

# THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

*Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper*

VOL. XLVI.—No. 24

SUNDAY, JUNE 13, 1926

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>A Slanderous Parson.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	353
<i>"The Mystery of the Godhead."—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - - - -	354
<i>Swift the Sceptic.—Mimnermus</i> ... - - - - -	356
<i>The Philosophy of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.—</i>	
<i>C. Clayton Dove</i> - - - - -	357
<i>The "Freethinker"</i> - - - - -	361
<i>Subman, Man and Superman.—Ona Melton</i> - - - - -	362
<i>J. A. Froude and his Assailants.—W. Mann</i> - - - - -	363
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums,</i>	
<i>Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

## Views and Opinions.

### A Slanderous Parson.

Some years ago, when reviewing Mr. A. W. Benn's *History of Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, we remarked on the omission of an account of the part played in the breaking down of Christian doctrines by the work of such men as Carlile, Hetherington, Paterson, Holyoake, Bradlaugh, and their fellow workers in the field of popular Freethought. We said then, and it is well worth saying again, that not to notice the work of these men and women is to play right into the hands of the enemy. Orthodoxy not merely sees to it that these men are belittled and slandered while alive, but it takes good care to bury them so soon as they are dead. "Respectable" writers either do not mention them at all, or name them in such a way as to give the unwary reader the notion that they were really not worth notice or study. The names of milder, and well-placed heretics, are duly honoured, of course. It is so easy to praise a heretic of the standing of Colenso, or F. D. Maurice, or Kingsley, or Huxley, and so on. The consequence is that when the student comes to work up the history of a given period, he finds no mention of the names of certain men and women, and grows up in absolute ignorance of what they did, or the part they played in the life of their time. That is one reason why we have never grown enthusiastic over the praise lavished on Huxley and others by certain Freethinkers. There is no great need to praise those that are already praised enough; there is the greatest need to do something to keep the names of the really active Freethinkers alive, even at the risk of being thought as bad as they in their day were reckoned to be. It is only fair to add that in a letter to us at the time, he admitted the force of the criticism, and hoped one day to remedy the omission. It has never been done, nor do we observe other heretical historians in a hurry to do so. And if we do not pay adequate honour to our own dead, we have small ground for complaining that Christians will not do so.

\* \* \*

### Slandering Freethinkers.

We were reminded of this by an article in the Northampton Daily Echo of May 31. Sunday, May

30, was "Charity Sunday" in Northampton, and the vicar of All Saints' Church delivered a sermon which well illustrated the nature of Christian charity. It did not lead the vicar to be either truthful or just. In fact, we may assume, it acted as the driving force to lead him to slander the living and to belittle the dead. When a man can say in these days, when Freethinkers are so common that the people who disbelieve in God are those who have no desire to help their fellow men, the statement stamps him as one who has precious little concern about the truth, and as one who realizes that a Christian pulpit is both a safe and an easy place in which to lie about one's fellows, alive and dead. Save as illustrating what we have said above we should not think Mr. Lewis worthy of notice at all. He stands for a peculiarly narrow, untruthful, and objectionable type of Christian, and the less one has to do with such men the better. Mere contact with them leaves a bad taste in one's mouth. But the particular passage in Mr. Lewis's address which we desire to notice is this:—

You had in this town some years ago a man called Bradlaugh, an Atheist, a man of nimble wits and superficial cleverness, who created a great stir by poking fun at the Bible and at the Church. But all his writings are in the waste-paper basket today, and there is nothing in this town, or in any other town, which exists as a love-token from Bradlaugh to his fellow men. And where he, and such as he, have walked this world you will find no trace of blessing to their fellows.

Now it is quite certain that no man could lie in this wholesale fashion unless the road had been made easy for him by the ignorance of his hearers as to what Bradlaugh was, what he did, and the kind of influence he had on his fellows. And we seriously suggest that part of the responsibility for this ignorance, and therefore for the poor character of the vicar of All Saints', lies with those who have done so little to keep the name and memory of Bradlaugh alive. The credit that was properly his, has been given by implication to others whose position in the world cast a halo of respectability over those whose own heresy might otherwise have made them suspect. Non-Christian writers have been in such a hurry to prove that their own heretical opinions were shared by men of standing and position, that they have quite failed to notice how very often these men of standing owed their own freedom to speak to the very ones whose work and influence they ignored. Men such as the vicar of All Saints' do not slander in the manner above noted unless it is safe, and one may do them the justice of saying that if it were unsafe to slander they would probably tell the truth. At least they would refrain from indulging in its opposite.

\* \* \*

### Christian Charity.

Presumably the vicar of All Saints' had in mind by public benefactors the givers of money only. It is the kind of test which appeals to Christians more



than to any other people in the world, and it is the kind of goodness most easily dispensed, and one which probably brings the smallest amount of real benefit in its train. The genuinely good man finds it no great difficulty to practise this kind of goodness, and the self-seeker, the man who for various reasons wishes to stand well with the public, the man who wishes to divert attention from various forms of quite legal rascality, finds it a very convenient form of virtue indeed. If the vicar had this sort of benefaction in mind, then on any large public scale Bradlaugh fell short. In acts of private benefaction, he probably outdid his slanderer. And in any other respect he would stand immeasurably above him. During his life he was loved by many thousands of men and women who could have no trace of self-seeking, and no hopes of monetary gain from their affection. And there were more genuine tears shed at his death than would be shed at the death of any one of the clergy of the English Church. The love tokens that men all over the country gave Bradlaugh were plain and unmistakable. He won the respect and admiration of those who agreed with his opinions, and even with the more decent among those who did not. The vicar of All Saints' cannot be reckoned among the number of the latter. He can respect neither sincerity of effort nor honesty of conviction. Praise from such a character, if any were forthcoming, would indeed be a condemnation of Bradlaugh.

\* \* \*

#### Helping Christians.

We suppose it is not much use expecting the vicar to appreciate the value to a nation of men who educate the public conscience by standing for what they believe to be right, careless of consequences, and who place the search for truth as among the most important of human pursuits. Others, however, with a keener sense of the harm to public life caused by neglect of these things, who see the consequences in the trickery, the dishonesty exhibited in public affairs, and, above all, who realize their profound reaction on human character, may feel inclined to rank the example of Bradlaugh as one of his most valuable gifts to the nation at large, even if that gift is so ill-appreciated in the vicarage of All Saints', Northampton. But even a fair-minded Christian of today, with a genuine appreciation of the influence of heresy on religious beliefs, might well consider the nature of the debt the believer owes to the unbeliever. It is part of the current cant in religious circles that to-day Christianity has become purified, that Christians have to-day a truer conception of the nature of God, of the beauty of the Bible, and that Christian doctrines are more humane. But how was this criticism brought to bear upon Christianity? Mainly by the very men that the vicar, in the safety of his pulpit, and preaching to people who either will not or cannot criticize him, holds up as of no account. How much of the belief in the literal inspiration of the Bible, in the unforgivable nature of unbelief, in the reality of eternal damnation, etc., would the preachers of this country have given up had it not been for the educative influence of Bradlaugh and his like? If Christianity has become more humanised, it is because Bradlaugh and others have helped to humanise Christians.

\* \* \*

#### Bradlaugh the Man.

Charles Bradlaugh's ability as a legal advocate was admitted by some of the leading legal authorities. His power as an orator on the public platform was also admitted. T. P. O'Connor once said that of all the speakers he had ever heard he had never known one to wield the power Bradlaugh wielded over a

public audience. Without his heresy he might have risen to any rank in the political world. As it was, and towards the close of his life, it was generally said by prominent politicians that if he had lived he was bound to hold office. In either capacity, had Bradlaugh worked for his own advancement, in the spirit that so many churchmen work for promotion, he might have died a wealthy man, and had he kept his opinions to himself, we fancy the vicar of All Saints' might have been eulogising him to-day. He would not have hesitated to praise the hypocrite, where he slanders the man. Bradlaugh allowed nothing to stand in the way of what he believed to be true and just. At the risk of misunderstanding and slander he fought for the right of the public discussion of Birth Control, and made it possible for Bishops and others to now lecture on it. He fought Government after Government to finally liberate the press of England. He fought the cause of the working man all over the country, and exposed the ruthlessness of monopoly after monopoly. His advice was at the service of any body of poor men who came seeking it. Above all, he set the example of absolute loyalty to truth, and spent his life—aye, and lost it—in the service of his fellows. That example was not lost—human nature would be a poor thing if it could be lost. It is only lost upon men such as the vicar of All Saints', whose appreciation of mental honesty is of so elementary a character. It is true that Bradlaugh's name is not to-day so well known as it ought to be. The responsibility for that lies primarily at the doors of Christian prejudice, which sees to it that the work of heretics shall be forgotten as speedily as possible. But it should be the endeavour of those Freethinkers who profess to honour the life and work of Bradlaugh to make the world realize that they are conscious of their indebtedness to him. The name of Bradlaugh remains, as the work of every good man remains. It is seen in the more liberal theology, the broader humanity of our times; it is seen in the saner and more liberal politics of our time. The vicar of All Saints' counts these things as of small account. But then he is the vicar of All Saints', and evidently has not the strength of mind and character to resist the demoralizing influence of his creed. We apologise to the shade of Bradlaugh for having to bracket the two names in the same paragraph.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

#### "The Mystery of the Godhead."

SUCH is the significant title of a leading article in the *Guardian* for May 28, and the very use of such a title shows conclusively that the article should not have been written. If the Godhead is a mystery it follows that nobody knows anything at all about it. And yet it so happens that the very people who call it a mystery write and speak of it as if it were an open sesame. In the leader just mentioned we are told that "many years ago, a young Balliol man, reading an essay to Jowett, was rash enough to declare that the Athanasian Creed, though a little obsolete in its terminology, could still be retained 'on account of its intrinsic merits' in the services of the Church." The Master of Balliol College, Benjamin Jowett, was anything but an admirer of the Athanasian Creed, and one can easily imagine the smile of scornful amusement that played on his countenance as he listened to the silly pronouncement of the omniscient young man. By the Godhead is meant "God as regarded in his triune nature, the Divine Trinity." Now, if God is known to possess a triune nature, or to constitute a Divine Trinity, surely



mystery is excluded. Of course, such a glaring inconsistency does not count in the theological world, being the commonest offence of which the divines are guilty. The *Guardian* states that "the doctrine of the Trinity is manifestly bound up with the assertion of our Lord's Divinity," which is a statement the truth of which cannot logically be denied. Consequently we find no doctrine of the Trinity in the Bible. It is true the names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, occur in it; but it is not indicated that they constitute the one true and living God. The truth is that the doctrine of the Trinity, not only is not biblical in its origin, but was humanly constructed during an extremely stormy period in the history of the early Church. The Christians pretended to be in possession of a knowledge deliberately withheld from non-Christians. Tertullian, for example, taught that a mechanic, if a genuine disciple of Christ, could easily solve problems which completely baffled and put to open shame the greatest Pagan philosophers; and curiously enough this same Father (160-230) was the first to employ the term Trinity to express the tri-personality of the Supreme Being. The Trinitarian controversy forms one of the darkest and saddest epochs in ecclesiastical history. The story of the heartless persecution of Arius because he rejected the orthodox doctrine is heartbreaking in the extreme. Gibbon says of him:—

His most implacable adversaries have acknowledged the learning and blameless life of that eminent presbyter, who, in a former election, had declared, and perhaps generously declined, his pretensions to the episcopal throne. His competitor Alexander assumed the office of his judge. The important cause was argued before him; and, if at first he seemed to hesitate, he at length pronounced his final sentence, as an absolute rule of faith. The undaunted presbyter, who presumed to resist the authority of his angry bishop, was separated from the communion of the Church. But the pride of Arius was supported by the applause of a numerous party (vol. ii. p. 389).

The controversy ended at the Nicene Council (325) in the triumph of Athanasius and the banishment of Arius, and the Nicene Creed ultimately became absolutely authoritative throughout the Church, although Arianism never ceased to exist, and even the Unitarians of to-day are lineal descendants of the famous Presbyter of the fourth century.

Having seen how utterly disgraceful and anti-social the Trinitarian controversy was from the very first, we now come to examine calmly and dispassionately the doctrine of the Trinity. The *Guardian* frankly admits that it suggests serious difficulties and is open to extremely grave objections, saying that "there is a difficulty for many minds in the very notion of a threefold Being within the undivided Unity. It is this same kind of perplexity which has produced Unitarianism in our own neighbourhood, and which gives a certain colour to the protest of the Jew and the Mohammedan, that theirs are the only monotheistic creeds." Our protest against it is that it is at once wholly unscientific and unphilosophical. Psychology informs us that multiple personality is a form of abnormality; in other words, that it is a disease. Many years ago there was in Manchester a Presbyterian minister who had the reputation of being a powerful preacher and efficient pastor. He was very fond of horse-riding. One day when out riding he fell from his horse and sustained serious injuries to the head. Though his life was despaired of for a while, he ultimately recovered; but he was a radically changed character. His piety had taken its departure, and his love of fine literature was dead. In every respect he was now the very opposite of what he had been before the accident. It is

not known to the present writer whether or not he remembered in his abnormal condition the incidents of his normal life prior to the fall. Usually, however, a person in an abnormal condition has an accurate recollection of the normal condition that preceded it. Dr. Azam informs us that in his investigation of the case of Félida X., an hysterical subject, he discovered that in her normal state, or "first condition," she was devoted to work and of a serious disposition, but that when she fell into an abnormal state, or "second condition," she displayed an amazing amount of gaiety and lightheadedness. Often before falling asleep she was in a perfectly normal state, but on reawaking she was found in an abnormal state, and whilst in this second condition she clearly remembered the scenes which had transpired in the first, but she invariably attributed them to some other person. As she grew older the transition from a normal to an abnormal state of consciousness became more frequent but retained its suddenness. It is scientifically reported that, in other instances, a man or woman of strong and stable individuality, may and often does, as the outcome of some great shock, "become a totally different being, with a personality entirely different and distinct from that which went before, equally strongly marked, and without the least knowledge or memory of the self which it has displaced." Such is the theory of multiple personality advocated by modern science. In certain circumstances a person may experience two or more radically different selves. "The two may change places again and again, at varying intervals of time; or there may be more than two, successively taking and losing possession of the same bodily organism."

At this stage the question is naturally suggested, what about the Christian Trinity? In the Athanasian Creed we read: "The Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal." The origin of this creed, both as to date and locality, is extremely obscure, but it won its way to universal acceptance in the West, though it never came into use in the East. The first thing about it that strikes an outsider is its thoroughly unscientific phraseology. The psychologists of to-day would condemn it as an entirely unscientific conception. God is represented not as a being who passes successively from one phase of personality to one or two others, the one normal and the others abnormal, but as a being who manifests himself simultaneously as three different and distinct personalities, equally normal and equally capable of more or less independent action. Such a conception is not only anti-scientific, but fundamentally contrary to reason and ineffably absurd. Such a being never existed and never can exist. No wonder that the *Guardian* admits that "men must think and doubt and wonder, and occasions must arise when their perplexities will have a bearing on practical life," and it follows that the more they think and wonder the less they believe on inadequate evidence and the less inclined they become to be swayed by an irrationally etherialized emotionalism. The inescapable fact is that the overwhelming majority of people have come to regard supernaturalism as a worn out and empty superstition, which reasonable beings can no longer entertain. The *Guardian* very truly observes that "the worst blunder of all would be to attempt an official emendation of the traditional phraseology," because what people have ceased to believe in is not



the phraseology, but the ideas which it endeavours to express. Not only the Trinity, but God in any shape or form, has become an object of popular disbelief. He began his existence as a ghost, the mere ghost of a departed relative or chief, and it is as a ghost that never really existed at all he is now at last slipping out of our belief. In spite of all the clergy say to the contrary, Atheism is gaining ground all along the line. The only danger is that God will go out before Humanity, in the fulness of its glory and power, comes in. Let us all do our utmost to cultivate and practise all the moral and social virtues, and to spread abroad the Gospel of human brotherhood and altruistic service. The belief in God has never yet succeeded in securing justice and fair play to all members of the community alike, as our existing industrial discontent abundantly shows. We are profoundly convinced that the right belief in man would ere long engender a spirit of harmony and good will, in the light of which all the perplexing problems which darken and imperil our life at present could be satisfactorily and finally solved.

J. T. LLOYD.

### Swift the Sceptic.

The mystery of vending spiritual gifts is nothing but a trade.—*Swift*.

Not a fantastical fool of them all shall flout me out of my calling.—*Shakespeare*.

Swift is Rabelais in his good sense.—*Voltaire*.

THE Christian Churches have contained in their folds many great men. Some of them were sincere believers in the doctrines they preached. Others were Christians from force of circumstances, or held to the doctrines for the material gain which has ever been no inconsiderable bait with which to catch men. To which class did Jonathan Swift belong? Was this great genius a sincere Christian, or was he merely a professing believer for the sake of the position he hoped to gain? Would he have remained a Christian had actual deaneries and possible bishoprics with their emoluments had no existence? Should we have found him among the Scotch Covenanters on the field of battle, or in the arena with the lions at Rome, had his birthplace placed him in different circumstances?

Three of his biographers, Scott, Johnson, and Thackeray, all unite in describing Swift as a religious man, and the general opinion agrees with them. One hesitates to enter the lists against such eminent writers, but a candid opinion compels a contrary view. The evidence points to the conclusion that Swift was a Christian only in name; that he remained in the Church for "purple, palaces, patronage, profit, and power," as a former Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral puts it. In fact, Swift was not merely a professing Christian: he was devoid of religious feeling, and he was one of the most irreligious of men. Compared to him, Paine and Voltaire were saints, for these great Freethinkers had at heart that enthusiasm for humanity, that love of their fellows, which was entirely absent in Swift. The author of *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Tale of a Tub* was intellectually incapable of believing the Christian legends, and emotionally incapable of loving his fellow-men. *The Tale of a Tub* is one of the most tremendous indictments of the Christian Superstition, from the purely intellectual side, that has ever been given to the world. *Gulliver's Travels* expresses such a scorn of the Lilliputian bitterness and its Brobdignagian coarseness, that its author could not have sympathized with a religion which claims to be a gospel of love.

Voltaire, a most excellent judge, regarded *The Tale of a Tub* as casting ridicule on all forms of the Christian Faith. The man who wrote that book was perfectly aware of the logical inferences of his propositions. The bishops who advised Queen Anne, when they counselled her not to appoint Jonathan Swift to a bishopric, were not without sagacity. There can be no doubt that Queen Anne and Voltaire were both right when, from their very different points of view, they regarded Dean Swift's literary work not only as anti-Christian, but as anti-religious.

Swift was irreligious, and a life-long dissembler. He could be coarser than Rabelais, and profaner than Voltaire. Men have been convicted and sentenced to death for treating sacred subjects less offensively than Swift treats the ceremony of Holy Communion. Consider the facts of his life. He was brought up in the household of the Epicurean, Sir William Temple, and educated in the library of an avowed Freethinker. Swift was the boon companion of Pope, and a friend of Bolingbroke. He deliberately chose these sceptics as the closest friends of his life, and the recipients of his confidence and affection. It is significant, nay, almost conclusive, as to Swift's attitude on religion, that he advised John Gay, the wildest of the wits about town, to turn parson, and look out for a seat on the Bench of Bishops.

The paper Swift left behind him, *Thoughts on Religion*, is merely a set of excuses for not professing disbelief. He says of his sermons, quite truthfully, that he preached pamphlets. They have no special Christian characteristics, and might have been preached from the steps of a Mohammedan mosque. There is no cant, for Swift was too great and too proud a man for that cowardly and sorry device. Tried even by the low standard of the eighteenth century, his sermons are singularly secular. The following amusing passage from Swift's sermon on the fate of Ixtychus, who is said to have fallen out of a window whilst listening to the preaching of Saint Paul, will illustrate the meaning:—

The accident which happened to this young man in the text hath not been sufficient to discourage his successors; but because the preachers now in the world, however they may exceed Saint Paul in the art of setting men to sleep, do extremely fall short of him in the working of miracles; therefore men are become so cautious as to choose more safe and convenient stations and postures for taking their repose without hazard of their persons, and, upon the whole matter, choose rather to entrust their destruction to a miracle than their safety.

The surest indication of Swift's real irreligion is given in the striking verses on the Day of Judgment, which were not published till after his death. They were sent by Lord Chesterfield in a letter to Voltaire, but everybody now knows the biting lines:

Ye who in divers sects were sham'd,  
And came to see each other dam'd,  
(For so folks told you, but they knew  
No more of Jove's designs than you.)  
The world's mad business now is o'er,  
And Jove resents such pranks no more.  
I to such blockheads set my wit!  
I damn such fools! Go, go, you're bit!

It is, of course, true that in ecclesiastical controversy Swift always took the orthodox side, for outwardly he was loyal enough to his employers. For the Deists of his time, such as Toland, Asgill, and Collins, he expressed contempt. He refers to "that quality of their voluminous writings which the English language compels me to call their style." In his famous and sinister argument upon the inconveniences which would result from a total abolition of the Christian Religion, he drenches his opponents with vitriol. But it is all dialectic fencing.



Swift's polemic was aimed at guarding the material prosperity of the Church, of which he was a paid official, just as a counsel will argue for whichever side pays him his retaining fee. If Swift's sword was sharp, it was a double-edged weapon, as may be seen by the sardonic climax:—

To conclude: whatever some may think of the great advantage to trade by this favourite scheme, I do very much apprehend that in six months after the Act is passed for the extirpation of the Gospel, the Bank and East India stock may fall at least one per cent. And since that is fifty times more than ever the wisdom of our age thought fit to venture for the preservation of Christianity, there is no reason why we should be at so great a loss for the sake of destroying it.

When face to face with death, Jonathan Swift let the mask slip from his features, and the real man is seen. When he wrote his own epitaph, he disdained any religious allusion. A pillar of the Church, he refused to permit any pietistic platitude upon his tombstone. A dignified worldliness, an appeal to the memory of men, but not a syllable of theology:—

Here lies the body of Jonathan Swift, Doctor of Divinity, Dean of this Cathedral Church, where fierce rage can tear the heart no more. Go traveller, and imitate, if you can, an earnest, manly champion of freedom.

The original is in Latin, and the dates were the only additions. His allusion to his fight for freedom is genuine, for he fought for the liberty of Ireland.

Rabelais and Renan, both great sceptics, left the Church, and chose the road to mental freedom. Swift stayed in the Church, and failed in his ambition. He had to be content with a petty deanery, when his ambition was at least a bishopric. He had prostituted his great and splendid genius. After all his dissembling, he died, to quote his own painful words, "like a poisoned rat in a hole."

MIMNERMUS.

## The Philosophy of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

### III.

(Concluded from page 342.)

V.—*The Moral Economy*.—This is the supreme manifestation of the universal order. It is composed of beings who participate in reason, and to whom reason prescribes conduct. Hence, all men are members of one state, and subjects of one law. On this point, Marcus is admirably clear. He says:—

There is one universe made up of all things, and one god who pervades all things, and one substance and one law, [one] common reason in all intelligent animals, and one truth (vii. 9). If our intellectual part is common, the reason also, in respect of which we are rational beings, is common; if this is so, common also is the reason which commands us what to do, and what not to do; if this is so, there is a common law also, if this is so, we are fellow citizens; if this is so, we are members of some political community; if this is so, the world is in a manner a state (iv. 4).

As the universe is composed of one substance and one soul, and, as all things work together in perfect order, it is a law for everything to act according to its nature. This action is involuntary in all cases except that of man. For whilst the other beings act naturally but without perceiving their nature, man acts naturally by perceiving his nature. Hence, in the case of man to act according to nature is to act

according to reason, for reason is that which distinguishes him from the other members of the universe.

Dost thou not see the little plants, the little birds, the ants, the spiders, the bees, working together to put in order their several parts of the universe? Art thou unwilling to do the work of a human being, and dost thou not make haste to do that which is according to thy nature? (v. 1). To the rational animal the same act is according to nature and according to reason (vii. 11).

Morality is the conduct prescribed by reason. It consists first of social duty, or obligations with respect to our fellow men, then of private duty, or obligations with respect to the things which in themselves are neither good nor evil, such as pleasure, pain, and death. Under the former category are justice, and benevolence; under the latter, patience and temperance.

Just as it is with the members of those bodies which are united in one, so it is with rational beings, which exist separate; for they have been constituted for one co-operation (vii. 13). For we are made for co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of upper and lower teeth (ii. 1). As thou thyself art a component part of a social system, so let every act of thine be a component part of social life (ix. 23). But, death, certainly, and life, honour and dishonour, pain and pleasure, all these things equally happen to good men and bad, being things that make us neither better nor worse. Therefore, they are neither good nor evil (ii. 11, see also v. 26).

If in contradiction to reason, man obeys one or another of the impulses possessed in common with inferior beings, he acts against reason, and this conduct is the only evil possible; for things beyond human control cannot do any harm, and, being natural, they are strictly in accord with the universe. Indeed, the existence of moral evil involves no dissonance in the cosmic harmony.

When thou art troubled about anything, thou hast forgotten, that all things happen according to the universal nature (xii. 26). Generally, wickedness does no harm at all to the universe; and particularly the wickedness [of one man] does no harm to another. It is only harmful to him who has it in his power to be released from it, as soon as he shall choose (viii. 55). We are all working to one end.....but men co-operate after different fashions; and even those co-operate abundantly who find fault with what happens, and those who try to oppose it and to hinder it, for the universe had need even of such men (vi. 42).

Here, a modern critic is likely to raise the following objection. If Marcus is correct in asserting that the right use and the wrong use of the reason are the only things respectively good and bad for man, then he is justified in concluding that evil is exclusively moral. But does not this conclusion tend to support oppression by denying that the effects thereof are harmful, except in the mistaken opinion of the subjects, who, however, ought to form the contrary judgment. The objection, though plausible, can be removed. Poverty and slavery, witness Epictetus, do not necessarily keep a man from attaining his proper end. But, as poverty and slavery could not exist if men fulfilled the duties imposed by a correct view of social relationships, the prevalence of the doctrine that virtue is the only good would automatically remove inequality of possessions and every form of tyranny. For, whether pain be, or be not, an evil, the infliction thereof by men upon their fellows is certainly an evil, being the result of a vicious disposition. Moreover, as private contentions and public strife are mostly due to the excessive



value that individuals and nations put upon the possession of commodities and land, the belief that these things are indifferent would prevent all the horrors arising from such competition. To destroy a tree, there is no need to lop off its branches; the better way is to fell it.

The ethical system of Marcus, whether true or false, is at least the purest that was ever invented. It rests obligation upon the constitution of man, and it never attempts to ensure right conduct by proposing either rewards or punishments.

For what more dost thou want when thou hast done a man a service? Art thou not content that thou hast done something conformable to thy nature? and dost thou seek to be paid for it? just as if the eye demanded a recompense for seeing, or the feet for walking. For as these members are formed for a particular purpose, and by working according to their several constitutions, obtain what is their own; so also as man is formed by nature to acts of benevolence, when he has done anything benevolent or in any other way conducive to the common interest, he has acted conformably to his constitution, and he gets what is his own (ix. 42). When thou hast done a good act and another has received it, why dost thou still look for a third thing besides these, as fools do, either to have the reputation of having done a good act or to obtain a return? (vii. 73).

Here again Marcus and Jesus are much at variance since the latter thought it necessary to encourage renunciation by the offer of a hundredfold return in "houses.....and lands" (Mk. x. 30) and even went so far as to promise a reward for bestowing a cup of cold water (Mt. x. 42; Mk. ix. 41). The difference is still greater in the matter of sanction, which Marcus never once took into consideration, whereas Jesus threatens it in the terrible form of the quenchless fire and the undying worm (Mk. ix. 48). In common with all the Stoics, Marcus regarded fear as a base passion, and he reckons it a thing to be deprecated before the gods (ix. 40). Hence, in his opinion, to have cured a man of lust by inspiring him with fear would have been like curing him of a headache by giving him the colic; for lasciviousness would simply have been exchanged for cowardice. As Marcus believed identity to perish at death, it is clear that he did not think the moral economy would concern its present subjects in a future life; and, moreover, upon his principles any such continuation of the system with a view to its completion, is quite unnecessary, and even impossible. For, as pain is not an evil, as vice is involuntary, as virtue is its own reward, and as even wrong-doing subserves the general order of the universe, there is no occasion whatever for indemnification, retribution, remuneration, or even amelioration. Here is another striking difference between Marcus and Christianity, for according to the latter, it is to be expected that, at the end of time, a terrific personage upon a great white throne shall judge the past deeds of all men, recompensing the good, and punishing the wicked; and upon the judgment shall make all things new..... The above are the main outlines of the system. There are, however, one or two details of application that should be noticed. As Marcus enacted laws for the mitigation of slavery, it is natural to find him asking himself, "How hast thou behaved.....to thy slaves?" (v. 31). But, in view of the silence, which teachers more revered than he is, have observed with respect to the rights of our dumb relations, it is an agreeable surprise to hear him say:—

As to the animals which have no reason, and generally all things and objects, do thou, since thou hast reason, and they have not, make use of them with a generous and liberal spirit (vi. 23).

The evils against which he girds especially are anger, resentment, and discontent; also the lust of life, the fear of death, and the desire of fame. In some cases he opposes to a vice its opposite virtue, as for instance, to anger, mildness; to resentment, forgiveness; and to discontent, patience. It is noteworthy that the faults exposed are mostly those peculiarly characteristic of old age. Comparatively little is said of temperance and moderation. These are virtues that Marcus had acquired early and practised successfully. Besides, it is easier to restrain the appetites than it is to govern the emotions; and Marcus was long exposed to things that must have tried severely his forbearance and endurance. The only fleshly weakness that occasioned him compunction was a certain disinclination to rise betimes. He alludes thrice to this pathetic circumstance (v. 1; vii. 21 viii. 12). He warns himself not to expect too much from his efforts for the improvement of other people, saying, "Be content if the smallest thing goes on well, and consider such an event to be no small matter" (ix. 29). This is all the more remarkable since Capitolinus attributes to him the art of making bad men good, and good men better (M. Ant 12). Of his attempts at self-amendment, he says:—

Be not disgusted, nor discouraged, nor dissatisfied, if thou dost not succeed in doing everything according to right principles; but when thou hast failed, return back again, and be content if the greater part of what thou doest is consistent with man's nature (v. 9).

He is well aware that others have observed his shortcomings; but this only emboldens him to say: "Be content if thou shalt live the rest of thy life as thy nature wills" (viii. 1). Indeed he seems pleased to have escaped the danger of living for reputation. This indifference to "the great cloud of witnesses" is one of his most touching disclosures, and it proves conclusively that he was far advanced on the way to perfection. Such is the system, and such the work. It cannot be denied that some of the principles are open to question; that some of the arguments lack force; that some of the dictates are impracticable. In these respects the book is more or less a failure as a treatise on ethics, which should of course proceed upwards from sound premises to safe conclusions. But, upon the other hand, it has such a strong tendency to promote goodness that it serves the one end of ethics more successfully than many a better exposition of the theme. For, with the exception of Emerson, no teacher ever rivalled Antoninus in the power of raising men from low aims to high purposes. His fine perception of duty, his spotless purity of motive, and his untiring effort of obedience, are the sources of this power. He breathed his personality into his book; and thus it became itself a font of inspiration.

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

#### A LIBERAL EDUCATION.

That man has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic-engine, with all its parts of equal strength and in smooth working order, ready, like a steam-engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers, as well as forge the anchors of the brain; whose mind is stored with knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations; who, not stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself.—*Prof. Thomas Huxley.*



## Acid Drops.

An announcement in a Sunday paper informs the world of an entente between the Pope and Mussolini. We have rice Christians in India, bread-and-treacle Christians in West Ham; we trust that this news does not mean castor-oil Catholics.

Christian love in actual practice is a queer thing. Just how much it is worth is revealed by some remarks made by a speaker at a Protestant meeting. This good man said that if the present Roman Catholic (Removal of Disabilities) Bill, which has passed its second reading, gets on the Statute Book, "we shall see once more processions of the Host in the streets—guarded by the police, and possibly by soldiers!" The spectacle of Protestants breaking the heads of Catholics for the love of Christ is really funny. If such a thing does happen, we hope the "movie" people will send a few pictures of these affrays to India. The squabbling religious sects there will be glad to see how the civilized whites settle their religious differences.

Catholicism battles royally for things that don't matter; a Don Quixote in the guise of the Rev. Father Herbert Thurston, S.J., addressing the University of London Catholic Society, asked what happened to children who died at birth: did they form a sort of celestial kindergarten? Apart from the fact that undertakers could supply the answer, the subject-matter gives a fairly good idea of the mental level of an audience that could be attracted by the subject and the lecturer. Here is a priest in the twentieth century throwing dust about in what is called a lecture! by this we measure the courage of a Bruno or a Servetus centuries ago.

The correspondent of one of the Sunday-school journals relates, as something of which Christians should be proud, that during the Strike some of the strikers passed the time away by singing school hymns. It is hardly worth while pointing out to those who are impressed by this that people who have no better idea of enjoyment than this, when enforced idleness occurs, are not likely to conduct life's business in the most intelligent manner, but some will certainly draw that conclusion. The mental vacuity indicated by a body of men having nothing better to do than sing Sunday-school hymns is shocking to think of.

A journalist, "T. E. W.," in the *Saturday Review*, as a result of the strike, has been sitting on the stool of repentance—denied his daily fodder of news. In this period of abstinence he opens his soul (in a column and a half) and tells us—what we already know. "Deny him news," he writes, "and he will fade away into imbecility." There is a chance to say something clever here, but we refrain, and with the prospect of the end of the strike he strikes a major key, thus:—

We of the pen are forced back, or allowed back, to the old, great, weary, endlessly exciting game, the wonderful business, sport, and slavery of recording, commenting, explaining, and generally assaulting the weak mind of this long-suffering nation.

It is a good thing that public opinion can exist without the journalist, and in *Riverside Nights* this particular form of activity is neatly summarized. An old newspaper seller confides in a purchaser that there is more joy in Fleet Street over one man who cuts his sweetheart's throat than over the ninety and nine who marry and live happy ever afterwards.

After reading the report about St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, no one will again be able to say that the churches are useless. A member of a horticultural association gave a lecture within the above church's sacred

precincts—we believe we have got the description right—on the culture of vegetables. And probably this was the first time in that place that the congregation ever heard anything that it could understand. You cannot do metaphysical tricks with cabbages.

We give below in full detail a curious offer made to the readers of the *Saturday Review*. As disinterested observers of the feverish activities of workmen in London on the building of cinemas and banks, in our wildest moments we could only conceive that such energy was being used in tidying the place up for the Resurrection Day. If great minds do not think alike they at least think on parallel lines, and with this remark we introduce the aforesaid and above-mentioned offer, which is only a *jeu d'esprit* of the *Saturday Review*, or, as it were, a flick on the head of Christianity with a bladder, or, again a trifle *passée*, and not even touching the fringe of fundamental Freethought:—

We offer a First Prize of Two Guineas and a Second Prize of Half a Guinea for the best official announcement that the Day of Judgment is imminent, prepared for transmission by the B.B.C. The announcement must not exceed 100 words in length, and should be accompanied by an appropriate request for the preservation of calm.

In 1817, William Hone was prosecuted for publishing *Three Parodies*; since then a little ventilation has taken place in the musty corridors of theology, mainly due to the illustrious obscure heroes who did not devastate half Europe in the name of war, but, instead, helped to remove the taboo on sacred subjects. In another fifty years' time it is possible that the *Saturday Review* may be publishing sensible articles on the philosophy of Materialism when it has finished sowing its wild oats.

If he did not mean it, he has said it. Even in saying it he follows in the footsteps of one who perhaps said it better and meant it—over a hundred years ago. And may we renounce our right to call ourselves Freethinkers if we pour the waters of scorn on the tender shoots of common sense. Make way, then, and listen to Mr. Winston Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech to the two hundred delegates of the World's Parliaments. "It was," he said, "for all of them to reconcile their duty to their own race and people with the wider kinship and comradeship of man throughout the world." Older he has grown, we will not commit an opinion on his wisdom, but we forgive him his taste in hats for reciting the *credo* of Thomas Paine.

The *Daily Chronicle*, to use a colloquialism, is well after the new Messiah whom Mrs. Besant is to introduce to England. A column of journalese gives well-known information about the Theosophical Society, and the writer, "Pro Bono Publico," who is well known in Grub Street, constitutes himself a public benefit society. One Messiah has given enough trouble in the world; by dying on a cross he has enabled millions to live on it, and competition in the business, following imports from America, is at bursting point. A penny daily as the bulwark of the real article is a joke that does not happen every day in this turbulent world.

A writer in the *Morning Post* is responsible for the following item of news: "The Dayton (Iowa) Fundamentalists are scotched, not killed. It is rumoured that further action is to be taken in active support of the First Book of Genesis." It would be an event if the primrose sprinkler caught up with the Freethinker.

The Stoke Newington General Purposes Committee recommend the Council to request the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to withhold their sanction from the proposed building of a Church of the Seventh Day Adventists. This is very selfish of them, but as the reason given for this request is an aesthetic one, we will not



spoil the picture by saying anything about trade interests.

Was the General Strike an "act of God"? We are inclined to fancy so, since reading the *Daily Chronicle's* Saturday sermonette. This tells us gravely: "Our country has had a hard lesson to learn of late; and maybe it is but the beginning of a lesson that now God intends to teach afresh to all the world." The strike, then, was God's little way of demonstrating that he is a jealous god. We are to understand that, disliking these Sunday games and the non-Churchgoing habits of his subjects, God thought a sharp lesson, with a hint perhaps that more dreadful lessons might follow, would effect a reform. On this theory, then, the Labour leaders were mere agents of deity and are thus quite undeserving of the vituperation which has been hurled at their innocent heads. If this be so, God might as well have told the journalists what he was up to. If he had done that, what a lot of bad language we should have been spared! There is another thing we notice about the sermonette writer's god. In his efforts to teach the unrighteous the error of their ways, the Lord doesn't appear to care whether the godly are made to suffer as the ungodly. But allowing the innocent to suffer as well as the guilty seems always to have been a favourite trick of God when striving to reveal his love for mankind.

Girl Guides' organizations have been condemned by the Primate of Hungary. In prohibiting the establishment of such organizations in any institutions under his control, the Archbishop declares that the Guide movement has a masculine character, pursues masculine aims, and is "opposed to the very soul of a girl." The Primate, we note, does not state what exactly according to his Catholic view are the essential characteristics of a girl's "soul." Knowing Catholicism a little, we strongly suspect the Archbishop's notions about girls are akin to those of St. Paul about women. These notions, as our readers are aware, are not very exalted ones. The "soul of a girl" as a priest conceives it should exhibit all the characteristics of slave mentality. Now as the Girl Guide movement aims to engender independence and initiative, we fancy the Archbishop's real objection to the movement is that it fosters these very same qualities. His Eminence evidently has begun to see that Guides grown to womanhood will not be the pliant and gullible persons their mothers have been. They will be much less ready to suck in all the priests tell them, and thus will be more difficult to dominate and to exploit in the good old Catholic fashion. Hence the Archbishop's prohibition. We compliment His Eminence on his acumen. He has little to learn in the gentle art of safeguarding his industry.

Those healthy-minded male readers of the *Daily News* who cannot pass a draper's window without shuddering, were no doubt a little startled to read the following remarks by the *Daily News's* dramatic critic, Mr. E. A. Baughan. Commenting on a New York magistrate's decision to allow an actress to appear as Eve covered merely with a net brassiere and a fig leaf, the critic says:—

Absolute nudity is not as indecent as the implications of half-dressed women.....In the main our dislike of showing our bodies is a matter of custom, largely due to our climate. We have for generations insisted on covering our bodies, and we have made an absurd mystery of matters which are not mysterious at all. What we call decency is too often an acknowledgment of our own mental indecency.....It is the mental attitude that counts, after all.

Mr. Baughan, we believe, is a little out in his remarks on custom and climate. He is nearer the mark in what he says about making an absurd mystery of matters not mysterious. They who are chiefly responsible for this are the Oriental Bible writers and their disciples the early Christian Fathers morbidly obsessed with sex. These turned the purely natural into something unclean.

What the Christian religion has done is to breed wholesale puritry and to foster that impure notion of sex which reveals itself, not only in taboos, but also in the widespread fondness for "smutty" stories which our Christin-trained habitues of clubs and pubs exhibit.

Freethought is an excellent dissolvent of accepted Christian notions. Once upon a time all saints were regarded as holy men who, like Cæsar's wife, were above suspicion. The times, however, have changed: Freethought criticism has done its work; so that we now find Christian writers quizzing the saints through what one might call Freethought spectacles. Says a writer in a Sunday-school paper:—

Some of us suspect the practice of prefacing a man's name with the word "saint." So many of the so-called saints were idle men absorbed overmuch in their own spiritual condition, a subtle form of egotism which, like all egotism, is mischievous.

This criticism of the saints is rather belated; Freethinkers have been saying as much for many long years. What we will add to it is, that the criticism applies equally well to a very large number of Christians, and also that another form of the Christian's egotism in his officious interest in other people's "spiritual" condition. Both forms of Christian egotism, however, we fear, are incurable. They have their roots too deeply embedded in Christian doctrines for a cure to be expected.

Commenting on the objection of Miss Hanna, the Penzance Headmistress, to the second verse of the National Anthem (mentioned here last week), a *Morning Post* reader says that there is now too much of this poor-spirited element being cultivated in schools. It is no sign of strength of faith or of Christian belief, he declares. The man who wrote most of the soul-stirring Psalms was a man "after God's own heart," who knew that all national enemies must be faced in loyal and wholehearted opposition. Evidently this reader will have none of your "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild"; he is all for Jehovah, God of Battles. "Love your enemies," we are next told, is the most beautiful of Christian individual doctrines, which Miss Hanna should inculcate for treatment of personal unkindness and wrong; in everyday affairs it is a "royal and heavenly law." Seemingly, however, the "royal and heavenly" is not for application to enemies in the lump. To use it thus, we learn, is "warping the command from its true meaning." What this good patriot is striving to convey is that you may try to love your enemy if he lives next door, but not if he dwells across the Channel. When he is of another race, there is no heavenly embargo on your cursing him with the utmost invective which acquaintance with the Bible has made you capable of.

These two ways of regarding a Biblical precept—Miss Hanna's way and the *Morning Post* reader's way—serves to reveal the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel teaching. So simple is it that no two Christians can agree how it should be interpreted nor how it should be applied. The reason why this is so is, that there are at least two kinds of Christian teaching to be culled from the one book. One is, Christly pacifism; the other, Jehovistic swash-buckling. And what happens is that each Christian adopts what accords with his own prejudices and feelings. No wonder Christians everywhere exhibit to the world so excellent an example of unity! After reading the *Morning Post* correspondent's plea for "Strafe your enemies," one turns with relief to the somewhat more civilized view of Mr. A. K. Lockington in the *Teacher's World*:—

The fostering of a sane, healthy love of country is part of a teacher's duty. Realizing with Nurse Cavell that Patriotism is not enough, teachers must foster a noble patriotism that yet leaves a place for the world-wide view, that realizes the interdependence of all mankind.



## The "Freethinker."

TROUBLE and difficulties in the newspaper trade are not yet at an end, and these are preventing the paper reaching subscribers with its accustomed regularity. Copies of all back numbers are, however, to be had, and we will send them, post free, on receipt of 3d. per copy. We hear from two correspondents that some newsagents are reporting the paper as having ceased to exist in consequence of the Strike. That is absurd; it would take more than that to kill the *Freethinker*. We have, of course, suffered financially from the Strike, and are still feeling its effects. But with the good offices of our friends we hope to get over that in time.

Meanwhile we have a very useful suggestion from one reader. This is that in every town some Free-thinker—or several Freethinkers—should take a number of newsagents under their charge, and either act as distributing agent, so far as they are concerned, or see that they get their supply and otherwise do what they can to get the paper before the public.

We like this suggestion very much. It would entail very little labour, a matter of one hour per week would be enough, and if they could approach newsagents as accredited representatives, some great good might be done. We shall be glad to know what our readers think of the suggestion. It is hard to push a paper such as the *Freethinker*. It does not deal with scandal, sensations, or betting and divorce news, and therefore cannot expect to appeal to the masses. A really large circulation a journal such as the *Freethinker* would never have, but it should have a very much larger one than it has.

### To Correspondents.

"FREETHINKER" ENDOWMENT TRUST.—J. Peterson (New Hebrides), £50.

A. W. ELLIOT.—We do not think that a public discussion on the value of prayer would prove of very general interest.

W. CLARK.—We are obliged to hold over your reply to Mr. Strickland till next week.

G. W. BROWN.—We remember writing on Sir Robert Anderson's *Silence of God* some years back. Our impression of it at this date is that it was rather too old-fashioned to be of any general interest to-day. The people who are affected by that kind of writing would not be likely to read the *Freethinker*. If we could feel sure of reaching them it would be a different question.

F. FORODE.—Thanks for cuttings. Will prove useful.

C. HARPER.—Next week.

A. J. MARRIOTT.—As you will see, Mr. Cutner deals with the points put forward in defence of Malthusianism, and pressure on our space warns us not to duplicate.

F. HAMPSON.—We suppose nothing will stop politicians playing to the Churches save developing intelligence to the point when the people will leave the churches alone.

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

*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 "Midland Bank, Ltd.," 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.

We have good reasons for believing that in one of the wholesale distributing houses there has been going on for some time, on the part of one of the subordinates, a persistent attempt to injure the circulation of this paper. We shall, therefore, take it as a special favour, if those who order the paper will see to it that they get it properly and promptly delivered. In this way they will help considerably, and it is the only plan by which this cowardly attempt can be frustrated.

We referred last week to the *Manchester City News'* controversy, and the article written by the editor explaining why Mr. Johnson decided it was the better part of valour not to enter on a public discussion. Mr. Johnson now complains that he did not know the editor would publish his letters, and says that he was afraid Mr. Cohen would rule out a great deal of what he said as irrelevant. From that we gather that Mr. Johnson will only discuss when he is assured that his opponent will admit the relevancy and force of all that is said on the other side. He concludes that the debate would be useless because Mr. Cohen's mentality is different from his own. For that compliment Mr. Cohen is inclined to thank him. But we note that Manchester is still unable to provide a professional preacher of Christianity who has the courage to defend his faith on the open platform.

We note that a well-known publisher is reported in the *Sunday Pictorial* as saying that there is no public interest in theology at the moment. That is probably correct, although it is quite possible that the generalization applies to certain areas and circles. There is enough professed interest in theology to keep the churches going, and to provide the funds for all sorts of "cranky" evangelical movements. For the rest, it is a long time since well-informed and well-balanced minds took a serious interest in theology, as such.

We are asked to announce that the *Freethinker* and all Pioneer Press publications can be obtained at the Hyde Park meetings from Mr. Le Maine, of the Metropolitan (Non-Political) Secular Society. Back numbers of the *Freethinker* can also be secured in the same quarter.

Once again we remind friends that we are prepared to send the *Freethinker* for six weeks to any address, or list of addresses, on receipt of postage—halfpenny per copy. This is an excellent way of bringing the paper into fresh hands, and it is one that secures many new readers.

*Tales for Teachers*, by Alfred Rowberry Williams, consists of a series of sketches of school life, some of which have appeared in these columns. Mr. Williams has an eye for simple effects and drives home his moral with simplicity and effect. The author writes out of his experience as a teacher, and many of the hints contained in his book should be found useful, not merely to his fellow teachers, but to all who are seriously interested in the formation of character. The book is published by the C. W. Daniel Co., price 6s.

For the benefit of London readers we repeat our announcement of last week that a debate will take place on the evening of Friday, June 11, between Mr. H. Cutner and the Rev. Father Desmond Morse-Boycott, at the Victoria Hall, Lewis Street, Kentish Town, on "Birth Control, For and Against." Dr. Binnie Dunlop will take the chair, and the proceedings will commence at 7.30.



## Subman, Man and Superman.

FROM Protoplasm to Homo Sapiens, or modern man, there extends a period of at least 1,000,000,000 years, according to the most reliable consensus of modern scientific opinion; while a previous period of lifeless and molten matter, probably preceded by a state of unstable nebulousity, must have extended backwards for such a length of time as to cause the mind to boggle in trying to realize the infinity of its extent.

The dividing line between these two periods is fairly well defined, because the end of the remoter age is indicated by the ending of the Azoic, or lifeless rocks. These basic rocks are molten, or chrysaline, and contain no indications of life.

Science indicates that the Azoic Age, which may have endured for 1,000,000,000 years, began in a state of white heat, or fiery nebulousity, and gradually cooling and solidifying, ended in clouds of steam, torrents of hot rain, pools of boiling water, and a quivering landscape—dotted over thickly with lurid volcanoes, belching fire and smoke, and innumerable geysers spouting columns of hot water that would fall with a continual hissing on the incandescent streams of volcanic lava.

At some period at the beginning of that almost inconceivable extent of time, life evolved. Those warm seas gave birth to Protoplasm at the time when the temperature of the Polar waters fell sufficiently to permit of certain natural chemical actions and processes, a degree of heat that may be scientifically ascertained in the future.

From Protoplasm, which was conceived in the womb of Mother Nature, and born by perfectly natural processes in those ancient pools of tepid water, has descended all that has life to-day, both in the animal and the vegetable kingdom, and including man who is poised at the apex, who is the epitome of evolutionary creation.

In the rocks of the Proterozoic Age only microscopical remains of the simplest life-forms are to be found—the minute algæ, representing plant life on the one hand and on the other the skeletons of tiny creatures called radiolaria; while certain mineral deposits are believed to have been formed by the corrosive action of masses of decaying jelly-fish.

The true scientist, discarding any belief in the supernatural, cannot doubt that life began with that long drawn out age. And he is not merely guessing because, having found visible and indisputable evidence of the origin and gradual variation of plant and animal life through vast ages, he knows that it must have required equally extended periods of similar growth and change for the original living organisms to have developed to that stage where they would leave shell or bone or even print behind them.

The scientist glancing backwards across the vast dead and silent ages of the past, immediately visualizes in his "mind's-eye" the process, stage by stage, by which Protoplasm slowly evolved to jelly-fish and various animalculæ, without sufficient substance to leave their imprint in those rocks. He clearly visualizes, between the frail jelly-fish and the first vertebrate animal, an enormous extent of time in which there were creatures with soft cartilage, and then harder cartilage in the place of spine; and he is satisfied that this evidence is quite incontrovertible.

A fully developed jelly-fish or a human being without ancestors is equally impossible. There is no stopping place where any creature or organism could originate after the protoplasmic atom from which all life germinated.

The Early Palæozoic Age, which may have lasted 250,000,000 years, has left us the first plainly visible traces of life in the guise of the sea scorpions and the trilobites. But these were already distant variations from the lineal ancestors of man who at this stage were probably developing cartilage; but were, as yet, quite incapable of creeping entirely out of those shallow and tepid pools which were their homes and only possible abodes.

The later Palæozoic Age, which may have endured, approximately, 150,000,000 years, was an age of fishes and amphibia. The sea-weed, from which all plant life primarily originated, was steadily climbing out of the sea, and colossal swamp forests had already developed. Throughout this age those swamps were of enormous extent. The earth's surface was still comparatively flat; no great mountain ranges existed, because, although there might be frequent volcanic action and upheavals, the earth's crust had not solidified sufficiently to support any great irregularities of surface.

It was in these great swamps that the dense forests of the Carboniferous Age flourished and left their record in the coal measures that abound throughout the world.

Fish and amphibia resembling large newts or salamanders, and also some primitive reptiles left their records along with that of the forests.

But undoubtedly many amphibian creatures, that were struggling up the slopes from the shallow waters to seek refuge from their more powerful but less agile enemies, were too frail and small to leave any trace behind. Nevertheless, their ability to climb and run was steadily increasing, and they were gradually becoming more adapted to land and less to water. The determining factor in their survival was their agility—their ability to scramble up the land elevations in precipitate flight from their enemies. When caught they were completely devoured; when they died by a natural death, it would be on the borders of the bare lands, where they would completely decay in the scorching heat without leaving any trace.

There is no good reason for doubting that man is descended from some line of these small amphibia.

Next we come to a very interesting age, the Mesozoic, which may have continued for 100,000,000 years, and is known as the Age of Reptiles, because during that age the earth teemed with gigantic reptilian monsters. Many of these Saurians grew to a length of fifty or a hundred feet. The remains of one has recently been discovered in East Africa that is one hundred and sixty feet in length. They could reach to a height of from twenty to forty feet. Such creatures, if alive to-day, could easily thrust their snake-like heads into our second-floor bedroom windows and pluck us out of our beds; or even peer over the top of an ordinary two-story house.

Although many were herbivorous, others, like the Tyrannosaurus, were carnivorous, and were fighting monsters of a most terrifying aspect.

The rocks of this tropical age are sown with the remains of these monsters, and here we find the first remains of true birds, which had evidently evolved from semi-reptilian amphibious creatures that had been literally forced to fly in the air to escape the teeming enemies that preyed on them.

The Archaeopterix had a long reptilian tail, studded with feathers, showing clearly its transitional nature.

The Pterodactyls grew to half the size of a man, and hopped, flopped or glided from tree to tree, or from rock to rock. They had the body of a serpent and the head of a bird, but the bill was filled with sharp teeth. The wings were like a bat's, stretching



from fore to hind legs. These weird creatures had no feathers, which indicated a purely reptilian origin. True birds must have evolved from scaly fish-like creatures, as feathers are only elongated and highly developed scales or fins.

Where were the progenitors of man in this age of monsters and monstrosities? As yet all the higher land was barren and parched, and only the low and moist regions were covered with vegetation. A creature that must have lived on this border line of vegetable and animal life, a creature that crawled, hopped and climbed, a creature that could subsist where all the larger reptilian animals would have perished from starvation, was undoubtedly our ancestor.

Although there are no remains that can be picked out as having belonged definitely to that creature, we know that he must have existed in that age, and that he had already, in all probability, developed a covering of hair that was becoming pronounced about the head and other vital parts of the body.

If we rule out the supernatural, as Freethinkers do, this must have been true, because at this point we would be about half way in the process of evolution from Protoplasm to the first and remotest remains that have been discovered that we can reasonably surmise were the remains of man.

Hair, scales, and feathers, all made of the same material, point undeviatingly back to the sea as the cradle of life.

The close of the Mesozoic Age is wrapt in mystery, although certain outstanding facts are plainly written in the record of the rocks. Some sudden change of temperature, or cataclysmal convulsion of nature brought death and destruction in its train.

The Saurians, great reptilian monster of many types, perished. On land only a few diminutive creatures of the hardiest types survived. So violent was this catastrophical change that a great variety of amphibious creatures perished completely.

The Ammonites, creatures with coiled shells that grew to a width of a foot or more, and of which there were upwards of a hundred varieties, filling those ancient seas, became entirely extinct. Only varieties of small shell fish persisted into the next age.

On the land almost all of the vegetation prevalent at that time disappeared, and was gradually replaced by entirely new varieties very similar to those of the present day.

ONA MELTON.

(To be Continued.)

## J. A. Froude and his Assailants.

### II.

(Continued from page 343.)

THERE is no such thing as a perfect history or a perfect historian. Green's *History of England* is considered by most people as the best and most reliable history of our country; yet, on its appearance, it "was found riddled with errors."<sup>1</sup> The same may be said of Carlyle's *History of the French Revolution*. See also the innumerable corrections made by Professor Bury in his edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, by Mr. J. M. Robertson in his edition of Buckle's *History of Civilization*, and Mr. Henderson in his edition of Macaulay's *History of England*. Yet, far from deriding, disparaging, and vilifying these great historians in the savage bludgeoning style adopted by Freeman towards Froude, they are full of admiration for them; indeed, Mr. Robertson has written a

bulky volume (*Buckle and his Critics*) of over 550 pages, in defence of Buckle against his many assailants.

Again, Froude has been charged with being prejudiced and starting with preconceived ideas. But every writer must start with *some* ideas; if he had no ideas, or beliefs, to begin with, he would never start writing history or anything else. The idea of a man sitting down to write a history with his mind a blank sheet is an absurdity, and the production of any work under such conditions would be as great a miracle as the resurrection from the dead. As the latest biographer of Voltaire remarks in his defence of Voltaire's historical works: "History is partly a science, but must also be partly an art or it is lifeless; an absolutely impartial history would probably be absolutely dull; the historian must have a point of view, a conception of human development."<sup>2</sup> The only question is not whether the writer starts with certain ideas, but whether he distorts, or suppresses, or otherwise manipulates the facts to suit his ideas. Judged by this standard, Froude was singularly open-minded. Froude had been brought up in the belief that Henry VIII. was the Bluebeard, that Elizabeth was the "Good Queen Bess" and Mary was the "Bloody Mary" of popular belief. But, as he studied the records of those times, it was borne in upon him that the popular verdict was not altogether a just one. Henry was not quite the lecherous ruffian he has been depicted. That it was not lust that drove him to divorce his wives, but the desire for a male heir to the throne. If Katherine could have produced a son, all would have been well; there would have been no divorces or executions, and Henry would probably have become known to history as one of the best of kings. It is true that Katherine gave him a daughter, but at that time there was no equality of the sexes as we know it to-day. England had never been ruled over by a queen alone, without a king, and neither Henry nor his ministers believed that the people would consent to be ruled over by a woman.

Of Mary, Froude tells us: "To the time of her accession she had lived a blameless and, in many respects, a noble life; and few men or women have lived less capable of doing knowingly a wrong thing."<sup>3</sup> Mary's cruelties were not the result of a cold and cruel nature; they were inspired by her religion. She believed that she was pleasing God by destroying his enemies, as she regarded the heretics, and she was prepared to sacrifice everything, including her kingdom and herself, for her religion.

Elizabeth, on the other hand, he found did not possess even the rudiments of a conscience, or an understanding of the word honour, as we have noticed in our last article. Which all shows that if Froude started with preconceived ideas he did not allow them to stand in the way of the truth, as he conceived it. Of course, these new views did not commend themselves to the teachers of the old, who applauded Freeman's assaults on Froude to the echo. Neither the Catholics nor the Protestants were satisfied with Froude's history. Froude was a Freethinker who stood aloof from both parties; it was no orthodox Christian who penned the following lines:—

When His name and His words had been preached for fifteen centuries there were none found who could tolerate difference of opinion on the operation of baptism, or on the nature of His presence in the Eucharist; none, or at least none but the

<sup>1</sup> J. M. Robertson, *Buckle and his Critics*, p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> Adlington, *Voltaire*, p. 176.

<sup>3</sup> Froude, *History of England*, vol. vi., p. 97.



hard-hearted children of the world. The more religious any man was the more eager was he to put away by fire and sword all those whose convictions differed from his own. (Froude, *History of England*, vol. viii., p. 414.)

His Freethought is still more pronounced in the volumes of his *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, and indeed it is difficult to believe that any Catholic or Protestant could hold the balance justly in that maelstrom of religious strife and hatred. As Buckle himself has pointed out, the best of the historians have been Freethinkers. He says: "The five writers to whose genius we owe the first attempt at comprehensive views of history were Bolingbroke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Hume, and Gibbon. Of these, the second was but a cold believer in Christianity; if, indeed, he believed in it at all, and the other four were avowed and notorious sceptics."<sup>4</sup>

But to return to Freeman. Herbert Paul gives several examples of Freeman's criticism of Froude in his *Life of Froude*. He found a misprint of the word *Guienne*, the name of a province, for *Guisnes* the name of a town, and charitably observes, "It is hardly possible that this can be a misprint." It was a misprint, for it was correctly printed in the marginal heading. "Freeman's trump card, however, was the Bishop of Lexovia, and that brilliant victory he never forgot....Froude had not been aware that Lexovia was the ancient name for the modern Lisieux, and for twenty years he was periodically reminded of the fact."<sup>5</sup> So anxious is Freeman to convict Froude of ignorance or bad faith that he trips himself up, after citing a Latin passage from which a paraphrased translation in English has been made, Freeman observes: "We presume that the words put by Mr. Froude in inverted commas are not Lord Burghley's summary of the Latin extract in the note, but Mr. Froude's own, for it is utterly impossible that Burghley could have so misconceived a piece of plain Latin, or have so utterly misunderstood the position of any contemporary prince." Upon which Mr. Paul observes: "But the words which Freeman says that Burghley could not have used are the words he did use....Freeman might have ascertained what Burghley did write if he had cared to know. He did not care to know. 'He was belabouring Froude.'<sup>6</sup> Other specimens, quite as foolish and ignorant, are given in Mr. Paul's book, but we have given enough to show with what peevish and querulous carping Freeman attempted to discredit a great historical work, which he had neither the knowledge nor the literary gifts to produce himself, according to his own confession. For writing to his friend, Dean Hook, the learned author of the *Lives of the Archbishops*, whom he knew he could not deceive, Freeman, in a letter dated April 27, 1857, makes the following open confession: "You have found me out about the sixteenth century. I fancy that from endlessly belabouring Froude, I get credit for knowing more of those times than I do. But one can belabour Froude on a very small amount of knowledge, and you are quite right when you say that I have 'never thrown the whole weight of my mind on that portion of history.'" On another occasion, also writing to Hook, he said: "I find I have a reputation with some people for knowing the sixteenth century, of which I am profoundly ignorant."<sup>7</sup> Freeman's researches were connected with the Norman Conquest in the eleventh century, a period he knew very well, with one amazing ex-

ception, and that the most important of all, viz. *Domesday Book*. This book, as we all know, was compiled by order of William the Conqueror for the purpose of taxation, it was a survey of England containing a minute record of the land, its owners, the property and cattle they possessed and the number of people they employed. J. E. T. Rogers, the Political Economist, well describes it as "one of the choicest antiquarian and historical treasures which the nation possesses." He goes on to observe: "My friend, Professor Freeman, has published a very copious history of the Norman Conquest....But he has made little use of *Domesday Book*, which, after the skeleton of facts is arranged, contains far more genuine living material than all his other authorities."<sup>8</sup> We can imagine the howls with which Freeman would have greeted such an important omission had it been made by Froude from his sixteenth century records!

(To be Concluded.) W. MANN.

## Correspondence.

### CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Until the article upon this subject appeared, some of us Freethinkers were not aware that the National Secular Society had for one of its objects the Abolition of the Death Penalty. Mr. Bedborough's advocacy is much too partial and too laboured to carry conviction. Murder is admitted to be the most serious crime against society, but there are several degrees of murder of which our laws recognize only one or two, and some, possibly, may not deserve the death penalty. But, on the whole, the law that one who deprives a fellow creature of life should forfeit his own, is a sound one and based upon a sense of justice.

The murderer by premeditation, plans his crime and arms himself for destruction—actions which by their cunning and ferocity alone place him on the level of a wild beast and render him unfit for the society of civilized men.

Mr. Bedborough would carefully preserve this specimen for the rest of his natural life, to be fed and tended and nursed in sickness at the expense of the community, in the "hope" that he "may be converted into a factor of some social value if directed towards a desire....for a life of good citizenship." An interesting experiment, no doubt, in which perhaps not one per cent. would be successful; the remainder, suffering no punishment whatever beyond the restriction of their liberty, would lead a life of protection from want and privation of any description which thousands of men, outside the prison walls, might reasonably envy though they would not commit a murder to secure it.

This may be Mr. Bedborough's idea of "compensation" to society, but, like many others, he omits to mention the social value of the victim of which society has been deprived. How can the results of a very doubtful experiment, as against an actual, realized loss, be valued?

There are of course other types of murderers. The human jackal who lives solely by preying upon his fellows, and who kills only in extremity and to save his own skin. A very promising material to convert to good citizenship! The sexual maniac could possibly be returned to society and prove of some use, but only after a period of detention and after complete sterilization.

That the present method of execution is crude and barbarous few would deny, for it is not in accord with modern ideas to inflict torture in addition to the forfeiture of life, and a lethal chamber should take the place of hanging. But the extreme penalty should remain.

<sup>8</sup> Rogers, *The Economic Interpretation of History* (1902), p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Buckle, *Miscellaneous Works*, vol. i., p. 254.

<sup>5</sup> Paul, *Life of Froude*, p. 154.

<sup>6</sup> Paul, *Life of Froude*, p. 160.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 151-152.



The fact that those countries which have abolished the death penalty show no increase in homicidal crime proves nothing except that the average of murders would appear to be maintained, whilst Mr. Bedborough's remarks that prisons are thrown into a state of agitation during an execution and that discipline suffers, seems a stretch of imagination.

Our laws are based roughly on ideas of compensation, compromise, and punishment. What compensation is possible to the family of the victim of a murderer and what punishment can there be in preserving the criminal in comparative comfort, immune from even the common daily struggles of the ordinary citizen?

We permit our diseased, epileptic, and mental defectives to breed without restraint and we release our homicidal maniacs to propagate embryonic murderers. Their inadequate elimination by the death penalty when occasion requires, is the only compromise possible with society. To argue otherwise savours of sloppy sentimentality.

R. H. YELDHAM.

#### THE LAW OF POPULATION.

SIR,—It will not be out of place, I think, to remind those people who are so very anxious to "cross swords" with me that my last three articles were really directed against Dr. Marie Stopes, and that, though I like nothing better than a discussion on Malthusianism, this journal is not quite the medium for that. In the *New Generation*, the genial editor, Mr. R. B. Kerr, is only too pleased to give space to those vigorous "antis" who trot out the same old arguments and bring forward the same old "proofs" that Malthus is wrong. These "proofs" have been thought of for many a weary year and much ink has been spilled in writing and re-writing them, but there are still Socialists insiting that they are quite new and original and must be answered again.

To reply to every point raised by an "anti" or two or three "antis," would take up not merely a great deal of my time, but also a great deal of space. And to expect me, in the face of my express declarations, to stand up for everything Malthus has written, is ludicrous. I am willing to defend the position I laid down in my articles and to claim that I have been "compelled" to give up this or that (the implication being, of course, that it was an opponent who "compelled" me), when I never set out to defend this or that position, is distinctly humorous.

The two letters in your last issue by "Scio" and Mr. Alf. Noble make an excellent study by contrast. "Scio" feels very aggrieved. He does not like my "manner and method," to wit, my pointing out that, though he had read Malthus "several times" he gave in one short letter three judgments on Malthusianism, all contradictory, and, therefore, mutually destructive. I ought not, he thinks, to have pointed this out. But why not? I don't think he understands Malthusianism yet and probably never will, no matter how many times he reads Malthus. He says that "the basic assumption of Malthus' *Essay on Population* is that mouths increase just twice as fast as food." For proof of this, he quotes from the Everyman edition (why he adds that he is "familiar" with the others, I don't know) the arithmetical and geometrical ratios given by Malthus. And what then? Do they prove the "basic assumption"? Will the reader carefully consider them (as "Scio" gives it) and see what would be his deduction?

"Supposing the population (of the whole world) to be a thousand million, the human species would increase as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, and subsistence as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9." That is how "Scio" proves the "basic assumption"! I am not out to defend Malthus' figures here, but Macaulay's schoolboy would have had a hot time if he deduced such a "basic assumption" from these figures. Now, I have had a long experience in arguing with Christians, and I make it an invariable rule to look up all references given me by opponents. And it will not surprise the reader to learn that "Scio" fails to quote the very necessary conclusion of the paragraph from Malthus, who continues, "In two centuries the population would be to the means of subsistence as 256 to 9; in

three centuries as 4,096 to 13, and in two thousand years the difference would be almost incalculable. That is full proof of "Scio's" "basic assumption," is it not?—"Mouths increase just twice as fast as food!"

What is Malthus trying to prove? Merely what would happen, in his opinion, were there no checks on population. These checks, natural, and artificial, are absolutely ignored, both by "Scio" and Mr. Alf. Noble. They are ignored because directly you get an average "anti" on Malthus, he starts talking nonsense and wants to put down that nonsense to the credit of Malthus. Thus I was very careful to point out, few people ever quoted Malthus correctly, and of those who had read his work "several times" couldn't understand what they read. There was another thing I pointed out, namely that it was no use "antis" attacking me, for I really am no recognized authority. I gave Professor East's *Mankind at the Cross Roads* as a work on the food question which would have to be answered before Malthus could be shown to be wrong, but both "Scio" and Mr. Alf. Noble take great care to ignore my suggestion.

Mr. Alf. Noble says that, "as for wheat production man's productivity has increased a hundred-fold in the last century—thanks, again, to improved methods and machinery. With bonanza farms miles in extent requiring but a few workers with up-to-date machinery, thus increasing food production a thousandfold how can anyone say that supply is difficult?" Indeed, how can anyone contradict that perfect gem of facts so convincingly put on the authority of Mr. Alf. Noble?

What does Professor East say? "Mechanical invention probably did not increase agricultural production by a single grain of wheat." But, then, who is Professor East, as Mr. Alf. Noble would say? Only a professor of agriculture and biology at Harvard. Possibly he's in the pay of those wicked capitalists who order "the destruction of amazing quantities of food to maintain high prices," one of those delightful statements constantly made by people (I used to make it myself), for which there is not a scrap of evidence. Mr. Alf. Noble's letter is packed with statements created from his inner consciousness such as "the 'Malthusian' suggests that a limitation of family solves the poverty problem," when, of course, the "Malthusian" suggests nothing of the kind. I expressly mentioned one of our great problems was that of distribution, but what does it matter what I say? Socialists and Communists, Mr. Alf. Noble tells us, are not responsible for the "anarchy" in that problem, which is quite true, but he does not say they are not responsible, neither, for the time during the war, "when everybody was fed, clothed, and housed." I particularly like the *everybody*, including the "millions of women making shot and shell." "All were fed" during the war—how well do I, who served nearly three years, remember the wonderful food I got! As for the people in other countries, tut, tut..... But it would be wearisome to continue further. Both "Scio" and Mr. Alf. Noble must learn that I, for one, refuse to accept any of their statements on their *ipsi dixit*. Quote me one chapter and verse against the statements given by Professor East and there will be some basis of discussion on Malthusianism. Otherwise we are wasting time.

H. CUTNER.

#### ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.

SIR,—The article on the "Pathology of Piety," in your issue of the 23 ult., does not report the result of the two trials quite correctly. On June 21, 1864, two of the essayists, Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, were suspended by the Court of Arches, with costs and deprivation of salary for one year. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, over which Lord Westbury presided, reversed the decision of the Court of Arches, and the essayists in question were restored to their functions with the costs of the appeal. The late Lord Bowen said that Lord Westbury "non-suited the devil, dismissed hell with costs and deprived members of the Church of England of their sure and certain hope of everlasting damnation."

JOHN STEPHEN.



## SURVIVAL.

SIR,—Mr. Hiliare Belloc, in his brief apology for Catholicism, when replying to Mr. Wells, in the *Universe*, March 12, 1926, insinuates that the ritual of the Church is not related to Occultism—something transcendental.

Mr. Belloc has conveniently ignored the knowledge that all organized systems of practical religion with their concomitant rites and ceremonies, are essentially magical performances artfully elaborated. There is really no difference between the supplications of the Bishop and the incantations of the Wizard, as in form and in substance they are kindred. They are both based on the fallacious reasoning of early man—"that causal connection in thought is equivalent to causative connection, in fact." More concise it means, that imagination and actuality are equal.

Of course we know that this is illogical reasoning, nevertheless all ritualistic rites, forms, and formulas from the simplest to the most profound gorgeous pretensions are based on this false reasoning.

All magical forms and formulas are for the purpose of mystification.

The magical formula, "*Hoc-est-corpus*" of the priest is just as effective as the magical formula, "*Hocus-pocus-presto*" of the magi.

No amount of sophistry can subvert the fact that the sorcerer's mud hut and reed and whistle was the origin of the Bishop's stately cathedral and grand organ.

Nobody knows of this evolutionary transition better than Hilaire Belloc, the master of erudition.

The sorcerer was the priest and the priest was the sorcerer. They are so to the present time.

HENRY MAHER.

## Mr. G. Whitehead's Mission.

We hear from Mr. Whitehead that he held seven good meetings in Leeds during the past week, in spite of the usual counter attractions that seem to invade the pitches in these days of industrial unrest. Mr. Whitehead finishes his fortnight in Leeds to-day, June 13, and will be in Newcastle for two weeks from Monday, June 14.—E. M. V.

## JESUS CHRIST.

A name which has been associated more than any other for the last fifteen centuries with the world's pain and misery is still the name that commands the greatest reverence to-day, such is the infatuation and madness of mankind. The spaniel whines and licks the foot that kicks him; but man makes his own fiend and calls him a deity—kicks himself with his own foot and blesses the operation. Some day man may awake to find that Paradise is at his own fireside, and among the objects of his daily life. But, as yet, he prays and cries in the troubled dream of a hectic nightmare. The hero of his nightmare is this terrible Jesus Christ, who, with his blood-reddened cross and his crown of thorns, makes the dream potent with teleological terrors, and who, with his grave-clothes and wounded side haunts the dreamer through all the phantom-lands of Misery. The curse of man is that he cares less for what concern him that for what does not concern him at all. The world is all he can know—yea, much more than he can ever know—and yet he cannot be persuaded to stand up manfully in it and do his part; he must needs, in his folly, lean over the rim of it to invent Elysiums and heavens in which he may drink the wine of gladness, and to torment himself with Niffheims and hells, in which he may drain to the dregs the chalice of inexpressible pain. When will he learn that his business is with his living neighbour, and not with the dead Jesus Christ? When will the truth of the Gospel dawn upon him, that his own children are cherubim, and that the mother of these children is more to him than the Mary of theology, and that her homely cradle-song to her babe is holier than all the music from the harps of angels?—"Saladin" (W. Stewart Ross).

## SALE AND EXCHANGE.

This column is limited to advertisements from private individuals only. Letters may, if it is so desired, be addressed to the Box Number, c/o "Freethinker" Office. Advertising rates 6d. for first line, every additional line 4d.

## FOR SALE.

The Illustrated Byron, complete with 20 engravings, and Life, 1814 (7s. 6d.); Letters of Junius, 1878, with facsimiles, etc., handsomely bound in calf and gilt (5s.).—Box 60, c/o Freethinker office, 61 Farringdon Street, E.C.4.

## 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.

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

## OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 6.15, a Lecture.

NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Hyde Park): Every Tuesday and Thursday at 7.30; Sunday at 11, 3.30, and 6.30; Lecturers—Messrs. Hart, Howell Smith, B.A., Hyatt, Le Maine, and Saphin.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Regent's Park, near the Fountain): 6, Mr. A. D. McLaren, a Lecture.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 3 and 6, Mr. F. P. Corrigan will lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (outside the Technical Institute, Romford Road, Stratford, E.): 7, Mr. A. C. High, a Lecture.

## COUNTRY.

LEEDS BRANCH N.S.S.—Mr. G. Whitehead's Mission, May 31 to June 13.

NEWCASTLE BRANCH N.S.S.—Mr. G. Whitehead's Mission, June 14 to 27.

"THE HYDE PARK FORUM."—A Satire on its Speakers and Frequenters. Should be read by all Freethinkers. Post free, 6d., direct from J. MARLOW, 145 Walworth Road, S.E.1.

TO FREETHINKERS.—Holidays in glorious Somerset; nice country; near sea; with or without Board.—Apply for terms (stamp), G. BAILEY, Bungalow, Walrow, Highbridge, Somerset. (Late Manchester N.S.S.)

THINGS DONE WELL, and with a care, exempt themselves from fear. Conscious that our work is good and truly worthy of the noble cause whose organ we support, fearlessly we appeal to you, week in, week out, to give us that trial which our persistence merits and our performance justifies. Write to-day for any of the following:—*Gents' A to D Patterns, suits from 55s.; Gents' E Patterns, suits all at 67s. 6d.; Gents' F to I Patterns, suits from 75s.; Gents' J to N Patterns, suits from 104s. 6d.; or Ladies' Spring Fashion and Pattern Book, costumes from 60s., frocks from 52s. 6d.*—MACCONNELL & MADE, New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

## YOU WANT ONE.



N.S.S. BADGE.—A single Pansy flower, size as shown; artistic and neat design in enamel and silver. This emblem has been the silent means of introducing many kindred spirits. Brooch or Stud Fastening. Price 9d., post free.—From THE GENERAL SECRETARY, N.S.S., 62 Farringdon St., E.C.4.

## UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

For List of Birth-Control Requisites send 1d. stamp to  
J. R. HOLMES, East Hanney, Wantage, Berkshire.  
(Established nearly Forty Years.)



**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.

**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.

*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 unsurpassing 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.*

**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 Egyptian Origin of Christianity.*

**THE HISTORICAL JESUS AND MYTHICAL CHRIST.**

By GERALD MASSKY.

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.

**REALISTIC APHORISMS AND PURPLE PATCHES.**

Collected by ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.

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

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

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



THE  
 "FREETHINKER"  
 ENDOWMENT TRUST

A GREAT SCHEME FOR A  
 GREAT PURPOSE

THE *Freethinker* Endowment Trust was registered on the 25th of August, 1925, its object being to raise a sum of not less than £8,000, which, by investment, would yield sufficient to cover the estimated annual loss incurred in the maintenance of the *Freethinker*. The Trust is controlled and administered by five trustees, of which number the Editor of the *Freethinker* is one in virtue of his office. By the terms of the Trust Deed the trustees are prohibited from deriving anything from the Trust in the shape of profit, emoluments, or payment, and in the event of the position of the *Freethinker* at any time, in the opinion of the Trustees, rendering the Fund unnecessary, it may be brought to an end, and the capital sum handed over to the National Secular Society.

On its first appeal to the Freethought public, a sum of nearly £4,000 was subscribed. This leaves a sum of more than £4,000 to be yet collected before the Fund is complete. The Trust will remain open until the whole amount is subscribed, which should not, if every Freethinker does what he or she can do, be at a very distant date.

The importance of the *Freethinker* to the Freethought movement cannot be well over emphasized. For over forty years it has been the mouthpiece of militant Freethought in this country, it has never failed to champion the cause of mental liberty in and out of the Courts, and its fight on behalf of the Secular Society, Limited, in which the right of an anti-Christian Society to receive bequests was triumphantly vindicated by a House of Lords' decision, was of first-rate importance to Freethinkers all over the English-speaking world.

The Trust may be benefited by donations, bequests, or by gifts of shares already held by those who wish to help in making up the required total. No donation need be considered too small or too large to help.

Donations may be sent to either the Secretary, Mr. H. Jessop, Hollyshaw, Whitkirk, Leeds, or to the Editor of the *Freethinker*, from whom any further information concerning the Trust will be given on request.

All sums received are acknowledged in the *Freethinker*.

Publications issued by  
**THE SECULAR SOCIETY, Ltd.**

- A GRAMMAR OF FREETHOUGHT. By CHAPMAN COHEN. A Statement of the Case for Freethought, including a Criticism of Fundamental Religious Doctrines. Cloth bound, 5s., postage 3½d.
- DEITY AND DESIGN. By CHAPMAN COHEN. An Examination of the Famous Argument of Design in Nature. id., postage ½d.
- HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER. 3s. 6d., postage 4½d.
- THE BIBLE HANDBOOK. By G. W. FOOTE and W. P. BALL. For Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians. Fifth Edition. 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.
- BIBLE ROMANCES. By G. W. FOOTE. 2s. 6d., postage 3d.
- MISTAKES OF MOSES. By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL. 2d., postage ½d.
- WHAT IS IT WORTH? By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL. A Study of the Bible. id., postage ¾d.
- GOD-EATING. By J. T. LLOYD. A Study in Christianity and Cannibalism. 3d., postage ½d.
- MODERN MATERIALISM. By W. MANN. A Candid Examination. 1s. 6d., postage 2d.
- A FIGHT FOR RIGHT. A Verbatim Report of the Decision in the House of Lords *in re* Bowman and Others *v.* The Secular Society, Limited. With Introduction by Chapman Cohen. 6d., postage 1d.
- GOD AND EVOLUTION. By CHAPMAN COHEN. A Straightforward Essay on the Question. 6d., postage 1d.
- WHAT IS MORALITY? By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. A Careful Examination of the Basis of Morals from the Standpoint of Evolution. 4d., postage 1d.
- THE RELIGION OF FAMOUS MEN. (Second Edition.) By WALTER MANN. Price 1d., postage ½d.

Can be ordered through

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

**BOOK BARGAINS**

- THE ETHIC OF FREETHOUGHT, by KARL PEARSON, F.R.S. Price 5s. 6d., postage 6d.
- A CANDID EXAMINATION OF THIRISM, 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, 15s.; Six Months, 7s. 6d.;  
 Three Months, 3s. 9d.

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

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