his private and exclusive information that God is interested in the visions of great poets. Personally I should like to ask God, through the agency of Dr. Glover, what he thought of Swinburne's lines, *Before a Crucifix*, of Carducci's *Hymn to Satan*, Shelley's *Queen Mab*, and Byron's *Vision of Judgment*. I would ask him myself, but I asked him many questions when I was a child, and never had a reply, and any further communication will have to come from his side. A person who disregards a child's request, is no gentleman.

By his identification of dulness with Atheism Dr. Glover seems to think that the Atheist cannot enjoy the flowers, the birds, and the colours and shades of Nature. Has Dr. Glover never heard of Richard Jefferies? If he has, and has read *The Story of My Heart*, he would know that no greater lover of Nature ever lived. That his love of Nature reached to pure rapture. No one has equalled him in description of the loveliness of Nature; yet in this very same work he gives expression to his indignant repudiation of an over-ruling Providence or Creator.

Another great lover of Nature was the naturalist, W. H. Hudson, as can be seen in his *Green Mansions*, *The Purple Land*, and many other fine works; yet Mr. Morley Roberts, his biographer, tells us that he had no religious belief whatever.

Tyndall, Huxley, and Clifford were all lovers of Nature; they all attacked Dr. Glover's religion. Huxley and Tyndall were Agnostics, and Prof. Clifford was an outspoken Atheist.

If we turn to art we find it is not necessary to be religious to become a great artist. J. W. M. Turner, one of England's greatest landscapists, had no religion. William Morris, who did more to raise the standard of artistic taste in this country than any other single man, was an Atheist. So was Salvator Rosa and Walter Crane. Whistler ridiculed religion, Rosa Bonheur and Ford Madox Brown were Agnostics. The great Russian painter, Verestchagin, was an Atheist, so is Ryepin, his compatriot.

Among the musicians we find that Berlioz, Richard Strauss, Saint-Saens, and our own Granville Bantock all repudiated religion.

On the other hand, where is the quintessence of dulness to be found better than in a Nonconformist chapel? The present writer speaks from bitter experience in younger days.

Many thousands of sermons have been preached upon the text: "Consider the lilies of the field; how they grow!" in proof of the poetical nature of Jesus. It proves nothing of the kind. He was using it as an illustration of something very different. He did not say "Consider the lilies, how beautiful and fragrant they are." He said, "Consider them, they toil not, neither do they spin," and if God clothed

the lilies in this fashion, how much more would he clothe the people who trusted in Him? Therefore they were to take no thought as to what they should eat or drink, or be clothed with; they were to be like the plants and flowers, who neither toiled nor span. A doctrine that would lead to universal ruin, and would hardly commend itself to our captains of industry to-day with their strident appeals for more production.

At the commencement of his article Dr. Glover deals with the story of the sisters Martha and Mary. Martha who did all the work, and Mary who did nothing, but just sat at Jesus' feet. Martha, naturally, objected to this arrangement, for which Dr. Glover denounces her as "one of the rudest and most uncouth people in the narratives of the Bible," and backs up the lazy, idle Mary, even as his master did. It is only natural that preachers should take the part of Mary, for they, like her, are parasites upon society.

W. MANN.

## Instinct and Intelligence Distinguished.

FEW words ever trip oftener from our lips than the term intelligent, and yet how seldom do you meet one who could tell you definitely what is the one fact that serves to distinguish it from Instinct. We often meet with the query, "Are animals intelligent?" "Do they possess reason?" "Are they subject to emotions?" Not at all difficult questions to answer if we have clear ideas what these terms individually and relatively signify. I think we can safely say that there is no such thing as an isolated idea—like a rounded pebble—in the whole contents of mind. Those mental elements called "ideas" are a mass of overlapping circles. And the conception conveyed by a term is usually vague unless we know to what extent its meaning coincides with and differs from the meaning of a kindred idea. Instinct and intelligence are a pair of such over-lapping circles and our ideas of them become distinct only in so far as we have a clear perception wherein they differ.

Now, Nature has obviously tried two types of mind as means of enabling a sentient organism to put itself in harmony with its environment for a brief period, but one sufficiently long to enable it to procreate and continue the species. *Instinctive* and *Intelligent* are the two labels by which these types or orders are known. The cardinal difference between them may be best conveyed by means of an illustration: Imagine a wasp to have strayed into a room through an open window and that, while it was exploring within, the window was closed. Sooner or later it would want to get out again, and would at once make for the light, with the result that it would hurl itself against the glass with considerable force; and there can be little doubt that the ordeal would be attended with considerable pain. Would it profit by it? Not in the least. Even if stunned, it would, as soon as it recovered, return to the charge and hurl itself against the pane a second time with much the same impetuosity as at first—an act that it would repeat for the hundredth time were there any force left in it. The wasp learns nothing from its experience. The impressions made upon its neural system are as evanescent as dimples made upon the surface of water—instantly vanishing and that without leaving a trace behind. Its memory is wholly ancestral; individual memory is virtually non-existent. Impressions made upon the brain cells of its ancestors millions of years ago it recognizes, and so it makes for the light; but its nervous "ledger" has no record of transparent glass

capable of barring its way and stopping its movements; and as its own experience counts for nothing, it repeatedly returns to the charge: that is the instinctive order of mind—all recognition is ancestral.

Put a dog in the same situation and suppose it has never before seen a sheet of transparent solid. It is probable that it would bang its head against the solid glass only once. The pain experienced in the first encounter would have taught it a lesson. In other words, it is capable of *learning* and of modifying its behaviour in accordance with what it has learnt. That is to say, it has not only an ancestral but also an individual memory. Its own experience leaves mental traces and enables the creature to profit by them: that is intelligence.

The purely instinctive creature is guided wholly by the impressions registered on its nervous system at what corresponds to birth. The intelligent animal, on the other hand, has the power to modify or supplement its innate tendencies from its own experience. Those two types of mind—the instinctive and intelligent—are respectively and well summed up in the familiar and pithy phrases: "The Moth and the Candle"; and "the burnt child shuns the fire."

It is now quite easy to answer the question: "Is intelligence an attribute of animal forms?" An animal is intelligent just in proportion as it is capable of modifying, guiding, or controlling its behaviour by its own successes and failures in like situations, *i.e.* to the extent it has the capacity to profit by its own experience.

It is the sole standard by which we arrange the higher animals in an ascending hierarchy of intelligence and which easily places man at the top.

The difference between instinct and intelligence is very analogous—indeed as alike as a material analogy can well be—to that between a tram and an ordinary road vehicle. In the case of the tram its movements are strictly confined to the lines along which it moves, whereas the cart or motor-bus has, within certain limits, freedom of movement—the limits being the width of the roadway and the number of alternative routes. The instinctive creature always moves along set lines; the intelligent animal has considerable latitude and choice. This freedom of behaviour enables the intelligent creature to adapt itself to new situations and emergencies and thereby to escape death..

As we ascend in the scale of intelligence, the "road" widens and the number of alternative "routes" increase until, in man, the "roads" have so widened and the routes so multiplied that a truer comparison would be that between a tram-car and an aeroplane which is independent of both roads and routes.

It will be noticed in passing that increase of intelligence has proceeded, *pari passu*, with immaturity at birth; in fact they are indissolubly connected. Insects, which represents Nature's instinctive experiment, emerge from their chrysalis in a mature state—in full armour for life's battle as Minerva did from the head of Zeus. Parents and offspring never see each other. Then as the creature becomes more and more intelligent it is born in a state less and less mature and more and more dependent upon its parents for protection and care—the helplessness culminating in the human offspring which is in a state of immaturity for the better part of two decades, a period that civilization continuously tends to increase.

There are one or two minor differences that should not be passed unnoticed. The first relates to personal "negatives," *i.e.* those taken in the individual's own life-time. It is a time-difference very much like that between taking a photo in bright and dull light. A fraction of a second is enough if the sun shines directly on the object, whereas in dim light many hours, or even days, are needed. Similarly, the lamb

gets a working "negative" of its dam after a glance or two, whereas the human child requires the "exposure" of many months before it has acquired a negative sufficiently deep for the sight of the mother's face to awaken a recognition. In short, in the case of instinctive creatures, personal negatives are all "snap-shots"; but the time of "exposure" lengthens as the degree of intelligence increases.

The other difference is related to the manner of finding one's way in space. Intelligence is dependent upon recognitions, *i.e.* upon objects more or less familiar. If in the middle of town or country, all appears strange, you feel bewildered and you stop until someone directs you by pointing or naming some recognizable objects. Instinct, on the other hand, is more or less independent of the senses. The swallow and the cuckoo, and, indeed, all migratory creatures, seem to possess a sense of direction—a spatial intuition—that enables them to traverse wide tracts of land and cross vast seas without any apparent aid from the senses. Likewise, the carrier pigeon will head directly for its home though taken to its starting place in a closed railway van and by a circuitous route where sights of objects to act as guides are wholly impossible.

In like manner the mysterious behaviour of insects in planting their eggs obviously implies spartial intuition. To me all this is as mysterious as anything in Nature; and why? Because I do not know the neural mechanism which enables the creature to effect it. I believe the ether must be involved as in wireless.

As in the case of Ulster and the Irish Free State there is here, also, a "Frontier question"—much disagreement as to where the boundary line should be drawn, if drawn at all. Anyone interested in that question cannot do better than get Professor Lloyd Morgan's *Instinct and Experience*, in which the question is fully discussed from every point of view with the author's usual masterliness and transparent love of truth.

KERIDON.

## Acid Drops.

The Rev. Amos Burnet, President of the Wesleyan Conference, has been declaiming against a section of English society in which, he says, "the men are without morals and the women without shame." And he adds that this section is "frankly pagan." One does not take seriously what these sensational preachers say, but we would say that there is one class in English society which is without a healthy sense of either truth or justice, and which seeks to gain its ends by slime and slander such as no other section of society would practice. And that is the section to which Mr. Burnet belongs. The wholesale condemnation of groups of people must be, on the face of it, a gross exaggeration; and the insinuation that they belong to the non-Christian class, is one of those slimy slanders in the use of which the clergy have always distinguished themselves. We do not say that Christianity creates this type, but it has a curious fascination for them. They evidently do not find it at variance with their own cowardly instincts.

The other day a London magistrate remarked that among those who came before him he noticed that those who were guilty of mean and petty offences, offences which the law could not always touch, were people who were looked up to as pillars of righteousness by others. We have made that remark more than once in these columns, and we commend it to the notice of the Rev. Mr. Burnet. We all spend more indignation on the known criminal than he deserves, and very frequently ignore the genuinely vile character. John Smith, who lives in a mean street and indulges in a weekly "booze" comes home now and then and blacks his wife's eye or otherwise physically injures her. The wife will probably tell you that in between these bouts

he is not at all a bad sort, but he nevertheless acquires the reputation of a brute and a wifebeater. Ebenezer Thompson lives in a nice middle-class street, never gets drunk, never assaults his wife, but with little nagging, pettifoggery, mean tricks may make her life a veritable hell on earth, and ruin the real happiness of the house. But Ebenezer will nevertheless go through life with his character unspotted, and at the local chapel may be found holding forth on the beauties of the Christian faith, of the power of Jesus to uplift mankind, and hold up the drunken wife-beater as an example of what a man becomes who has forsaken Christ. And yet we fancy we would rather take our chance in hell with John Smith than go to heaven in the company of the good Ebenezer. The London magistrate was quite correct, but we should like him and others to explain why Christianity has such an attraction for these peculiarly mean and detestable characters.

The *Leeds Mercury* relates the following joke:—

According to the playful Rector of Halesowen, Worcestershire, the Americans have a collecting-plate which, if you put a penny in, "makes a noise like hell, and takes your photograph." I suppose if you put in a half-crown it would play the Hallelujah Chorus.

If the staff of the *Leeds Mercury* continues in this irreligious vein they will probably find Lord Danesfort on their track.

A storm in a teacup has been aroused by the inclusion of a figure of Jesus Christ in a play produced recently in London. One London newspaper says bluntly that the author "lays himself open to an accusation of blasphemy." Christians always mix policemen and prisons with their piety.

The Rev. M. Knapp, vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Dalston, declares that the clergy require business training. How the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and their clerks will smile when they hear this.

The Rev. F. Gilbey, in full clerical warpaint, recently paraded the chief streets of Birmingham with sandwich boards appealing for funds. A facetious onlooker called it "Gilbey's whine."

A fortnight ago the Very Rev. Father Vincent, a Franciscan priest, was throwing a little ecclesiastical dust in the eyes of the twentieth century as follows:—

The Franciscan spirit is a Liberal spirit, and even a Socialist spirit, and, in the right sense, a Communist spirit, while it is a very Conservative spirit in loyalty to authority.

In 1638, when visiting Galileo in prison John Milton said that he was imprisoned for "the sin of thinking in Astronomy otherwise than the Franciscan and Dominican licensers thought." The spirit that put him there was doubtless that of the business spirit of Franciscan thought not mentioned by the Very Rev. Father Vincent, and in this way we can see what contributions organized priesthood makes towards the growth of mankind.

From a review of *Problems of Life*, by Leo Trotsky, we learn through Mr. Robert Lynd that this terrorist at the present moment is crushing the gallant Republic of Georgia. This statement appears in the *Daily News*, September 22. On September 23, Mr. H. Wilson Harris in the same paper said that we really have not much knowledge of what is happening in Georgia. It is a great pity that the two publicists don't make up their minds to say the same thing—it would look so much better, but, as Mr. Robert Lynd had quoted freely from the book, we suppose he had to beat the dog with something. Trotsky writes that "the cinema competes not only with the public-house, but also with the Church." That would be true if written by a native of the Kamshaka mountains or the Bishop of London.

M. Saquier, who spoke in French at the meeting of

the National Council for Prevention of War, said, "All nations are of one family, and we need more direct relations between all peoples." This disciple of Thomas Paine is using a vocabulary that will be common in the future, in spite of the activities of Christians who do nothing towards bringing it about. Universal brotherhood is a subject not welcomed by the popular Press, and there is no money in the idea for professional Christianity.

For twelve shillings and sixpence you can buy a book entitled *Christ's Likeness in History and Art*, by Giovanni E. Meille. With 200 illustrations and a coloured plate. The author's enthusiasm takes him into deep water:—

The first portraits of Christ were probably the work of one or another of His disciples, and various copies, not identical in detail, must have been distributed fairly early amongst the faithful of the Churches in Asia and Africa.

A reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* with good sense and courage comments as follows: "This, of course, is pure imagination.....for the most part these pictures are repellent.....We can imagine no book we should feel less inclined to give to an intelligent pagan." In other words, a book's a book, although there's nothing in it.

Wicked Freethinkers must have been corrupting the usually deeply devout, if somewhat benighted and bloodthirsty South Americans. The Argentine Senate, states Reuter, has fanned into a blaze the smouldering quarrel with the Pope by passing a resolution instructing the government to declare the Papal Nuncio "persona non grata," which means that he would have to leave, to recall the Argentine minister to the Vatican, and to demand explanations from the Vatican. The quarrel has been going on for some time, and rages around the appointment of De Andrea to be Archbishop of Buenos Aires. The new Archbishop was an anti-Socialist and pro-French, and was opposed, says Reuter, by the pro-German elements. Cardinal Beda, the Nuncio, induced him to resign, but the government refused to accept his resignation. The Pope has ignored the Argentine Government by appointing him Apostolic Visitor for South America. South America is, of course, one of the few remaining strongholds of Catholicism, and it will be interesting to watch developments of this quarrel.

The York magistrates recently sentenced Mary Jane Morley to one month's imprisonment for breaking open the offertory box in St. Deny's Church, and stealing 5d. No scornful infidel will be able to charge these particular Christians with failing to put their ethical principles into practice. If a man steal thy coat, give him thy cloak also. Apparently the revised version runs: If a woman steals fivepence give her a month's imprisonment also.

The Rev. Harold Hurst, Curate of St. James's, Northampton, when preaching his farewell sermon at the church, stated that the religion of Jesus Christ was a jovial one, for "Sonny, cheer up," was ever on the lips of the Son of Man. The reverend gentleman should read his Bible again, as it states that Jesus was a "Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief." It does not mention one case of Jesus Christ laughing or making a joke, excluding, of course, the occasion when He cast out the devils and transferred them into the herd of swine which ran into the water and got drowned. This was a very funny joke. One well-known hymn used to commence:—

Man of Sorrows, what a Name.....

We have not seen a hymn-book lately, but possibly this has now been altered to read:—

Jovial Jesus, Jester sublime.

The annual report of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East has recently been issued. In a general review for the year, the Society states:—

As we look abroad we are confronted by a world

whose life and thought are undergoing changes which are nothing less than revolutionary. Everywhere we see a lack of political and moral stability. While even to the most optimistic among us these changes do not of themselves suggest that Christ is becoming pre-eminent in the world's life, yet they do present a challenge and a call to the whole Church of Christ which she will neglect at her peril. Never was the world's need of Christ more evident than it is to-day, and never has there been a more widespread consciousness of that need.

One wonders whether the authors of this report sincerely believe this nonsense, or whether it is merely asserted for propaganda purposes. After all the force of suggestion is great. Christians claim so often that Christianity is another name for Humanism, and that religion is essential to human progress and happiness, that they possibly come in the end to believe it themselves. No one questions the fact that the world to-day is in the throes of vast social changes, and that there is everywhere manifest a longing for a saner, happier world, but that is not in any way equivalent to saying that there is a widespread "need of Christ."

Those movements which to-day seem to be holding out new hope to the world—movements towards international disarmament and peace, justice in social affairs, humanization of industry, and the like—were secular in origin, and those who have done most to help them forward were Freethinkers, whether they openly paraded the fact, or thought religion of too little importance to be mentioned at all. The churches always have, and of necessity always must be on the side of reaction and social stagnation. They embody what are loudly trumpeted as immutable moral and scientific laws, divinely revealed to mankind, and as such no progress is possible. True, "liberal" theologians perform mental acrobatics to prove that even religion evolves, and divine revelation changes as the needs of humanity changes; but this, as any Freethinker, or any more or less logical and sincere Christian knows, is humbug, or at the best the self-deception of timid inquirers after truth. With a creed and a moral code for all times, the Churches inevitably oppose all attempts at social change. Down through the ages Christianity has always supported those who find change in habits and thought hateful. No popular movement has ever received its blessing, until that movement has arrived at success; no scientific discovery, even though it has ameliorated human suffering, has received its approval; and it has looked askance at all movements towards social and political freedom and sanity. In our own century we have seen one of the most powerful of the Christian sects—the Greek Orthodox Church—supporting opposition to the Russian Revolution, not because of any humanitarian feelings, nor because of any belief that social progress can only come through enlightenment, and not through the use of physical force, but simply because the Russian revolutionaries stand for an order of things in which religion will play no part. The great and powerful Church which could look on benignly whilst under the old Czarist régime men and women were tortured and killed for daring to express their honest opinions, rose in righteous indignation to defend its own privileges from those who preached that "religion is the opium of the people." Had Bolshevism been sufficiently pious the Russian ecclesiastics would no doubt have discovered that it was the practical embodiment of Christian principles.

What, too, is the attitude which organized religion takes concerning what Bernard Shaw has declared to be the greatest discovery of the twentieth century—birth control? One of blind, unreasoning opposition, based upon and supported by biblical reference. Birth control may or may not be desirable, but it has to be debated on its merits, in a scientific spirit, and not settled by dogmatic references to what some half-barbaric person thought a few thousand years ago, or what the Fathers, with their disgusting views of the sex-relations, said during the Dark Ages. So, too, with the question of the reform of the divorce laws, education, social and political problems, and all those prob-

lems which men and women must solve if this world is to be made happier and safer for humanity. Never, never does or can organized religion have anything sane or helpful, or even reasonable, to say on these matters. They are not to be settled by appeals to tradition or the views of persons long since dead, for most of them are new problems, peculiar to our form of civilization and political and economic organization. That individual Christians may take broad and sensible views of such matters, does not alter the fact that Christianity, whether judged by the Bible, or by the dicta of the Fathers and its modern leaders is purely obscurantist. And the sooner it is clearly realized that religion is the implacable enemy of all progress and all real happiness, the sooner will mankind solve those problems which religion merely exacerbates.

Spiritualists are said to be much concerned at the result of the prosecution, at Brighton, of Mrs. Elizabeth Taylor Woodall, of Walsall, and Mr. J. J. Goodwin, minister of the local branch of the Church of the Spiritual Evangel of Jesus the Christ, of Forest Hill. Mrs. Woodall, a medium, was fined 40s. for professing to tell fortunes, and Goodwin was fined a similar amount for aiding and abetting her. Both defendants pleaded Not guilty, and Goodwin went so far as to challenge the court's jurisdiction. Whilst having no sympathy with the mediums, it seems only fair to protest against this discrimination. After all organized Christianity is little more than wholesale fortune telling. Do as we tell you, say the priests, and we predict a contented life here, and eternal blessedness hereafter. Defy us, and you shall go to a distinctly unpleasant after-world.

Moreover, hundreds of years of preaching of supernaturalism have prepared the popular mind to receive all manner of charlatans, and every kind of stupid belief as gospel. It is infinitely more reasonable to suppose that one's future is written in the stars, or in the grouts of a tea-cup, than it is to believe the ridiculous nonsense that is to be found in church creeds. Furthermore, if the universe is peopled with souls, and angels, and devils, why should it not be possible to get into connection with them, and bribe them into telling the future? If saints may prophesy in the past, why should not modern fortune-tellers be able to do the like? The choice is really between a sane, scientific conception of nature, and a febrile, unhealthy belief in supernaturalism. When the last priest gabbles his ancient formulæ, the last seer will stare into his crystal globe, or shuffle his pack of cards, or go into a trance and permit a spirit to use his body, or engage in any other of the foolish or morbid rites necessary for predicting the future.

A modern miracle at last! Soon after the Bletchley Salvation Army hall had been prepared for the harvest festival a fire broke out and burnt an organ and some of the thanks-offerings.

On further consideration, the horrible suspicion occurs to one that possibly it was not a benevolent acceptance by the deity of the sacrifices offered to him, but an expression of his disapproval of the Salvation Army. Here is a problem for the theologians to settle.

Tucked away in a corner of a newspaper we found a paragraph entitled "Bibles and Bicycles." "Fifty new recruits of the Church Missionary Society are leaving the country this autumn to meet Islam's demands for education and new ideas." That is rather a crude way of putting it, and, of course, it will deceive nobody who is acquainted with foreign opinions of missionaries. It appears that the rise of Uganda as a cotton-growing centre has brought wealth to the natives, who are buying Bibles and bicycles, and with characteristic arrogance, missionaries are going to teach the natives how to spend their wealth profitably on social improvements without letting them degenerate. This is presumably the reasons for the trip of the fifty from this paradise called England where eight people sleep in one room.

**EVERY ONE ANOTHER ONE—To Gain a New Reader for the**



## Our Sustentation Fund.

BELOW will be found the first list of subscriptions to our Sustentation Fund, and from the prompt response to what was written last week we can safely say that the old paper still holds its place in the affections of its readers. It will be noted that the total of the first list of acknowledgments does not equal the "bumper" of last year, but times are harder now than then, and we have no doubt it will be made good before long. Many of those who have written have apologised for not sending larger sums, and some have promised to send again if all that is required is not forthcoming. We do not think that there should be any need for this. The burden is not a heavy one when it is distributed over the Freethinking readers of the paper, and there are enough of these to provide all that is required without straining anyone. And so far as my personal feelings are concerned I would greatly prefer it to be done without anyone feeling that he is sending more than his means justify him in sending.

Most of those who have sent congratulate me on having kept the deficit down to its present point. Well, it might easily have been more, but while I regard it as my primary duty to keep the paper going, I also take it as an obligation to see that the amount lost is as small as it can possibly be made. I trust this will be considered a reply to those who have written as above noted.

Mr. C. Bush, who, with his accustomed generosity, forwards a cheque for £50, hopes that the thousands of Freethinkers will see that all that is required is sent without delay. He says it naturally goes against the grain to make these appeals, but it is the only way in which to meet the situation.

Mr. E. D. Side says:—

I am pleased you allow your friends the opportunity of helping where we can—with the Sustentation Fund. I sincerely wish that some Trust could be formed among us to relieve you of the necessity of appealing for help. It would be glorious and would relieve you of a great and disagreeable worry.

When this Fund is out of the way we may have something to say in this direction. A suggestion has been made by several friends who are deeply interested in the *Freethinker*, and with their permission I will publish what they have to say when the proper time arrives.

A very old friend of the movement and of myself, Mr. T. Robertson, of Glasgow, writes:—

I trust that your appeal will be successful. It is astonishing that you manage to carry on in these times with so little loss. It is a marvel how, week after week, and year after year you can continue with unflagging energy in your work. Nothing short of heroic devotion to principle could sustain any man in such a work, and nothing short of brilliant ability and a fertile mind could enable him to do so with all the skill and vigour you have shown through all the years I have known you. Surely the turning point will be reached when such work and such ability will at least command freedom from monetary worry and a decent measure of comfort.

We feel almost inclined to apologise for publishing this letter, but we value the high opinion of the writer, and those who know Mr. Robertson know that it would not be said unless it was both felt and meant. All we can say is that Freethought has always been with us a labour of love, and whether it brings much or little, comfort or worry, we shall keep at it so long as we are able. And there is a very great deal of comfort in doing the work that one loves.

"John's Granpa" sends a letter which will, we think, interest many:—

In thanking you for giving your devoted supporters an opportunity to show their interest in the best of causes, I may mention that our good little paper has actually saved me during the whole of the year nearly the whole of the amount of my contribution to the above Fund. You will remember that in December I made arrangements with Mr. Scabrook, 145 Leigh Road, Leigh-on-Sea, to take four copies of the *Freethinker* weekly and if not sold I to pay for same. But quite early in the year every copy was taken, and my guarantee became inoperative, so I saved money. The *Freethinker* is honestly worth 1s. a week to me, and unless I find a way again to spend 1s. per week next year on increasing the circulation, I shall be pleased to contribute permanently to the above Fund what I save.

If our readers would all set themselves to work in the direction indicated by this friend, we should be above the necessity of any Fund whatever.

Mr. S. G. Leech says:—

It is fine work, but one sometimes despairs, the enemy has so strong a hold on the unthinking mind. Still, we possess two great assets—time and the courage of yourself and your associates.

One can quite appreciate the feeling, akin to despair, that comes over one after long battling with human stupidity and inertia, but it is when we compare the world as it is with what it was a generation or two ago that one realizes the progress that has been made. Time is indeed on our side, and the strongest of superstitions must weaken before the advance of human intelligence.

Finally, Mr. A. W. B. Shaw writes:—

Would that I were the millionaire who could endow the *Freethinker*, but alas, I am not, or ever likely to be one. However, it is open to me to contribute a small offering to the best of causes. There is one gratifying circumstance in connection with the *Freethinker*, it always maintains a uniform level of excellence, which is more than can be said of most papers.

First list of acknowledgments: H. Jessop, £25; C. Bush, £50; J. A. Fallows, £10 10s.; A. R. Wykes, 10s.; J. W. Wood, 10s. 6d.; J. Sumner, £5 5s.; J. M. Gimson, £5; Mrs. G. Adams, £2; G. Alward, £1 1s.; T. Dunbar, 5s.; J. King, £5 5s.; J. Davie, £10; G. F. H. McCluskey, £5 5s.; H. Tucker, £2 2s.; F. Lee, £5; S. Pulman, £5; T. Robertson, £5; In Memory of R. H. Side, £2 2s.; E. D. Side, £2 2s.; R. E. Side, £1 1s.; Dr. J. Laing, £5 5s.; J. Tipping, 10s.; W. J. Easterbrook, £5; F. C. Wykes, 4s. 6d. "John's Granpa," £2 2s.; H. Irving, 5s.; J. G. Finlay, 10s.; T. T. (Glasgow), 5s.; S. G. Leech, £2 2s.; J. B. Palphreyman, £1; S. Healing, 5s.; R. Brown, £3; H. Spence, 5s.; R. Crum, 10s.; A. H. Deacon, 5s.; R. Allen, 5s.; E. Truelove, 10s.; A. V. Allen, 5s.; A. J. Greeker, 4s. 6d.; "Sine Cere," £10 10s.; D. Marr, 2s. 6d.; J. G. (Glasgow), 10s.; H. G. (Glasgow), 10s.; T. Saunders, 3s.; A. W. B. Shaw, £5; J. Robinson, 5s.; A. Bullock, 5s. Total, £182 18s. CHAPMAN COHEN.

My reasons for believing there is no God are about the same as those I entertain in regard to the existence of witches, wizards, ghosts, devils, etc. Such beliefs most assuredly have for their origin a common cause; hence it logically follows that disbelief in one discredits belief in all the others—in other words, they stand or fall together. Nature is all in all. Nature constitutes everything; and if there was a God he would have to bow down to her mandates. Nature, governed by her own inherent forces, is all that has been, all that is, and all that shall be.—E. J. Buck.

**"Freethinker" is Equal to Doubling Your Own Subscription**

### 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.

HOWELL FRANCIS.—Thanks. Shall appear. Mr. Cohen hopes to visit Sheffield again, but cannot say when.

H. R.—Does it not all turn on the question of whether you would like your child to grow up placing a high value upon opinion as one of the forces that go to make human society healthy? It is either that or training it to become one of a crowd of cowardly conventionalists, who in time comes to look back upon its parents as belonging to the same type. We cannot choose for anyone, all we can do is to place the alternatives before them and let them decide.

T. BETTS.—It would be best to wait for the local reports which may supply us with material for an article. Perhaps you will be good enough to keep us posted.

J. G. FINLAY.—Thanks for subscription. There is no need to apologise. In these times one must do what one can, and that is all that is required. If each one acted on that principle a Fund every five years would see us through all our troubles. "Salt of the Earth" shall appear as soon as possible.

S. GLADING.—We are obliged for the report of the discussion in the New Zealand House of Representatives on the Religious Exercises in Schools Bill. It is both interesting and useful. The friends of reason and justice need to be ever on the alert.

H. IRVING.—Shall hope to meet you soon. Very sorry to hear of Mr. White's death. Please convey our sympathy to Mrs. White.

We are asked to request C. E. S. to be good enough to write to Westcliff.

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

*The 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.

The arrangements for Mr. Cohen's lecture at the Parkhurst Theatre on October 26 are now well in hand, and friends can help by advertising it as widely as possible among their friends. Reserve seats, price 1s., can be obtained at the office of the *Freethinker*, or next door, at the N.S.S. offices.

Bigotry has been again at work, this time in Glasgow. Following the usual custom the local N.S.S. Branch applied to the magistrates for permission to hold a concert with lecture on Sunday. These meetings have been held for very many years, and asking for permis-

sion was regarded as more or less of a formality. This time the magistrates, while granting permission to a number of I.L.P. and Labour meetings, declined to give it to the Freethinkers. No reasons were given, but it is quite evident, as we have often pointed out, that there is nothing the retrogressive elements in this country dread so much as Freethought. It is the universal solvent of all abuses. The President of the Branch writes us that if the incident brings home to Glasgow Freethinkers the need for a building of their own in which to meet, the refusal of the magistrates may do much more good than harm. We presume that the meetings were to be held in corporation property. Otherwise we should say that the proper course for the Branch to pursue would be to hold the meetings and tell the magistrates to go to the devil—or any other place for which they have a preference.

We are pleased to announce that the other day we received notice from a very old friend of ours and of the movement that he had bequeathed to the National Secular Society the sum of £500. We honestly mean it when we say that we hope it will be a long time before the Society benefits from this particular source. Money is both welcome and necessary to a propagandist movement, but it is dearly purchased by the loss of old friends. But as we must all go one day, it is well to remember that the best of causes will still go on when we are no longer on the scene.

We are pleased to record that our old friend, Mr. E. Anderson, of Forest Gate, has accepted nomination as candidate to contest the Park Ward of West Ham Borough in the Municipal Election to be held on November 1. Mr. Anderson was previously on the Borough Council for three years and gave his best services to the Secular Party in their local work for freedom of thought. We hope all who value truth and religious freedom will, as far as they can, give him their assistance to win the seat. Mr. Anderson's nomination is supported by the whole force of the Trade Union organizations in the Borough.

Mr. George Whitehead is back in London and is now engaged on a "mission" in North and North-West London. We hear from the Secretary of the Finsbury Park Branch that at Highbury Corner there have been large and attentive meetings, which were made the more interesting by a clergyman who offered opposition. There were many questions asked, and good sales of literature made. This is always a good feature, as reading is the only way in which Freethinking can be firmly established in the minds of men and women. Messrs. Judge, Pollock, Wright, and Lovie gave every assistance to the Branch officials in carrying out the week's work. The meetings are to be continued during October. Mr. Whitehead also addressed a very large meeting in Finsbury Park on Sunday morning last.

We are pleased to hear that the first of the public discussions arranged by the North London Branch at the St. Pancras Reform Club passed off very successfully. The debate was on the God idea in which Mr. Pell took the affirmative side and Mr. Palmer the negative. Mr. Ratcliffe occupied the chair. To-night Mr. H. G. Everett and Mr. C. E. Ratcliffe debate the subject "Is Immortality a Fallacy?"

A debate has been arranged between Mr. Hick, Secretary of the R.P.A. for the Plymouth district, and a keen member of the Devonport Branch of the N.S.S., and the Rev. A. Mambly Lloyd, vicar of St. Chad's, Devonport, on "Can Civilization Survive the Collapse of Christianity?" The debate will take place at St. Chad's Mission Hall, Moon Street, Devonport, on Tuesday, October 14, beginning at 7.30 p.m. We trust that as many local Secularists as possible will attend the debate, which should be both interesting and useful.

**Freud.**

FREUD founds his system on Association, Schopenhauer on Will, Hering on Memory, Nayrac on Attention, Maine de Biran on the Sense of Effort, Kant on his insufficient but redundant Categories, Czolbe on Time, Spencer on Evolution, Bergson on the *Elan vital*; what is the reason of these discrepancies?

Does it not become suggested that they are all fiddling tentatively with a mechanism whose complexity baffles them, but of which the first sees one part, the next another. That will be found on further investigation to be the correct answer, and, therefore, so as to form a basis for reasonable discussion I postulate thus the fundamental processes of the mind :

Time ) *Universal Conditions.*  
Space )

Immediate Presentation + Impulse + Hedonism. *Conditions of Function.*

*Including : Sensation.*

Sense of Effort.

*Implies : Conception of Unity.*

Association + Memory.

*Involving :*

Negation.

*Producing : Agreement*

(and its negative,  
*Discrimination).*

*Giving rise to :*

Generalisation

(leading to Classification  
and Symbolism).

The full interpretation of these processes constitutes the backbone of my psychology, so that for the sake of brevity we will assume that exposition to be known. With this mechanism of inter-related actions and reactions well understood, it becomes possible to see as by the light of a lamp the combinations that make up any form of thought, however complex. But what is of interest to our present purpose, this tabulation of the Fundamental Processes will furnish us with a criterion by which we may judge of the success of the great thinkers I have mentioned in their attempt to furnish us with an explanation of the workings of the human mind.

On the very terms it will be seen that they have failed, and that their psychologies, except for luminous suggestion or sporadic hint, are worse than useless. This will become more evident if I give the expression a concrete form. Suppose that a child, trying to understand the working of a steam-engine, observes the piston going up and down, and cries, " Ah, there's the secret of it all."

But the steam-engine, though a fine product of common-sense, is not quite so simple as the child supposes. Another placed at a different angle catches a glimpse of the slide valve, and without clearly seeing what he is looking at, cries out in turn, " No. There's the inner meaning!" A third, venturing to explore, finds the boiler and traces the course of the steam, and cries out, " *Voilà, l'Elan vital*!"

These children are the Kants, the Freuds, the Bergsons of the world in infancy. None of them is capable of giving a clear and lucid explanation of the function he is studying because he has caught tentatively at something partial, and because he has discovered no means even of posing to himself the question in such form as to prepare the solution : in what way can I find the conditions which must be fulfilled in order that the working may become reproducible? And now—let me speak as a professor for a moment—note this important point. If a person thinks that by observing the movement of the piston he has acquired an explanation of the mechanism of the steam-engine, he will talk nonsense not only about the steam-engine, but also about the piston.

And that is precisely what Kant, Schopenhauer, and Bergson and Freud have done for us in philosophy. It requires but little hardihood on my part to say this, for it is evident from the opening sentence that these great philosophers are in contradiction; in that case they cannot all be right, though that fact gives no assurance that all are not wrong. A man cannot solve a simple equation in algebra if he ignores the true method; is it not evident then that he will fail in such an intricate and illusive domain as psychology unless there also he has found the right system?

These propositions are simple as A B C; it is the applications that are so terrible. It reminds me of a notable Member of Parliament who agreed with me that all hereditary privileges were anomalous, but who, as I proceeded still to talk, hauled me up with a look of sheer consternation as he stammered out, " But, but, you wouldn't apply that to our King!"

This is a protentous introduction I know to a discussion of Freud, but the aptness will be seen when I say that as Freud builds his system of psychology on the one process of Association, his system is valueless. This method of attacking the subject is analogous to that by which Galileo smashed the theories of the Thousand Years of Night, or that of Lavoisier who blew away the clouds of that phlogiston which had enabled eminent scientists to think absurdly for generations. This method is not only scientific; it is the method that responds to the deepest principle of science.

There is another way of approaching Freud, and that—ah, you see the power of association—reminds me of the murder of a woman in Kilburn. I was on the staff of a well-known London evening paper at the time, and another member of the staff was a pious Presbyterian who, however, kept his religion in a compartment quite separate from his journalism. When the question of the poster arose various suggestions were made, until Mac, removing his pipe from his mouth, uttered in his broad doric that injunction that so impressed me : " Hauld oop the woman!" No, those were not his exact very words. Even after reading Freud I cannot repeat them; but they would serve as a fitting motto for the elucubrations of this great purveyor of scientific sweetmeats.

In previous studies of thinkers we have found it advantageous to search for the " germinal idea," and thence to trace up the development of the work. With all of those, moreover, even the least successful there was at the threshold a certain sense of responsibility, and an attempt to discover the principles that might render clearer the vast maze of the complexes of thought that confronts the neophyte in psychology. Freud, however, dispensed with these difficulties. While attending the lectures of Charcot—an extraordinary mixture by the way of savant and charlatan—the suggestion was given to him of the great importance of sex even in matters of intellect. Straightway he went off at a tangent, and did not look back, nor apparently around; for never in the whole history even of quackery has a great theory been built up with such sheer flippancy and with so little circumspection.

I have felt inclined to leave the whole matter there, for nothing remains except " gossip," but as the question has been discussed lately in your columns on other lines, and Wohlegemuth and Javali have riddled Freud in detail, I will offer some general comments. It must always be remembered that even when a theory or system of philosophy is false the author may adduce in its support many observations of value, but the theory must be tried on its own basis and by virtue of the arguments that essentially sustain it. I had therefore expected that I might have dug up something worth saving and retaining

in the mass of Freud's writings, but I have found there what old Dennis would have called "a heap of clotted nonsense."

Once in reading, not Freud but Jung, who in veritable German style has given some thoroughness and system to Freud's methods, I met with a curious experience. It was in the analysis in which "male nurse" suggests "cupboard," and from which Jung derives corollaries which seem facile and plausible. But so does Edgar Allan Poe's little essay in thought-reading in his *Murder of the rue Morgue*, and for the same reason, that he knows in advance where he wishes to lead the reader. I had independently tried a similar analysis and had also found the conjunction "male nurse—cupboard," but as I had remembered the links of association I was able to satisfy myself that they had nothing in common with Jung's, and that the conclusions he drew on these grounds were simple fudge.

Freud himself nowhere displays even this semblance of a scientific method; he wades on with the stout heart and untroubled soul of the scavenger. Devoid of illumination from the base he talks egregious nonsense on the theory of sex, he talks egregious nonsense on group psychology, he talks egregious nonsense on the meaning of dreams, he talks egregious nonsense on "the Unconscious"; when he dilates on the "Œdipus complex" he almost achieves genius in folly. There must be something in the man, I am tempted to believe, who could get talk of this sort over the footlights. Take this from the *Theory of Sex*:—

It rather seems to show that the child brings alive into the world germs of sexual activity, and that even while taking nourishment it, at the same time, also enjoys a sexual gratification which it then seeks to procure for itself through the familiar activity of "thumb-sucking."

Or this from his delectable study of Leonardo da Vinci:—

It seems to me that it had been destined that I should occupy myself so thoroughly with the vulture, for it comes to my mind as a very early memory, as I was still in the cradle, that a vulture came down to me, and opened my mouth with his bill and struck me a few times with his tail against my lips.

These words of Leonardo show, according to Freud, "the intensity of the erotic relations between the mother and the child."

I refuse to comment here; there is nothing left but to draw up the ladder, or close the *grille d'égout*.

A question of another kind remains, and that is to trace out the steps by which this stuff became first "popular," then "scientific." Once before when writing on Freud I was met with the objection: "I suppose you won't deny that sex exists." No. To do so would be the feat of an inverted Freud. In regard to sex I have no objection to the fullest and most candid discussion, and I think that the artist and the novelist, for instance, should stand before their work with the same freedom as the anatomist in regard to his subject. But that is not equivalent to saying that a pretentious theory must be true, no matter how weak the scientific argument, if but the sex element be strong. There, however, is the keynote to Freud's success. He has noted the vast extent of prurient sentiments, and he has delivered the goods.

In the United States especially he has had tremendous vogue, partly because of the expertness of "booming," which is the pride of a great class of Yankee publishers. Then yielding to this popular pressure even the British medical journals, and societies holding high reputations, the Teacher's Con-

gress, even the British Association, have opened their doors to Freudism, while in compensation they exclude works of merit.

Here we have a little field of special study in psychology, and my M.P. friend who "stuck to Kant" gives the clue. If a man throws in his lot with the majority he can shield himself from criticism. If he maintains an unorthodox opinion he must so far have mastered the subject as to know where he stands; he must have originality, independence, courage. These qualities are rarer than one might have hoped.

ARTHUR LYNCH.

## Correspondence.

### BIRTH CONTROL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. Kerr's letter leaves me wondering whether it would be any use to ask him to read the book which he affects to criticise. Thus he asserts that "the domestic rabbit and pig are not less fertile than the wild ones." As a matter of fact they are far more fertile; but if Mr. Kerr could be persuaded to read my book he would find it carefully pointed out that comparisons of the effect of environmental changes upon fertility between wild and domesticated varieties are rendered illegitimate by the fact that the latter have been selected for high fertility under favourable conditions for countless generations. He would also find it shown, by a mass of evidence from the leading authorities, that they both, nevertheless, respond to environmental changes according to exactly the same law.

I am accused of regarding France as "the leader of the world in hygiene" because I point out that the decline of both birth-rate and death-rate commenced in that country during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Before the Revolution the population suffered from a terrible burden of taxation, from over-work and from underfeeding. With the removal of these burdens the death-rate naturally fell, and the birth-rate immediately fell with it. I fail to see that this plain statement of fact involves the assertion that France led the world in hygiene, although, in the broader sense of the term, the fall of the death-rate was due to an improvement in hygienic conditions.

Mr. Kerr wonders how I know that the fall in the birth-rate in the Suez Canal zone, when the death-rate fell, was not due to contraceptives. Because such an explanation involves the nonsensical assumption that the people study the death-rate returns and only take to contraceptives when the death-rate begins to fall; and because Dr. Halford Ross, who was in charge of the measure which brought about the fall in the death-rate, testifies that contraceptives had nothing to do with it, their use being entirely contrary to the religious beliefs of the people. This fall in the birth-rate immediately following the fall in the death-rate is common to every case, without a single exception, where the statistics are reliable and not vitiated by migration; and the suggestion that birth control is responsible for the vast decrease in the death-rate from malaria, typhoid, smallpox, and a hundred other diseases which always follows vigorous hygienic measures, is too crude to merit criticism.

Mr. Kerr wishes to know if I have heard of *coitus interruptus*. If he will read his birth control literature he will find it admitted by Dr. Norman Haire, in his address to the Medical Section of the International Conference of the Malthusian League in 1922, that in 95 per cent. of cases *coitus interruptus* is followed by conception. The fact that Roman Catholic priests in the confessional frequently come across evidence of attempts to prevent conception by such means proves nothing as to its success. Apparently Mr. Kerr believes that the people of any country only become acquainted with *coitus interruptus* when the death-rate begins to fall. But it was practised centuries before the fall in the death-rate began, and never affected the birth-rate in the least degree.

Knowing Mr. Kerr's controversial methods I was morally sure that his assertion that the vast majority of the people dealt with by birth control clinics have no more children was based upon what he wished to believe rather than upon ascertained facts, and his admission that the clinics have published no statistics confirms this. But I must altogether decline to accept his naïve assurance that the judgment of the people in charge may be implicitly relied upon. Mr. Kerr's own powers of self-deception are a sufficient reason why. What will happen if a thousand average families using no contraceptives are set apart will be that a vast proportion will have no more children, some will have one, some two, and so on in diminishing proportion. And this is just what happens with those who take to contraceptives. Those who have another conception after using contraceptives will usually persuade themselves that they were not sufficiently careful and try again. As Mr. Kerr knows, an immense proportion of the "contraceptives" sold are the merest frauds, yet any of the manufacturers of these frauds can show thousands of unsolicited testimonials from people who, having had no more children after using them, have attributed this result to the "contraceptives" on the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* principle. The "evidence" provided by the birth control clinics is of exactly the same quality and would not deceive a child who did not wish to be deceived.

The assertion that no biologist in the world agrees with me is a characteristic example of Mr. Kerr's conception of controversial accuracy. If he will study the falling birth-rate he will find that a whole series of prominent doctors, statisticians, and sociologists express the view that the declining birth-rate is due mainly or partly to natural causes. And if he will study the history of science he will find that it is a record of the efforts of individuals or small minorities—always successful in the long run—to break down the prejudices and preconceived ideas of those whose conception of scientific method consists in self-deception and a refusal to look facts in the face.

I am credited with the belief that the people of New Zealand "know nothing about contraceptives." Of course, what I actually said was that there is no propaganda in that country in the shape of meetings, newspaper articles or leaflets; but Mr. Kerr seems to be afflicted with a kind of congenital incapacity to credit me with my own beliefs and prefers to impose upon me distortions of his own devising. I should be justified, by the way, in protesting in the strongest terms against Mr. Kerr's accusation of "wildest statements" and similar charges, which always turn out to be based upon nothing but his own neglect to make himself acquainted with the views he is criticising or with the most elementary and essential facts; but I fancy I can afford to leave the matter to the judgment of your readers.

CHARLES EDWARD PELL.

#### ARTHUR LYNCH AND HERBERT SPENCER.

SIR,—Mr. Henry Spence's letter makes me pleased and, at the same time, sad. Pleased, because he innocently furnishes proof of my assertion that, in questions of philosophy, the standards of judgment are radically false, for in place of the rightness or wrongness of the reasoning they introduce all sorts of extraneous matters of which the most important are prejudice and the force of mere authority.

Mr. Spence argues that although Spencer's conceptions were imperfect they were passable sixty years ago. Yes, but Spencer endeavoured to found an enduring system of philosophy, basing on observations such as these; now Mr. Spence himself implicitly condemns him.

He next asks where I get my biological knowledge. As a simple matter of fact I have for my sins studied these and other subjects at various seats of learning more extensively than Spencer or any other of the authorities in philosophy since the days of Aristotle; but I attach no importance to that form of argument; that would bring me to a level with the professors. I gave reasons for what I stated. Mr. Spence then asks: "Can Mr. Lynch give a better formula of evolution than Spencer's?" I reply: Yes, in a preliminary chapter in my *Ethics* I have reviewed the doctrine of Evolu-

tion and have given a statement more comprehensive and exact, and, I hope, more fertile than Spencer's.

Mr. Spence cites a statement of mine as being my formula of evolution. The phrase quoted simply indicated a radical defect of Spencer's enunciation, and was used only within that scope. Mr. Spence's remarks here are pointless; that is, in line with the academico-conservative tradition.

Mr. Spence says that Spencer did not offer his formulation as a law of nature. But he did, for it was the guiding principle of development of all his work, and he applied the doctrine derived from biology to domains only remotely connected with his first field of study.

As to the question referred to by Mr. Spence of the transmission of acquired characters, that is subsidiary in Spencer's philosophy; his essential theory might be held either with this or without it.

I have no criticism of Spencer, still less with Robbie Burns—for he at least was successful—for taking pains to make his work perfect. Mr. Spence's remarks here are again beside the mark. I certainly throw about a few epithets, but the point was directed not against Spencer but against the strongholds of the professors, who, even after Spencer had produced all that was vital in his system, left him to perish, and only admitted him in at the end, even as great leaders in another sphere are now being roped in to have their claws clipped, to be muzzled, to be deprived of their vitality.

I see that, if there be any destiny worth while in store for the human race, the one great instrument of our salvation is thought; and I see also that the great Universities which should be the leaders of the people stand as obstruction to all thought that threatens certain of their lower interests; I see the domains of religion and politics reeking with shams and falsities; I see in the rewards of merit, whether academic preferences or political titles, such as Bradley's O.M., grotesque inversions of standards; I see learned societies, including the British Association, turned into log-rolling cliques; yet in the midst of this, still strong in my own faith that the light will prevail and that the walls of these immoral Jerichos will fall, I build especial hope on the mind of youth; and then I find these poisoned at the source by the same old traditional lies, diseased by intellectual frauds and warped from their proper purpose; and that is why, as I said at the beginning, I have been made sad—till once more I take up my burden, and my frail but imperishable weapon of reason, and march forward.

ARTHUR LYNCH.

#### Obituary.

It is my sad duty to record the death of Mr. Tom White, who was a member of the Barnsley Branch N.S.S. He died while at business on Friday, September 26. To die in harness befitted his desire, but the shock to his wife and family was consequently severe. About thirty years ago when the present editor of the *Freethinker* threw his weight into the movement, I introduced the paper to Mr. White. His own mental endowment and his reading had already made him sceptical of religious beliefs. The *Freethinker* did the rest. He became a subscriber and a propagandist. The day before he died I delivered his copies of the journal, as it has been my custom to do every Thursday for all those years. Tom White was a fearless antagonist, and would stand alone if need be for any principle he adopted, whether it suited or did not suit friends or foes. His honesty, courage and generosity stood out in a marked degree. His fertile brain and his argumentative powers made him a boon companion. His expressed wishes for a Secular cremation—no drawn blinds—no mourning—no fuss—were faithfully carried out by his loving wife and his two sons, who bore themselves bravely through a trying ordeal. The body was cremated at Sheffield on Tuesday, September 30, and the writer conducted a Secular service at the crematorium.—H. IRVING.

### The Hand of the Potter.

HAD I stumbled across Omar's potter "thumping his wet clay" I should not have been more astonished. There, amid the bee-pillaged heather stood the moorland pottery, a long, low building with a solitary chimney-stack. Only the faint hum of running belts gave token of industry until one approached and heard the rumble of wheel-barrows.

Two men were digging the stubborn clay from the heathery slope, and conveying it to the "blunger" in which it was being converted to a creamy, clay-filled liquid, and then sieved. Near at hand was the "pan"—a long shallow trough where the clayey mess had set into a firm, even mass ready for the "pugging mill."

The "pugging mill" was steadily turning out its long, thick "slip" of refined clay, portions of which were being carried to the "thrower."

There at his wheel the "thrower" sat, receiving weighed portions of "slip," and, with deft fingers, giving form to formlessness.

In the sultry heat of the drying room stood the rows of unbaked vessels—"biscuit" they are called at this stage. To some of the vessels, glaze had been added which, though as yet opaque and lustreless, would fuse to a glassy hardness in the kiln, where the skill—and the shortcomings—of the "thrower" would be monumentalized.

The kiln stood open, with its towers of "biscuit." Fuel was being laid on the kiln floor. To-morrow, in the fierce heat, the potter's work would gain a measure of permanency.

Finished pots—crocks, bread-bowls, bread-pots, mugs—were reposing on tables and shelves in the straw-strewn warehouse. On a bench, near the door, were the "throw-outs"—the submerged tenth of this "clay population"—and rustics were bargaining for them. A hunch-backed, odd-job man—I found on enquiry his disability had been with him from birth—was superintending the sale of these ungainly pots. Was it my fancy, or did I really hear an ungainly vessel say:—

They sneer at me for leaning all awry;  
What! did the Hand then of the Potter shake?

H. BARNES.

### A Sad Situation.

SAID my neighbour to me one morning,  
"My wife went to hear Billy Sunday last night  
And 'hit the sawdust trail,'  
Now she has given herself to Jesus—  
Her sins have all been washed away,  
In the blood of the Lamb,  
And she is going right on up to heaven,  
Just as soon as she gets through with earth and me!  
She tells me though,  
That, in my unregenerate and unsaved condition,  
I am bound straight for hell!  
O, but it is a sad situation,  
I shall not be punished nearly as much as I ought to be,  
For hell will not seem half like hell to me,  
If my wife is not there!"

HOWELL S. ENGLAND.

### MR. G. WHITEHEAD'S MISSION.

Our Missioner, Mr. G. Whitehead, returned to London from his provincial tour on September 29. Last week he held five successful meetings at that outdoor Forum, Highbury Corner, and on Sunday addressed meetings in the morning at Finsbury Park and in the afternoon at Regent's Park. This he will continue to do during October, and will also hold week-night meetings. Those of our friends who wish to have him in other parts of North London during the week should communicate with Miss Vance. As Londoners are not used to open-air Freethought meetings except at the old-established stations, where order is enforced, it is highly necessary that all Freethought comrades in the district should rally round Mr. Whitehead.

### SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

#### LONDON. INDOOR.

ETHICS BASED ON THE LAWS OF NATURE.—(Emerson Club, 14 Great George Street, Westminster, entrance in Little George Street): 3.30, Lecture in French by M. Deshumbert on "La Psychologie des Foules." All are invited.

METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (174 Edgware Road, W.): 7.30, Debate—"That Atheism presents a more Rational View of the Universe than does Theism." Mr. C. H. Keeling v. Father Vincent McNabb, C.P. The Discussion Circle meets every Thursday at 8 at the "Lawrie Arms," Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (St. Pancras Reform Club, 15 Victoria Road, N.W.): 7, Debate—"Is Immortality a Fallacy?" Affirmative, Mr. C. E. Ratcliffe; Negative, Mr. H. G. Everett.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (New Morris Hall, 79 Bedford Road, Clapham): 7, Mr. J. H. Van Biene, "A Few of my Opinions—for what they are worth,"

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7, Mr. Joseph McCabe, "G. B. Shaw on Joan of Arc."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11, C. Delisle Burns, M.A., D.Lit., "Marriage."

#### OUTDOOR.

FINSBURY PARK BRANCH N.S.S. (Highbury Corner, Islington): 8, Mr. G. Whitehead will lecture every evening.

FINSBURY PARK.—11.15, Mr. G. Whitehead, a Lecture.

METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY.—Freethought lectures and debates every evening in Hyde Park. Speakers: Messrs. Baker, Beale, Brayton, Hyatt, Harris, Hart, Keeling, Knubley, Saphin, Shaller, Stephens, Dr. Stuart, M.A., Mr. Vincent, B.A., B.Sc., and Mr. Howell Smith.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Regent's Park, near the Fountain): 3.30, Mr. G. Whitehead, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Outside Technical Institute, Romford Road, Stratford, E.): 7, Mr. H. C. White, a Lecture.

#### COUNTRY. INDOOR.

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S. (No. 2 Room, City Hall, "A" Door, Albion Street): 6.30, Mr. F. Lonsdale, "The Church and Labour." (Silver Collection.)

LEEDS BRANCH N.S.S. (Youngman's Restaurant, 19 Lowerhead Row, Leeds): 7, Mr. Lew Davis, "By Their Gods ye shall know Them."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Humberstone Gate): 6.30, "An Evening with Beethoven," Amy Carpenterhurst, assisted by Edith C. Ensor. (Musical Illustrations.)

ESAU EXCHANGING his birthright for a mess of pottage is not the sort of deal we offer you. You can make quite certain there will be no mess about it at all by referring to the Freethinkers whose names we shall give you. Giving all new enquirers references is only one of our unique modes of doing business. Learn about all the others by writing to-day for any of the following:—*Gents' AA to H Book, Suits from 54s.; Gents' I to N Book, Suits from 99s.; Gents' Superb Overcoat Book, prices from 48s. 6d.; or Ladies' Absorbing Autumn Book, Costumes from 60s., Coats from 46s.* Address the Freethought tailors—MACCONNELL & MAHE, New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

SPRING Cleaning, Vacuum Cleaning, Carpet Beat-  
ing, Floor Polishing, Window Cleaning. Private Houses, Offices, etc. Efficiently and Economically. Send postcard to Mr. LATIMER VOIGHT, the GREAT METROPOLITAN CLEANING CO., LTD., 75 Kinnerton Street, Knightsbridge, S.W.1. 'Phone: Victoria 4447. And he will call and estimate for your requirements. Agencies arranged. Freethinkers help each other.

THE publishers of *THE EVERLASTING GEMS* announce that they have a remnant of the first edition of this vitriolic and amusing book, and that by special arrangement with the author (who is an old supporter of the Freethought cause) they have requested The Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, to supply these copies to readers of the *Freethinker* at the reduced price of 2s. net, post paid.

# 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.

## 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.).

**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.).

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

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

# LEICESTER SECULAR HALL PURCHASE FUND

"Object," to raise £2,500 to free the Hall from debt.

WE APPEAL to all friends of the Movement, whether calling themselves Secularists, Rationalists, or Freethinkers, Positivists or Ethicists, or with no label at all, to give a subscription to the above Fund.

A BAZAAR is to be held, and gifts of Books, Furniture, Clothing, Boots and Shoes, Pictures, and other saleable goods would be welcomed, and are appealed for.

On behalf of the Committee and Members,

SYDNEY A. GIMSON, *President.*

E. HENRY HASSELL, *Vice President.*

HERBERT E. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

Secular Hall, 75 Humberstone Gate, Leicester.

## RUSKIN SCHOOL, for Boys and Girls.

In zone of least rain and most sun. Gravel soil. In own gardens and playing-fields. Rationalist.

BELLERBY LOWERISON,

Heacham-on-Sea, King's Lynn.

## PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS

### DETERMINISM OR FREE-WILL?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

NEW EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

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

Price: Paper, 1s. 9d., by post 1s. 11d.; or strongly bound in Half-Cloth 2s. 6d., by post 2s. 9d.

### HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

By J. W. DRAPER, M.D., LL.D.

(*Author of "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," etc.*)

Price 3s. 6d., postage 4½d.

*A Book that Made History.*

### THE RUINS:

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

By C. F. VOLNEY.

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

Price 5s., postage 3d.

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

### COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANISM.

By BISHOP W. MONTGOMERY BROWN, D.D.

A book that is quite outspoken in its attacks 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.*

PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS.—Continued.

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

Cloth Gilt, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

*A Book with a Bite.*

BIBLE ROMANCES.

(FOURTH EDITION.)

By G. W. FOOTE.

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

In Cloth, 224 pp. Price 2s. 6d., postage 3d.

MODERN MATERIALISM.

*A Candid Examination.*

By WALTER MANN.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

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

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

176 pages. Price 1s. 6d., in neat Paper Cover, postage 2d.; or strongly bound in Cloth 2s. 6d., postage 3d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK.

*For Freethinkers and Enquiring Christians.*

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

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.

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

## The Repeal of the Blasphemy Laws

**A Verbatim Report of the Speeches by Mr. Cohen, the Rev. Dr. Walsh, and Mr. Silas Hocking, with the Home Secretary's Reply.**

(Issued by the Society for the Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws.)

PRICE ONE PENNY, by post three-halfpence.

Should be widely distributed by Freethinkers.

## 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

## 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 pages, Cloth Gilt, 5s., by post 5s. 3d.; Paper Covers, 3s. 6d., by post 3s. 10½d.

## BOOK BARGAINS

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY, by ISADOR H. CORIAT. Published at 10s. 6d. Price 4s. 6d., postage 6d.

BODY AND WILL, by HENRY MAUDSLEY, M.D. Published at 12s. Price 4s. 6d., postage 6d.

THE ETHIC OF FREETHOUGHT, by KARL PEARSON, F.R.S. Price 5s. 6d., postage 6d.

A CANDID EXAMINATION OF THEISM, by "PHYSICUS" (G. J. ROMANES). Price 3s. 6d., postage 4d.

LIFE AND EVOLUTION, by F. W. HEADLEY. Price 4s. 6d., postage 6d.

KAFIR SOCIALISM AND THE DAWN OF INDIVIDUALISM, by DUDLEY KIDD. Price 3s., postage 6d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON 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, 18s.; 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.

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