

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. 33

SUNDAY, AUGUST 15, 1926

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
Education and Religion.—The Editor	497
Evil.—J. T. Lloyd	498
Those Derelict Churches.—Minnermus	500
Jesus in Faith and in History.—H. Cutner	501
A Parson on Parsons; An Essay on Clerical Candour.— Ephphatha	502
The Myth of Prometheus.—William Clark	506
The Kindly Warfarers.—C. Clayton Dove	507
"Gems From Ingersoll."—Joseph Lewis	508
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

Views and Opinions.

Education and Religion.

It is a pity that Cabinet Ministers and members of Parliament generally do not recognize that, once elected, they represent the *people*, and not a mere section. Once the faction fight of an election is over, a member of Parliament sits to promote the welfare of the nation as a whole. We are, of course, dealing with the matter from the standpoint of scientific theory only. What members of Parliament actually work for and what they actually represent is quite another question. But as a mere theory the representative character of a Cabinet Minister holds with special force. He is representative of the nation as a whole, and if politics developed a proper sense of what was fitting we should not so often see Cabinet Ministers using their position and influence to promote sectarian interests as purely personal opinions. At present this is done so habitually that the general public appears quite indifferent to the important principle involved. A Minister's connection with this church or that chapel is utilized as a means of pressing forward sectarian claims, and the Minister responds, although from a political point of view his reply should be that, as a member of the Government, he represents the *people*, and not the members of this or that religious body. If a Cabinet Minister belongs to a firm that undertakes Government contracts, there is an immediate outcry, even though the profits on the transaction may be small, and the idea of financial gain to himself being the last thing of which the Minister would think. The much greater evil of using position and influence to promote sectarian interests is passed by without comment. The average Christian thinks so much of money that he finds it difficult to conceive anyone being strong enough to resist making it whenever the chance presents itself. Mental dishonesty is too common to attract attention. It reminds one of Dod Grile's "Morality is custom; immorality is customary."

* * *

Religion and the State.

An illustration of the truth of what has been said was furnished the other day by our present Minister of Education, Lord Eustace Percy. Speaking at a teacher's meeting he repudiated the charge of the

Bishop of Ripon that the Board of Education was indifferent in matters of religion. He said the Board had to work under certain statutory restrictions, but it would not countenance the tendency to curtail the time available for religious instruction. That is quite what one would expect Lord Percy to say, but if he would only take the trouble to understand the position in this country, he might realize that religious instruction is to all intents and purposes outside the scheme of National education. It forms no integral part of it, and is only there—at the beginning and end of the school time—because sectarian interests were strong enough to have it so. The child's education is planned without necessary reference to religion. The existence of a conscience clause is alone proof of this. You may have your child taught some kind of religion if you wish; you may dispense with it altogether if you so desire. The State admits that religion is not absolutely necessary to the turning out of good citizens. If Lord Percy does not realize this much he is quite unfit to be Minister of Education, although to that criticism he might reply that any other Minister of Education would probably speak as he does. And that we are not inclined to dispute.

* * *

A Familiar Song.

But when a public man begins to talk about religion and education and the use of the Bible in the schools there is a certain amount of nonsense that he is almost bound to voice. From the time when Prof. Huxley set the fashion by his foolish laudation of the Bible in the schools we have had journalists, parsons, and politicians repeating it. So, in this instance, we have Lord Percy saying:—

They had difficulty in facing the comparative ignorance of all classes of the Bible. It was an ignorance which had grown extraordinarily during the past fifty years. As a consequence, English culture and literature had suffered. This loss of familiarity with the Bible had brought impoverishment of the language and thought. Their aim must be to revive the Bible as a whole; the short time available made it necessary that teaching should be systematic. They really needed a growth of confidence and of courage to clear away the atmosphere of mystification that had grown round the Bible in the child's mind and had had the effect of making it a dead language. The Bible could be so taught as to make it a vital force in culture, literature, and character.

Of course you could create some sort of a character and some sort of a culture, and some sort of a literature out of the Bible—as you could from the life of a thieves' kitchen. But between what one could do, and what it is desirable to do, there is often a great gap, and there is certainly one in this case. The culture that came from the Bible was that of the belief in demonism, the burning of men, women and children for witchcraft, the belief in views of man and of the world that for centuries stood in the way of a rational and scientific view of nature. Does Lord Percy, when he speaks of his aim as being that of

the revival of the Bible as a whole, mean the revival of these beliefs? If he does not mean that, what does he mean? Perhaps he does not mean anything at all. When a public man gets orating about the Bible, it is sound, not sense, that is required; and Lord Percy probably knows that so long as he says the customary things about the Bible, whether they are sensible or not, matters very little.

* * *

The Bible and Literature.

To talk of English culture and literature having suffered because of an assumed lack of familiarity with the Bible, is only another sample of the nonsense current for many years—part of the chatter about the debt the English language owes to the Bible. Far from any such debt existing there never was a time when the English of the Authorised Version was either spoken or written. The English of the Bible is not the English of any of the great Elizabethans—of Shakespeare, of Bacon, of Raleigh, of Marlowe, of Sidney, or any of their contemporaries. It is true that a great many Biblical expressions crept into common use, and while a knowledge of the origin of these expressions may be useful, they are about as important to the creation and the development of a nation's literature as would be a knowledge of the origin of the commonest of popular catch-words. One would dearly like to have from Lord Percy a precise account of when and how English literature and thought has declined because of our ignorance of the Bible. In every country there are periods during which the degree of literary excellence advances or recedes, but the causes of this have to be found quite apart from the strengthening or the weakening of belief in a nation's fetish book. Besides, it is not true that we are more ignorant of the Bible than were preceding generations. The use of Biblical expressions are not so common to-day as they were, say, during certain periods of the seventeenth century, but, again, there is no evidence that the use of Biblical expressions was even then common with the whole of the people. It does not appear to have been at any time more than a sectarian fashion, and it is entirely owing to the way in which the sects have utilized their opportunities that this belief has taken rank with many as an established truth. And it might, on reflection, occur to Lord Percy that the common use of a score or so of biblical expressions is no more certain indication of a knowledge of the Bible than the singing of a popular song about "Sweet Violets" indicates a knowledge of botany.

* * *

The Decline of the Bible.

We are not, as a matter of fact, more ignorant of the Bible than they were, and that for very good reasons, but there is a much wider knowledge of the Bible current than has ever been the case. But the Bible is *known*, not merely accepted as a fetish to be blindly worshipped or unquestioningly obeyed. We no more dream of going to the Bible for instruction in morals, in sociology, or in science, than we should go to it to practise the old method of settling the guilt of an accused person by marching him across red-hot stones. During the past hundred years we have come to know the nature of the Bible, its history, the character of its legends, and its relation to the other religious beliefs of semi-civilized peoples. The consequence is that for all save the most ignorant the Bible has lost its authoritative power, and this is reflected in the diminished extent to which it figures in general speech and in general literature. But the fact of this being so, the fact that within the brief space of two or three generations there

can be this marked decline in the use of the Bible in popular speech and writing, is proof of the truth of what has been said, namely, that it was never more than a fashion set by a temporary sectarian supremacy. English life and literature developed independently of it, although reflecting whatever vogue it might have had. But it is perhaps asking too much to expect a Minister of Education to have a scientific grasp of either literature, history, or life.

A Priest's Book.

When did this talk of the necessity for the Bible being retained in the interests of literature, culture, etc., come into vogue? Only within the last three or four generations. Before that the Bible was there, and few thought of questioning its right of place. It was there, not because of its value as an aid to culture, but because belief in its divine origin was essential to man's salvation. It was only when the growth of knowledge and the development of social life forced the problem of education upon governments and compulsory State education appeared that the question of what was to be done with the Bible arose. Nonconformists were by this time strong enough to make the possibility of teaching the established religion rather doubtful. Never expecting that the State would teach any religion but that of the Established Church, they were willing to accept the principle of Secular Education. Then came the famous compromise which offered all the Christian sects, at the expense of the State, the largest possible common measure of religious instruction. The Nonconformists swallowed their professed principles and accepted the bribe. Still, with some, there went on the fight against the Bible in State schools. And then came Professor Huxley with his stupid laudation of the Bible as necessary to the complete education of boys and girls. It was one of the worst services done to the cause of popular education, but again the religious party saw its value and it was well worked from then down to Lord Eustace Percy. And it is all so manifestly untrue. The Bible is in our schools for no other reason than that it is the fetish book of the Christian Church. The clergy are not interested in the Bible as a vehicle of literature, of sociology or of general culture. The priest is interested in it only because it is *his* book—the charta of his place, his power, and his emoluments. It is as a priest's book that the Bible is in the schools. It is because it is a priest's book that it must be turned out of the schools.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Evil.

ON July 20 the Bishop of Manchester preached before the British Medical Association in St. Mary's Church, Nottingham, and chose for his subject, "The Conquest of Evil." The sermon was published in the *Christian World Pulpit* for July 29, and is in several respects a highly remarkable deliverance. Its main purpose is to produce the conviction that the Christian religion, as interpreted by the theological party of which the Bishop is a distinguished member, does not present a view of the universe which cannot be shown to be in essential harmony with the discoveries made concerning it by modern science. Dr. Temple's claim is that science is favourable to essential religious principles, a claim which in our opinion he completely fails to justify. We readily admit that the Bishop's theology is the simplest conceivable; but our contention is that no theology, however broad, can rest on any scientific basis whatsoever.

In its very essence it is distinctly anti-scientific. The Bishop says:—

I wish to urge that, so far at least as I understand it—not that I claim that that is particularly far—the main trend of knowledge makes easier and not more difficult the intellectual acceptance of the essential teachings of the old tradition. More particularly is it extremely difficult for anyone of my generation to understand what all the trouble over evolution in the last century was about, and is about now beyond the Atlantic. No doubt that is partly because I was brought up in a home where the new thoughts were already familiar, and so my own religious training was already adapted to them, and I have with great difficulty to think myself into the position of those to whom such ideas of evolution came as a shock.

As many of our readers are aware, the Bishop of Manchester's father was Dr. Frederick Temple, author of the first essay in the famous work, *Essays and Reviews*, published in 1860, who became successively Bishop of Exeter and London and Archbishop of Canterbury, and who was distinguished by the liberality of his religious views. What the son's theology is is not easy to say, but it is certainly not that which our grandfathers so firmly held. He says:—

For them the world was something which had been made more or less as we see it now, once and for all. All of it was supposed to be good, except man who had introduced evil into the scheme of things by his own self-will and disobedience; and so there came in time a quite peculiar act of God utterly different even in principle from anything which he had ever done on any other occasion, of which the name was the Incarnation. Things had been utterly static until that time, and suddenly, abruptly, without analogy elsewhere in the divine method, there comes an altogether novel act, a fresh act of creation, isolated, unique and without analogy.

With all due deference to Dr. Temple we maintain that the theology which he rejects in the name of scientific knowledge is the creed to which the overwhelming majority of present-day Christians strenuously adhere. Is it not the form of Christianity so tenaciously taught by the Church of Rome throughout the world and by the Catholic party in the Church of England? Is it not the theology embodied in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and *Shorter Catechism*, and do we not read in the latter that "Christ, the Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin"? In John's Gospel Christ is called the Word of God, and in the text of the Bishop's sermon we find these words: "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.....And the Word was made flesh." Our point, however, is that the Bishop's simpler faith is no more believable on scientific ground, than the old orthodoxy which he repudiates. We discard both because in modern knowledge there is no need or room for either. Of supernatural science knows absolutely nothing.

The Bishop is a strong believer in and zealous advocate of the supernatural. To him God is all and in all. "From him," he says, "comes the whole of truth, from him comes the whole strength in which we are to struggle against the evil in the world and win the victory that will at last, it may be, justify the presence of that evil." That clearly shows that at present the Bishop is totally unable to justify the existence of evil. And yet he declares that "the real significance of life is wrought out through the struggle with the conquest over evil." But what is evil? The Dictionary calls it "moral badness, or

the deviation of a moral being from the principles of virtue impressed by conscience; disposition to do wrong; wickedness; depravity." The Bishop informs us that evil is of two kinds, namely, physical and moral. Physical evil means bodily disease and is treated by the medical profession, while moral evil signifies sin, and is treated by the clergy of all denominations. It is with evil as sin that we are now concerned. On the question of its origin Dr. Temple is practically silent, regarding it as "a singularly unimportant one." He says:—

For myself, I am convinced that the solution of the problem of its origin is not to be found in delving back into past history, for I do not believe we should ever come to a time when there was not a germ of what we call evil, but that it must be sought rather in the relation of time as a whole to that eternal experience which we believe to belong to God, and that in his good providence evil exists to be conquered, the conquest over it being itself a thing of such value that when it is conquered, the evil, while still utterly evil in itself, takes its place as a contributory force to the perfection of the eternal good.

That, in our estimation, is equivalent to a wretched begging of the whole question. It is an appeal from the known to the unknown, from time, in which we live and move and have our being, to eternity, which is merely a dream-object, or, as Shakespeare calls it:—

The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
No traveller returns.

God and eternity are wholly unknown and, as we think, unknowable, because positively no evidence of their reality is obtainable from any source whatever. Consequently to appeal to them is an act of culpable cowardice, and this is what all the clergy are constantly doing. Take the following sample:—

It is clear that on the Christian view, and I should think that also particularly on what we may perhaps term the historico-scientific view, the struggle with evil is the main element in the significance of life and of reality. That, again, is at the heart of the Christian conviction. We most of all see the divinity of our Lord, not in the miracles where his power broke through, but in the sufferings wherein he showed us how God faces and deals with the evil in the world. It is from the Cross that he reigns over the hearts of men in every generation. The writer of that wonderful vision with which the Bible closes finds in the Lamb that had been slain the explanation of all history, because that event when it happened was in principle the worst that ever could happen, and that event in our experience is revealed to be the best thing that ever has happened. There the Devil did his worst, and in that same act mankind from then till now has found God's own best.

In that last sentence his lordship attributes to mankind a belief held and cherished only by a dwindling minority even in Christendom. Then think of the infinite folly of characterizing the crucifixion of Jesus as an event which "when it happened was in principle the worst that ever could happen," and yet as an event which in the experience of professing Christians "is revealed to be the best thing that ever has happened." If the crucifixion of Jesus as described in the New Testament actually occurred it was as cruel a murder as was ever committed, and God was much more responsible for it than either the Jews or Pontius Pilate. And what conceivable object was achieved by means of it? According to the Bishop's own teaching the only possible way of conquering evil is by bravely struggling against it. Speaking for ourselves, we do not believe in the existence of evil in the sense of sin. The only evils we recognize are those unavoidably incidental to the

process of growth and development, and these have attended the whole course of the evolution of life. Most of the evils which afflict us to-day are due to the fact that as yet we have not adequately learned the art of social life. We have not sufficiently realized that no two human beings are alike, and until that truth comes home to us as utterly inevitable we shall not succeed in satisfactorily solving the problems which now cause us so much misery and suffering everywhere. What we need most of all is practical knowledge which engenders wisdom, the wisdom to bear with and serve one another in the warfare against injustice and wrong.

J. T. LLOYD.

Those Derelict Churches.

There has been only one Christian, and he died upon the cross.—*Nietzsche*.

He who rides on a tiger cannot dismount easily.—*Chinese proverb*.

Gold will knit and break religions.—*Shakespeare*.

THE Anglican Church, which is the State Religion of this country, is losing its grip on the national life. The supply of men for the Church's ministry has fallen considerably, not only in quantity but in quality also. The latest returns show that, whereas the pre-war figures comprised 25,000 priests, the total number now includes only 16,500. Young men of ability are seldom attracted to the Church nowadays, and those who enter Holy Orders no longer bring lustre to the State Religion. Nor is this all, for people are paying less and less attention to the Church's teaching. The number of communicants is getting lower; the total of Sunday-school children is diminishing; and the large outside public is drifting yearly further and further from the Anglican fold. The most solemn festivals of the Church have little meaning to the rising generation. To our fathers Easter was a close season for music-halls and theatres, now it is a continuous round of amusements. The Church frowns at divorce, and the Law Courts register thousands of decrees annually. To the Church all Nonconformists are heretics, and the Free Churches' returns prove conclusively that heresy is now far more popular than orthodoxy. And last, but most certainly not least, the Church schools are not only diminishing, but the maintenance of those still existing is yearly becoming a heavy financial responsibility for Anglicans and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Owing to its favoured position as the State Religion, and its ancient endowments, protected by Parliament, the Anglican Church still maintains a bold front. But it is simply the brave appearance of an old tree whose heart is withered. It may still weather a few storms; it may even make a brave appearance; but it is doomed. The Church is a creature of Parliament, and what Parliament makes it can also destroy. A simple measure of Disestablishment and Disendowment would, if carried, reduce the once-proud State Religion to the lowly position of one of the smaller Free Church bodies. When no longer in a position to offer bribes, the Anglican Church would, indeed, be in a pitiable plight, for, as rats leave a sinking ship, so would people cease to give their allegiance to an institution no longer enjoying the protection and support of the Government and the governing classes.

The times, indeed, are as out of joint for the Church as for Prince Hamlet of Denmark. The social and economic conditions are the chief factors in the resolution of the Bishops and Church Assembly to sell nineteen church sites in the City of London. There are forty-six parish churches within the narrow

confines of the city, and the estimated attendance on Sundays is slightly over two thousand. The cost of maintaining these churches is over £60,000 yearly. By the sale of the nineteen sites a million and a half of money will be obtained, and will be spent by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in bolstering the Church's position elsewhere.

The City Churches are a survival of the Ages of Faith. So exuberant was the piety of our forefathers that two of these churches are only forty yards apart, and at the back of Cornhill there are six churches within the narrow space of nine acres. It is an ironic commentary on the clerical pretences that near twenty churches, built by a former generation for the glory of the Christian God and his church, should have to be sold in order to keep the Anglican Church in a state of solvency during an age of Unfaith. And this, mark you, is only the beginning of the end. The intellect of the nation is slowly rising above the sixth-century ideals of the Anglican Church, and the consequent loss of manpower in the church cannot be compensated in terms of pure finance. Priests may build churches; they may even erect schools; they may use the poisoned weapons of their profession; but all will be unavailing if the conscience of the race is dissatisfied with the ignorance and superstition of past ages.

What does the Anglican Church stand for? It stands for Royalty and the kingly supremacy at a time when every throne in the world is rocking. It stands for the inferiority of woman when every decent man regards the equality of the sexes as a foregone conclusion. It stands for the perpetuation of a distinct clerical caste when liberty, equality, and fraternity have been the watchwords of Democracy for over a century. And the very triumphs of the High Church only make matters worse, for these men, with their sixth-century ideals, are as hopelessly out of date as black Fundamentalists from the rice-fields of Carolina; creatures who cannot write their own names but are cock-sure that all the scientists of the world are to be damned everlastingly.

Yet these priests (for the laymen are but cat's-paws) seek constantly to interfere in national affairs. Ever since 1870 they have sought, not only to safeguard the Church's position, but to control absolutely the national education, and at the public expense to have narrow and outworn ecclesiastical views forced on children. Only the jealousy of the Nonconformists prevented this, but the absurd "compromise" has been a bone of contention between priests and Free Churchmen for over half a century. For thirty years the Bishop of London and his colleagues have been fighting what is called, euphemistically, "the social evil," although it is one of the most unsocial of evils. All they have done is to close a few notorious places of resort, and to drive their frequenters into the streets. In both these instances not the most fair-minded critic could pretend that this priestly intervention has been anything but a deplorable failure. In the one case the cause of national education has suffered grievously from the quarrels of opposing sects of Christians. In the other case the conditions of our streets and open spaces after dark has been worsened.

The impudence of these priests is simply amazing. They butt in every time as "representative Churchmen," but whom do they represent? Not the laymen of their own Church, for they are never consulted on these matters. Nor the great bulk of citizens in this country, for they never trouble the pew-openers. These priests represent nobody but themselves. That being so, they have no particular claim on the attention of the public, for they are but a survival from an age which was absolutely

undemocratic. Priests, by their peculiar training, are suited neither by knowledge nor temperament to embark upon the perilous seas of statesmanship. By attempting to do so they only bring their Church into disrepute and themselves into ridicule.

MIMNERMUS.

Jesus in Faith and in History.

"THE MAN NOBODY KNOWS."

A FRIEND of mine asked me the other day if I could compute how many books, pamphlets, and articles have been written about Jesus in all languages during the past nineteen hundred years. I hazarded 1,562,793, and he protested it was not enough. We had a long discussion and the figure was left an open question. But I appeal to bibliographers to set to work and compile a complete bibliography of all references in literature, in all literatures, to Jesus. I admit it would be a stupendous piece of work, but how entertaining! To turn up the names of Socialists and Individualists, fervent believers, and "reverent" sceptics, of Englishmen and Germans, of Abyssinians and Chinese, and many others, all uniting in perfect hymns of praise to the one unique glorious figure history has given us, is surely a treat for the gods. Of course, there is another side to the medal. "Vulgar" people like myself would have to be admitted to the work, but with what scorn would we be treated!

The great value of such a bibliography would be in pointing out how Jesus has affected the world. No matter what a man or woman was, in Jesus would be discovered the highest exemplar of that particular trade or profession. He is the greatest Roman Catholic as well as the greatest Calvinist the world has ever seen. He is the head of the Salvation Army as well as of Christian Science. There is no poet or orator greater than he, no Communist or Prohibitionist. He combines in his teaching such wonderful simplicity and openness that a child can understand and follow him. While, at the same time, there will be found such wonderful occultism in his every word that even the most advanced "adepts"—people so high in the ranks of mysticism as Mrs. Besant or Mr. A. E. Waite—can never exhaust all that is "esoteric" in his symbolic expressions. While the followers of Plato and Berkeley will show how Jesus anticipated (never mind dates) their philosophy, the students of Pythagoras will prove conclusively that everything in the science of numbers can be found in the four gospels. In short, turn where you will and how you will, Jesus is there pointing out the true path once for all.

And with it, quite apart from books and articles and pamphlets, go the preachers and speakers of the "good tidings." For over 1,500 years they have filled pulpits and market places, manors and hovels. They have never ceased pursuing the good work, expounding, exhorting and wheedling and frightening all who have listened to them. They have slain millions of "infidels" as an example to backsliders. And they have taken care, as I think Dr. Wace once hoped, to make it a very unpleasant thing for any man to say he didn't believe in Christ. And would you credit it, in spite of these years of work, an American business man has discovered that, after all, Jesus is "the man nobody knows!"

Needless to say, Mr. Bruce Barton, the author of a book with this title, claims to know Jesus himself, but—according to him—he's the only one living. At least, he was the only one living till he wrote his book and got people to read it, and thus added a few more to the very select number.

It is an amusing work. Most books about Jesus are, of course, but this is particularly humorous. Mr. Barton is so very sincere. He claims we are all wrong in looking at Jesus as "a physical weakling." He was really a very strong man—an ardent Physical Culturist—possibly the strongest man that ever lived. And to call him "a kill-joy!" Why, "he was the most popular dinner guest in Jerusalem." He was "a successful carpenter"—which, in American business language, measured in terms of Ford and Rockefeller, means he was making "his pile" and paying dividends.

The whole book is written from this "business" standpoint. Mr. Barton wants you to picture a thoroughly efficient business man, as understood in America. A man who thinks in cheques and bonds and index files and graphs for every workman showing you scientifically how he never slacked off in his work; the man, with his telephone glued to his ear, dictating important letters to a typist and dictaphone, and, at the same time, listening to Wall Street, and making rapid calculations of rises and falls in the Stock Market. Some boy, this Jesus, and no mistake! "Jesus a"—commercial—"failure!" Perish the thought! "Why," says Mr. Barton, "He picked up twelve men from the bottom ranks of business and forged them into an organization that conquered the world!"

There you have Mr. Bruce Barton's complete thesis. No half measures, you see. Jesus's organization "conquered" the world. It reminds me of the statistics given in year books—England has a population of forty millions whose religion is Christianity. *We* may protest we're not Christians, but year books are not compiled for us.

When I was in the army we were once marched off to hear a great Y.M.C.A. preacher. He spent most of his time, naturally, on Jesus, greater than the kings of the world all put together, and the marvellous physician, Luke, who followed him. When a medical man, used to treating all diseases, used to the most delicate operations, learned in botany, biology, anatomy, physiology, psychology, law, languages, literature, art, and music, a great and noble physician, could humbly follow his Master Jesus, how could we, humble soldiers, ignorant as dirt compared with Luke, hold back? That is the kind of thing we had to listen to, and Mr. Bruce Barton carries on in much the same way for 180 pages, only he wants us to see Jesus as the greatest business man the world has ever seen, and doesn't bother so much about Luke, the world's greatest physician.

Mr. Barton is all for the "literal" interpretation—-with expansions of his own—of the Holy Word. The expansions are reminiscent of modern novels. "There was no trifling with Jesus." "Jesus's face kindled with admiration." Jesus "played a stroke of master strategy." "Standing a little apart from the rest, the young man from Nazareth watched in amazement which deepened gradually into anger." "And suddenly, without a word of warning he strode forward to the table where the fat money changer sat, and hurled it violently across the court."

Methinks all these extracts have a very familiar accent, and we are not surprised that the money-changer has "the face of a pig" and that he "leaned gloatingly over his hoard." Jesus "stood flushed and panting, the little whip still in his hands." Naturally "his glance swept scornfully over the faces, distorted by anger and greed." Oh, shades of the *Boys' Friend*! And, finally, "Not a man of them dared to stand up to him."

When you get 180 pages of that sort of thing (and these are quite mild), what kind of intelligence

must Mr. Barton credit the world that knows not Jesus with? I give it up.

Jesus was a great business man from the very beginning. Mr. Barton quotes, "Wist ye not that I must be about my father's *business*?" Here you get God as a business man also—though I can't quite make out whether Mr. Barton believes Jesus was God or that they were too separate persons. If the latter, the puzzle would be to settle which of the two had the greater business instincts.

In talking like that, however, to his parents, and thus silencing them, Jesus's "hour of boyish triumph had not turned his head." I never knew that the triumph of any of my dearly beloved heroes ever did turn their heads, so I am glad to be reassured with regard to the greatest hero of the lot. But, as Mr. Barton so earnestly points out, Jesus did not say, "Wist ye not that I must practise preaching" or like phrases. No, he distinctly and clearly asserts *business*. "He thought," says Mr. Barton, "of his life as *business*." You can't quite get over that. For my own part, I take off my hat to Mr. Barton. The way he manages to read American business into the sayings of Jesus compels my utmost admiration. What did, for example, Jesus mean when he said, "Whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain"? Why, says Mr. Barton, it means "Do more than is required of you; do twice as much!" In fact, it's a "startling bit of *business* advice." I can see how thoroughly, too, it will appeal to our coal miners and how popular Jesus would have been in Mr. Cook's job. You ought to work, according to this business gospel, not eight hours per day but sixteen. Oh, Mr. Barton!

And what an advertisement writer and leader writer Jesus would have made! Mr. Barton gives us some of the headings the "caption" editors would have had displayed had there been newspapers in Jerusalem:—

PALSIED MAN HEALED.

JESUS OF NAZARETH CLAIMS RIGHT TO FORGIVE SINS.

PROMINENT SCRIBES OBJECT.

"BLASPHEMOUS," SAYS LEADING CITIZEN.

"BUT ANYWAY, I CAN WALK," HEALED MAN RETORTS.

Isn't it scrumptuous?

You see, Mr. Barton takes every word in the Four Gospels as literally true, and by using his modern American imagination he can make Jerusalem quite like New York or Chicago, or even like "Main Street." And he is so thoroughly serious; he means every word he says.

Mr. Barton, moreover, waxes very wrath if you suggest Jesus never smiled. Why, Christ was the greatest humorist that ever trod this earth and was always laughing and joking and poking fun.

"The keen eyes of Jesus saw deep into the souls of men. There was a twinkle in them now." I like that twinkle. Fancy a business man without a twinkle! And Jesus always "towered magnificently above it all."

Well, well; I really must stop. The extracts I could give are so very delicious in their entire absence of humour—as well as any pretence of historicity—that I send the reader with joy to a work which runs Mr. Max Beerbohm or Mr. Whyndam Lewis very closely in their most fooling moments. It does, I seriously maintain, read like a parody. And it is the kind of book which would swell the bibliography I hope some ardent Christian will one day compile.

The introduction by the Hon. and Rev. James Adderley, M.A., commences, "By recommending this book, I do not necessarily give my consent to

all its deductions or my approval to all its expressions." I should think not!

But if Mr. Barton ever sees this article I wonder whether he would favour us with a dissertation on the *language* Jesus actually spoke and tell us how he can read into *that* American business terms. I really would like to know.

H. CUTNER.

A Parson on Parsons; An Essay on Clerical Candour.

LOOKING through an old book of cuttings, I came across one, about six months old, which is really worth rescuing from the obscurity of the files of a provincial evening newspaper. It is an extract from the *Evening Star and Daily Herald* of Ipswich, and is entitled "The Man in the Street and Religion," being a report of a speech delivered at the Empire Theatre, Dovercourt, by the Rev. Isaac Shimmin.

A Dr. Ford Porter "was in the chair." The worthy Doctor assured his hearers that "he was not a very assiduous churchgoer," and that—this is the year of grace, 1926!—"the doctrine of evolution had taken away a *certain amount* of the Bible's infallibility." Before Darwin, I suppose, the Bible had the attribute of infallibility—now, "a *certain amount*" of this infallibility has been "taken away." But what on earth is left of infallibility if "a *certain amount*" has gone? Dr. Porter exhibits a confusion of both thought and diction only too typical of orthodox Christians who seek to reconcile the fact of evolution with the fiction of Genesis. But let us turn our attention to the Rev. Isaac Shimmin:—

England was supposed to be a Christian country, yet they were told that not more than twenty per cent. could be found inside Christian churches. The average man in the street was dead against parsons and clergymen. He said they had a soft job and were determined to keep it. The average man in the street said when a fellow was overcome and in distress, the priest and the Levite too often passed by on the other side, and, *in many cases, the man in the street was right.* He found there was nothing that aroused the fury of the average man in the street more than the fact that was sometimes brought home to him that Christian proprietors of slum property were dealing with their tenants in a harsh and un-Christian manner. Then he became furious against Christianity itself, and *he was right.* The man in the street had probably been to church once since he was married. He found the sermon dull and long, the singing not equal to a third-rate music-hall, and the seats very hard, and he said he was not going again. *There was nothing to help him in the whole service,* and so he said he had no use for religion, or, as the boy said, "I'm not taking any." They were not going to condemn that man; they were going to understand him. It was no use taking a theological cudgel and pummelling him. He had come across good Christian people who had grumbled about preachers and pulled them to pieces at the dinner table before the children, and then they wondered that the children had no respect for the parsons.

SINGING A LIE.

He claims that they are coming closer towards making people believe that *secular was sacred.* Sometimes they got up in church and sang:—

We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity.

And they knew they were singing a thundering big lie. They were divided, and if the angels ever

¹ How extremely kind of them!

wept, it must be because of the foolishness and pig-headedness of many who professed to follow the Galilean teacher.²

A more damning indictment of clerical impotence and uselessness could hardly be imagined. This is the sort of thing Freethinkers have been saying for years. But we may be sure that the Rev. Shimmin does not concede so much of the anti-clerical case for nothing. He goes on: "He agreed with the man in the street, perhaps the sermons were often wearisome, but, after all, they were much better than some political speeches he had heard." Now, I quite agree that some sermons I have heard—and I have heard not a few—are a lot better than some I have heard not a few—are a lot better than some political speeches I have heard. But political speeches are seldom the last word in either intelligibility, reasonableness or interest. With a vengeance, the Rev. Shimmin is damning his colleagues with the faintest of faint praise. Fancy telling a clergyman his sermons are better than the ranting of Hyde Park Tories, Radicals, or Socialists!

After this, the Rev. Shimmin proceeds to claim that the seats in churches are not quite so uncomfortable as those at football matches—the which one may concede without prejudicing the question of the reality of Divine revelation. He then concludes:—

If the man in the street went to church, he would be welcomed and helped, and would be a better man for going. The man in the street said they were hypocrites, but he claimed that the majority of men and women in the church were doing their best, in their simple way, to be loyal to what they believed to be the truth.

Now, I absolutely agree that most Christians—the vast majority—"in their simple way" are quite sincere, honest, and altogether admirable people. But, in the Rev. Isaac Shimmin's view, is a man "a better man for going" to a place where you are expected to sing things which you *know* to be "thundering big lies," where the sermon is "dull and long," and the singing "not equal to a third-rate music-hall"?

This, then, is the rock on which we must rebuild the Church which, but a few decades ago, thundered its precepts with the voice of authority, confident in the security of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession! Gone is the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Shattered is the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture. Now, it seems, we are to found our faith on the alleged superiority of parsons over politicians and a careful comparison of the relative hardnesses of the seats at football matches and in the House of God. Truly, a remarkable *apologia pro vita sua* for a Church of England clergyman! EPIPHATHA.

Acid Drops.

Both Sir Oliver Lodge and Dean Inge preached sermons in connection with the meetings of the British Association, and we may notice both at greater length next week. Sir Oliver, as might have been expected, dwelt upon the revelation of a "spiritual world" that was coming, but unlike men of the type of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, confessed that science was against him. He said it will not be long before the question is asked, "Does Man Survive?" and it will be answered. But the question has always been asked, and save amongst savages, the answer has been, "No proof." And in spite of prophecy—an occupation in which anyone may indulge—we say unhesitatingly that there are no new facts known to modern science that would indicate a coming revision of that reply. Sir Oliver's talk

² Italics throughout are mine.

about what is electricity, or ether, or matter, has simply no bearing whatever upon the subject of human survival. They merely serve to impress certain people with the wonders of science, its many unsolved problems, and, having created a state of unthinking amazement, prepared the way for the irrelevant conclusion that we shall all survive death. It is another form of the old truth of getting the rabbit out of the hat—quite an easy trick—provided the audience can be prevented seeing how the rabbit gets in.

From the point of view of scientific reasoning the possibility of a future life becomes more and more unlikely as one understands the quality of human nature and its reactions. There is not a single human quality or capacity that does not bear a direct relation to this life. Any other life—assuming one to exist—would have to be identical with this one if we were able to live it, or our qualities able to express themselves. But the whole belief in a future life is based upon its being of a radically different kind. Family life, for instance, clearly implies birth. Birth implies death. The qualities of truthfulness, justice, mercy, honesty, loyalty, all imply the existence of a set of conditions similar to those that exist. The talk of "higher intelligence," "eternal relationships," "meeting our loved ones again," are all so much sentimental unreason, whether it is furthered by a scientific man or not. And Sir Oliver Lodge is not the only instance of a man eminent in one department furthering downright nonsense in another.

The Boston Broadcasting Station has, by arrangement with the Y.M.C.A., been sending out every morning a ten minutes' religious service, consisting of the reading of a passage from the Bible, a hymn, and a prayer. The Directors of the station say that this is the only portion of the programme to which exception has been taken. We are glad to hear of the objection, but, in this respect, America is much as we are. So long as Christians have the power to use public property to their own advantage they will do so. When they are not allowed to do so they shriek "Persecution."

We said several weeks ago, concerning the story of the kidnapping of Mrs. McPherson, the American lady evangelist, by handits, that, in our opinion, it was nothing more than an advertising "stunt" arranged by the lady herself. We now see that American papers are coming to the same conclusions. There is nothing sensational the average evangelist will not attempt. They are probably the least truthful class in the community. They leave politicians hopelessly in the rear.

The Australian papers in reporting Gipsy Smith's mission in Adelaide refer to the large crowds attending the meetings, but admit that these are comprised almost wholly of church adherents. The outsider has not been much in evidence. Evidently the more balanced Australians do not favour spiritual debauchery, and are disinclined to give the "good tidings" the glad eye. But the Gipsy's non-success in achieving his avowed intention to make more Christians won't prevent his furnishing the credulous in England with the usual exhilarating reports of wholesale conversions.

Idealism is indestructible, declares Principal Brewis. That explains why the Churches with all their wealth and influence and Blasphemy Laws have never succeeded in destroying Freethought.

When things seen wax, and things unseen wane, the soul of man begins to perish, says the Wesleyan President. What this means is, when religion flies out of the window the broker's man walks in at the parson's front door.

The Chairman of the Schools Athletic Association, Mr. Creese, must be held responsible for infecting youth with that which the parsons deplore—pagan ideas. Says he, "Our purpose is to teach the children of England healthy games, and so give them a 'healthy mind in a healthy body.'" Mr. Creese is a man of sense. He would appear to realize that the child cannot acquire that kind of mind and body in a Sunday-school hearing about the gloomy adventures of the Man of Sorrows or the hectic imaginings of Biblical worthies.

Prayer is asked (by the *Christian Herald*) for the revival missions being held in various parts of Great Britain and Ireland, and that a great spiritual awakening may come upon the world in view of the imminent return of Our Lord. What puzzles us is why prayer should be necessary. If a spiritual awakening is part of the Divine scheme of things, why waste breath praying over it? And if not, all the prayer in the world won't bring it about. If our pious friends had as much sense as they have mind for praying, they would first discover for certain whether the Lord intends to have a spiritual awakening, and leave it to Him. They would then have more energy available to devote to bettering the world and mitigating the evils they declare they see around them.

A Japanese ex-colporteur of the Scottish Bible Society has written the whole of the Old and New Testaments in Japanese characters on one sheet of paper, measuring 79 by 35 inches. The work took him four years and three months to accomplish! Poor wretch. The Lord evidently endowed him with industry but omitted intelligence to direct it.

Germany is reported to have obtained a new gas for warfare purposes. This produces a dense fog over a large area. The chemists, we understand, obtain the gas by distilling an essence from the volumes of sermons and theological argument accumulated since the time of Luther.

"There was never a time, in our belief," said the leader-writer of the *Yorkshire Post* recently, "in which family life was so strong, because there was never a time when parents and children so completely shared each other's interests, and so freely recognized the human fallibility of their own judgment and experience." Now, that is the considered opinion of one writing in a responsible journal. But it is not likely to commend itself to our moaning Jeremiahs in the pulpit who declare that indifference to religion is resulting in the decay of family life. What is disappearing from many homes is, the keeping of the young at a distance, misunderstanding, repression of individuality, despotic commands, and solemn lecturing. Most of these things originated in notions culled from Bible reading; home life was governed by ancient patriarchal ideals having fear (quaintly called "respect"), not affection, as their keynote. With their disappearance family life has become a much more wholesome and companionable affair. But to admit that such is the case doesn't suit the parsons' little game. Hence the periodical lamentations from the pulpit.

Sir Rabindranath Tagore who has recently visited Italy complains that the newspaper reporters there have distorted his views and have given Italian readers the impression that he has an implicit admiration for Fascism. He therefore wishes to correct this, declaring that he had no sympathy with Fascism because he found it had for its object the cult of blind passion for nationalism and imperialism. Sir Rabindranath adds that even if Italy could be conceived as now being prosperous, yet if the methods employed are found to be ethically wrong and a menace to the rest of the world, then we have a right to judge it, and that is what he feels is expressed in the serious crime of the repression of free speech and the imperialistic ambition of the Govern-

ment which goes against the condition of peace in the world.

We can quite appreciate this distinguished Indian gentleman having little sympathy with the methods and ambitions of the Brummagen imitations of ancient Romans now dominating modern Italy. Their methods strike him as ethically wrong; but Fascists are not likely to perceive that, while they are convinced these methods are Christianly right. For does not His Holiness of the Vatican see in them nothing objectionable? And are not all Fascist leaders loyal supporters of Mother Church, which teaches that great evil is the outcome of unfettered thought? How then can Fascism be other than ethically right? The Fascist has no doubt on that score. And with the greatest goodwill he forthwith shows the world how a good Catholic can love his enemies by dosing them with castor oil.

There is a crisis among the Mennonites, an American religious sect, which has a rule rigidly enforcing simplicity of dress. According to a contemporary, members of the sect must not wear ribbons, feathers, and flowers, nor use buttons—hooks and eyes alone are permitted as fastenings. Mennonites are also forbidden to read newspapers. What has precipitated the crisis is that the Modernists are protesting against these restrictions. The Fundamentalist party, however, is standing for the old ways. Our contemporary finds the quarrel amusing, but adds, "and perhaps not a little admonitory. For have we not known ecclesiastical disputes about things other than buttons and hooks and eyes that have been, at bottom, quite as ridiculous?" Yes. And we expect such puerile disputes to continue to arise so long as there exists a ridiculous creed and solemn people who have not yet learned to put away childish things.

The Rev. A. Douglas Brown declares that many of the troubles which have beset the nation so sadly have been of our own sowing. The nation that sows disrespect to the Divine sanctions must expect to reap the harvest of disruption and disintegration. The nation that cuts God's Holy Word with the knife of criticism must expect to be confronted with the thorns and briars of unbelief and communism. The nation that surrenders the sanctity of the Lord's Day cannot evade the bitter reckoning of lawlessness and strife which are bound to follow any nation's forgetfulness of God. It is obvious from all this that we have at least one acute intelligence which understands the real causes of social unrest and economic trouble. Our professors of sociology and economics would be well advised to scrap all their absurd theories and hearken to this modern descendant of the priests of Israel.

The Fleet again returns to the subject of compulsory attendance at Divine service on ships, and admits that with the "lower deck" it is in general disfavour, "the men go to it cursing, they go to sleep (if they can) while it is on, they come away cursing." But *The Fleet* points out that compulsory church attendance has its roots in the Established Church and the Nonconformist conscience, and the first Article in the Articles of War says:—

All officers in command of H.M. Ships of War shall cause the public worship of Almighty God according to the liturgy of the Church of England, established by law, to be solemnly, orderly, and reverently performed in their respective ships, and shall take care that prayers and preaching by the Chaplain in Holy Orders of the respective ships, be performed diligently, and that the Lord's Day be observed according to law.

The editor of *The Fleet* says he would like to put a few Bishops on a lower deck on a Sunday morning to listen to what goes on. If he did, we do not suppose it would make much difference. He might be shocked at the men's "irreverent" behaviour, but the degradation of compulsory religious service would still go on.

To Correspondents.

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

E. LECHMERE.—Thanks for inducing your newsagent to display copies of the *Freethinker*. This is help of a real and important kind. There are many thousands of potential readers for this paper if we can only get into touch with them.

G. E. CLEAVER.—There is no direct vote of money by Parliament to the Church of England. But every church is exempt from payment of rates and taxes, which amounts to a very large annual State subsidy. In the past there have been very large sums given direct, besides the imposition of taxes for the benefit of the church. Church rates, for example, when abolished, were bought by the community.

W. ELLIS.—One can always depend upon local governing bodies giving a "leg-up" to the churches whenever it is possible for them to do so. And, unfortunately, one can also depend upon those who ought to protest standing quietly by and allowing it to be done.

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.

The holiday season is in full swing, and there are ample opportunities for our friends to help on the good work by introducing copies of the paper wherever possible. Those who would care for small parcels of specimen copies for distribution, may have them if they apply to this office. And we are still ready to send the *Freethinker* for six weeks on receipt of name and address with threepence to cover postage. Many new readers are gained in this way.

We have received a brave and cheery letter from Mr. Vincent Hands, who is at present in a sanatorium. He writes with courage, although he is not blind to the gravity of his position. We are sure that if clear-headed pluck will pull him through he will win. And even under his present trying conditions his interest in Freethought continues, for he writes that he has discovered in the institution one embryo Freethinker whom he hopes to lead to maturity. He also sends an article, which we hope to publish next week.

We regret to announce that Mr. William Bailey, for many years a faithful member of the Manchester Branch, has just died. His funeral will take place at Golder's Green Crematorium on Thursday, August 12, at 1 o'clock.

A lengthy and well-reasoned letter appears in a recent issue of the *Weston-super-Mare Gazette* in favour of their being provided entertainments and recreations for Sunday. The letter is signed "T. S. P.," and we hope it will stir up others to activity. In a subsequent issue the retort is made that if "T. S. P." does not like the English Sunday he should pack up and go on the Continent, where they do things differently. That is essentially Christian in its stupidity and impudence. "If you do not like to live as I live, clear out," is the attitude of the average Christian, and it is responsible for far greater social evil than many would readily believe. At the back of the mind of many Christians there appears to be a half-formed impression that it is only by an act of condescension on their part that other people are permitted to live.

Some months ago we wrote an article criticising Mr. Upton Sinclair's protest against using the schools as propaganda for Capitalism. We took occasion to point out that while we agreed with him in his protest, we did not see that it was doing better to use them as propaganda for Socialism. It was only another form of the same policy, the right policy being to leave all propaganda outside the school doors. We are glad to find Mr. Ramsay MacDonald making use of the same argument. It is a lesson that is badly needed. How much it is needed is shown by the *Star*, which, in a leading article on Mr. MacDonald's speech, lays it down as a rule that "the good teacher should teach that on which all good men are agreed." That is easy, but not helpful. It would at some time or other sanction anything of which one can reasonably think. All good men have been at some time agreed upon quite a number of foolish and bad things. The really sound rule is not to be so much concerned with teaching children things at all. Teach them how to think, and be not over-anxious about what they think. But that would not please those who see in children only the material for enlarging the ranks of a party or crowding the seats of a church.

To those of our readers who are keen cyclists the name of "Kuklos," the bicycling expert of the *Daily News*, is a very well known one. The other week, "Kuklos" for the nonce took over Dr. Glover's column, and furnished the *Daily News* readers with an article on "The Golden Rule." What is interesting to us is that "Kuklos" frankly avows himself as an Agnostic since early manhood, when he ceased attending any place of worship. He says he has not attended such a place since. He also remarks that when he saw all the Christian nations killing one another in the name of one and the same God, the last vestiges of respect for organized Christianity fell from him. We are glad to see "Kuklos" declare himself; some Freethinking readers of his column had suspected the truth long ago. What we should like to see is some of our timid Agnostic writers for the press pluck up courage and follow the "Kuklos" example.

"Antiquary," in *John O'London's Weekly*, has been tracing the origin of the National Anthem. As a result of his research he states that the phrase "Frustrate their knavish tricks" very appropriately applied to "the vile Popish plot" from which King James I. escaped—a firework display not arranged by Messrs. Pain. It is a pretty phrase and reminiscent of a story from an acquaintance who had been reading Carlyle and had found the term "milk-nosed maggot." Immediately, he wanted to go out, and find somebody on whom he could use it.

F. Vincent M'Nabb, in the same paper, applies the name of "the Poet's Poet" reference to Francis Thompson. What has Mrs. Hemans done amiss, or, for that matter, Martin Tupper, that they should be overlooked in the handing out of bouquets? And considering that Catholics are not to be trusted with reading everything, if Father M'Nabb were not of the true faith we would say he was biased.

The Myth of Prometheus.

BEFORE dealing with this myth in detail it may not be out of place to give a few facts regarding the relative size of the earth to other spheres in the universe, and we are thus enabled to approach the subject of this article in a more humble state of mind than we otherwise should if the insignificance of our planet were not recognised.

There is a large star known as Betelgeuse, which has a diameter three hundred times greater than that of the sun, and the sun has one which is a hundred times greater than that of the earth. If we represent Betelgeuse by a ball ten inches in diameter the earth will, in comparison, be a microcosmic mass only one three-thousandth of an inch across, and man will be an ultra-microcosmic speck measuring one twenty-thousand-millionth of an inch. For any one of us to imagine that the appeals of this creature to his gods in order that the forces of Nature shall not in any way threaten his happiness and comfort, merely indicates that such a one is full of conceit respecting his position and importance in the kingdom of the stars.

The myth of Prometheus relates that this ancient hero took away some fire from the sun and brought it down to earth. It is a myth which has many counterparts in this world, and the ancient tales are full of the fire which the gods rained down from heaven. These balls of fire were probably cold before reaching us, but they were rendered white hot by atmospheric friction. We have to ascertain, however, the reasons why the Greeks arrived at the seemingly extraordinary conclusion that the fire was obtained from the sun.

There were certain facts which may have induced them to connect the two events as cause and effect. They were:—

1. The sun did not decrease in size but suddenly became colder.

2. There was interposed between the earth and the sun a non-conducting matter which prevented its former heat reaching the earth.

3. The sun actually decreased in size by the abstraction of a portion of its matter, which fell on the earth.

4. The earth was removed farther from the sun and the *apparent* diameter of this body was decreased, and consequently the heat derived from it.

Let us now examine each of these possibilities and subsequently make a comparison with other myths in order to arrive, if possible, at the true meaning attached to it.

My general theory, being regarded as a working hypothesis, may be employed here in the attempt to make order out of chaos in respect of the many interpretations to which this myth has been subjected.

1. If my theory is correct and also portions of the broken planet, as is probable, fell into the sun, it would not have become colder, but may have become hotter. We cannot conceive, with our present knowledge, of any reasons why this body should suddenly decrease in temperature.

2. If a planet had been disrupted whether by external forces—my theory—or by internal forces—Olbers' theory—then there would be, as a result, a great amount of meteoric dust scattered throughout the solar system. This dust would prevent a portion of the heat of the sun reaching us, and the temperature of the earth would be lowered. This explanation is only partially satisfactory, because it does not account for the removal of the fire, which conclusion can only have been based on a real or apparent shrinkage in the diameter of the sun.

3. Let us assume that the quantity of matter taken away by Prometheus from the sun was a yard deep of its whole surface. This brought down—if he were not cremated during the operation—would have covered the earth to a depth of ten thousand yards. The arrival of such a mass would have reduced the crust of our planet to a molten mass, and nothing would have been left alive. Further, a reduction of one yard in the radius of the sun is not appreciable by means of the best telescope ever yet made, consequently much less discernible to the human eye; and the loss of heat radiated by this body would have been unnoticed. We must therefore cast this aside as an explanation of the myth.

4. The removal of the earth to a position farther from the sun would decrease its apparent diameter, and also the quantity of heat received from it. If the Greeks mistook an apparent for a real decrease they were, taking into account their lack of astronomical knowledge, to some extent, logically justified in assuming that the fire which arrived on the earth came direct from the sun. They could not imagine that the small star, which had been disrupted, would produce such terrible effects. Yet on the other hand, they did say that the giants, ash-nymphs, furies, and Aphrodite came from the blood of Uranus. Evidently the two myths were in existence together.

An interesting contribution to the Prometheus myth is obtained from Polynesia.¹ The *Times Literary Supplement* in a review, in their issue of November 27, 1924, of Padraic Colum's *Legends of Hawaii*, makes the following remark:—

The main story, "The Seven Deeds of Maui," is exceptional, for the collector has used a pan-Polynesian hero, and gathering hints from folk-lore as far distant as New Zealand, and, becoming a story-teller himself, skilfully knitting, tells how the Promethean hero of the Pacific brought fire to men, barbed the hook, affected the climate by snaring the sun of its fiery legs on the mountain of Haleakala and compelled it, by a hard driven bargain, to moderate its impetuous pace.

In this myth, obtained from a place so far from Greece that it may be considered as absolutely independent in its origin, we find the following statements: (1) The velocity of the sun was decreased; (2) The sun was snared of its fiery legs; (3) The climate was affected.

If (1) means that the apparent daily velocity of the sun was diminished, then the days had become longer, but this would not have the effect of reducing the day temperature. For instance, when the sun is directly over the tropic of Cancer—23½ degrees North—the hottest part of the world is 43 degrees North, as the greater length of the day in this latitude more than compensates for the lower average altitude of the sun. If the meaning of the myth is that the time interval between two successive solstices was increased, then the earth must have been removed farther from the sun, and (2) and (3) would follow as necessarily consequential results.

WILLIAM CLARK.

(To be Concluded.)

If you wish to subject all things to yourself, subject yourself to reason.—*Seneca*.

¹ Sir James G. Frazer, in his most recent work on mythology, mentions about the barbarous tale of Ra, the Sun-God, who, growing old and feeble, incurred derision, sought counsel of the elder gods and withdrew from earth to heaven. I think it will not be unduly straining this statement to mean that, Ra became smaller in size and gave out less energy than before. If such is its true interpretation this myth is in conformity with the foregoing ones from Greece and Polynesia.

The Kindly Wayfarer.

(Luke x. 30-35.)

II.

(Concluded from page 492.)

1. *The Anti-Clerical Element.*—Matthew¹¹ declares that Jesus accused "the chief priests" of refusing to repent and to believe at the call of John the Baptist, although the publicans and the harlots accepted his ministry; and all the Synoptists, especially Matthew, assert that he made severe attacks upon the scribes and the Pharisees, who were respectively the special interpreters and the meticulous observers of the Mosaic Law. As this institution, supposed to be of divine origin, dealt very largely with religious ceremonies, it was a matter of vital importance to the priests and Levites, who would therefore resent insults to the scribes and Pharisees, even though they themselves, or at least the priests, often belonged to the Sadducees, a party who differed from the Pharisees in keeping only the law, whereas they kept both the law and the rules deduced from the law. Indeed Mark¹² and Luke¹³ say that "the chief priests and the scribes" consulted together about suppressing Jesus; whilst Mark¹⁴ declares that the takers of Jesus acted upon the authority of "the chief priests and scribes." It is evident that although the people revered the Pharisees, they did not dislike to hear Jesus attacking their idols for the evangelists lately quoted agree that only the fear of the people deterred the religious chiefs from having Jesus forthwith suppressed.

Here there is nothing strange because, as everybody knows, the populace, whilst adoring their "superiors," take delight in hearing them traduced. Thus the authenticity of the present parable is confirmed rather than invalidated by the anti-clerical bias therein exhibited.

2. *The Anti-National Element.*—This is far the more serious of the two points. For, whilst a Jewish crowd might endure and even enjoy an attack upon the priests and the Levites, they would never support an insult to the Chosen People. Besides this, according to Matthew, Jesus displayed all the sentiments which his compatriots entertained with respect to their race. He makes Him express surprise at the remarkable faith evinced by a Gentile, saying that He had not found the like of it. "No, not in Israel,"¹⁵ this emphasis revealing the high opinion which He had of His people. Matthew also asserts that Jesus declared, "I was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel";¹⁶ and that He said to His disciples, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine";¹⁷ the names of these animals being then habitually applied by Jews to Gentiles, as they are now by Muslims to Christians. In agreement with this prescription, Matthew reports Him as saying to the twelve apostles when sending them forth to preach, "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."¹⁸ Finally, Matthew, following in the steps of Mark,¹⁹ relates that once when a foreign woman asked Jesus to heal her daughter, He replied, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs."²⁰ Of all these sayings, Luke has none but the favourable reference to the Gentile;²¹ whilst, on the other hand, he describes how Jesus once stung to the quick the

patriotic sentiments of his race. There he represents Him as being expelled from Nazareth for telling the congregation in the synagogue that at Elijah's day many widows in Israel had been left to starve whilst one at Sidon had been miraculously relieved, and that in Elisha's time the many lepers of Israel had been left to perish, whilst Naaman, the Syrian, a mighty foeman, had been miraculously cleansed.²² But this discourse is ascribed to a visit, which, as I have before observed, is the same as the one recorded by Mark²³ and Matthew²⁴, who put it at a later period; say nothing about the provocation or the expulsion, and let Jesus depart in peace, wondering at the unbelief of the people. Further, Mark never mentions either Samaria or its people, and Matthew has only a single reference, that where he makes Jesus tell his apostles not to enter "any city of the Samaritans";²⁵ but, apart from the one in the present parable, Luke has three notices of the kind. From the first of these we learn that the inhabitants of a Samaritan village having refused Jesus their hospitality in the course of His final journey to Jerusalem, the apostles James and John asked Him if they should pray for fire to consume the place; and that Jesus, after rebuking their vengeful spirit, "went on to another village."²⁶ Continuing his account of this journey, Luke describes it as being in part "through the midst of Samaria and Galilee";²⁷ and adds that on the way Jesus healed ten lepers, only one of whom, and he a Samaritan, troubled to thank his benefactor, Who thereupon drew a comparison favourable to "this stranger," and gave him a blessing.²⁸ These attempts to show the interest of Jesus in the Samaritans; and, in the last instance at least, to show the superiority of the Samaritans over the Jews, are not only peculiar to the Gospel of Luke, but also contradictory to that of Matthew. Thus the honour shown in the present parable to the Samaritans in the person of a private man, and the contempt there expressed for the Jews in the person of their religious representatives, is a very strong argument against its authenticity. The only way to solve the difficulty is to suppose that the one who felt compassion and gave relief was not originally described as a native of Samaria; but received this description from Luke, who seems to have had a liking for the Samaritan people.

The word "Samaritan" occurs only once in the parable; and not at all in the context. Here, when Jesus asks, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour to him that fell among robbers?" the lawyer, instead of replying "The Samaritan," replies, "He that showed mercy on him." Still the peculiarity may be explained by the supposed reluctance of the lawyer to use the term "Samaritan" in such a flattering connection; and if this explanation be true the man's avoidance of that term is an artistic touch of no mean order. The history of the text does not, as far as I know, afford the slightest evidence that another term once stood where "Samaritan" now stands; but such an alteration might easily take place whilst the parable existed as part of the oral tradition; to say nothing of the probability that Luke himself made the change when putting the parable into his work. There is evidence that he did not scruple to alter parables, and especially to change the quality of the persons therein described. Thus in the *Entrusted Money* he turns Matthew's "man" into "nobleman"; whilst in the *Rejected Invitations* he turns Matthew's "king" into "man." The suggestion

¹¹ xxi. 23-32.

¹² xiv. 1.

¹³ xxii. 2.

¹⁴ xiv. 43.

¹⁵ viii. 10.

¹⁶ xv. 24.

¹⁷ vii. 6.

¹⁸ x. 5-6.

¹⁹ vii. 27.

²⁰ xv. 26.

²¹ vii. 9.

²² iv. 25.

²³ vi. 1.

²⁴ xii. 54.

²⁵ x. 5.

²⁶ ix. 51-56.

²⁷ xvii. 11.

²⁸ xvii. 12-19.

I would make is, that originally, "publican" and not "Samaritan" was the designation of the kindly wayfarer. All the Synoptists agree that Jesus displayed much sympathy with publicans, but Luke is the only one who makes Him display any sympathy with Samaritans; whilst Matthew, on the contrary, lets Him treat them with disregard. Among other reasons for the change, Luke, who reports the *Pharisee and the Publican*, might wish to avoid repetition; and, therefore, as he could not suppress the publican in that parable, he may have suppressed him in the present one. Moreover, it is a fact that, apparently for the same reason, he sometimes suppresses incidents recorded by his predecessors, the second Feeding of the Multitude being a case in point. Against the term "Samaritan" and for the term "Publican," the following arguments may be adduced. The xenophobia of the Samaritans exceeded even that of the Jews. On returning from abroad they sprinkled themselves with urine;²⁹ and they burned out the footprints of strangers.³⁰ Josephus accuses them of polluting the temple with human bones, and of murdering the Galilean pilgrims.³¹ A gloss in the Fourth Gospel says, "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans";³² "their fruit and their cattle," adds Dr. Brewer, "were pronounced unclean; and all the people were held accursed forever."³³ Hence, in a story conspicuous for its truth-like details it is very strange to find an innkeeper, established on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem, so familiar with a Samaritan, that on receiving from him a small sum in advance, he was ready to trust him for any further expenses incurred by taking care, at his request, of a wounded and penniless man. If "Publican" and not "Samaritan" stood originally in the parable, the anti-national element was still present though much weaker than is now the case. For being either the tax farmers who extorted gain from the fiscal dues of Palestine, sold to them at auction by the Romans, or else the tax-gatherers who were paid to effect that extortion, and permitted to imitate it, the publicans in general incurred contempt because of their connection with the foreign masters of their country. Nevertheless, the Samaritans were held in far greater abhorrence. Descended from heathens who had been brought into the land to take the place of its former inhabitants, the deported Israelites, they had adopted a religion similar to that of the Jews, but regarded by the Jews as heresy. There could hardly have been stronger reasons for hatred between two peoples. The distinguished author of *Ecclesiasticus* says that his heart abhors them "that sit upon the Mountain of Samaria.....and the foolish people that dwell in Sichem."³⁴ In allusion to Cuthah, one of the heathen cities whence the Samaritans arrived, and whence they had a contemptuous designation, it was said, "He that eateth the bread of a Cuthæan is as one that eateth swine's flesh." Thus the Rev. F. Marshall does not seem to exaggerate when he says of the Samaritans that, "the Jews learned to hate them worse than they did the Gentiles";³⁵ and if so, they certainly detested them far more than they did the publicans, who went about freely and worshipped in the temple. All things considered, it would appear that had Jesus referred in such flattering terms to a Samaritan, and contrasted him so much to his advantage with members of the Jewish hierarchy, the Crucifixion would have been ren-

dered unnecessary by the spontaneous action of the listening crowd.

On the other hand the parable may well be authentic, provided that its hero were not described as a Samaritan when it was first spoken.

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

"Gems From Ingersoll."

Address delivered over Radio Station (U.S.A.).

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL was not only America's greatest writer and orator, but he was also one of the grandest men who ever lived. He was not only a soldier, but also a patriot. He was a poet as well as a philosopher, a benefactor and a humanitarian.

He was in the fullest, broadest sense a man among men, a genius among intellectual giants, a mountain standing amidst the hills.

Just before his death, Luther Burbank, of sainted memory, said in a letter to Ingersoll's oldest daughter, Mrs. Eva Ingersoll Brown, "His life and work have been an inspiration to the whole earth, shedding light in the dark places which so sadly needed light."

It was Luther Burbank, if you remember, who requested that Ingersoll's eloquent oration to his brother be read at his burial.

And Mark Twain said of Ingersoll:—

He was a great and beautiful spirit; he was a man—all man—from his crown to his foot soles. My reverence for him was deep and genuine. I prized his affection for me, and I returned it with usury.

And I hold in my hand a letter from humanity's greatest benefactor, who has written me his appreciation of Ingersoll especially to be read to you tonight. He says:—

I think that Ingersoll had all the attributes of a perfect man, and, in my opinion, no finer personality ever existed. Judging from the past, I cannot help thinking that the intention of the Supreme Intelligence that rules the world is to ultimately make such a type of man universal.

The writer of this letter is Thomas A. Edison.

But perhaps the best description of Ingersoll comes from a member of his family. An admiring friend once said to his youngest daughter, Mrs. Maude Ingersoll Probasco, "Your father was a great man," and she impulsively exclaimed: "My father was not a man, he was a God."

It is generally said, however, that Ingersoll was a destructionist, that his philosophy was of a negative character; that he tore down and did not build up.

Never was a grosser misrepresentation ever made of a man and his labour. Only those who are not acquainted with Ingersoll and his works; only those who did not understand his purpose; only those who are ignorant or prejudiced about what he sought to accomplish could make such a statement. For no man had a deeper regard for humanity; no man loved humanity more fervently, no man did more to bring understanding and peace to humanity than this infidel, this unbeliever.

He laboured to abolish war, and was the first to propose an international court to settle disputes between nations. He said, "Every good man, every good woman, should try to do away with war, to stop the appeal to savage force."

Throughout history, the man who has been ahead of his time, the leader, the pioneer, has always been misunderstood, vilified, maligned, and slandered.

The man who has defied convention and proposed

²⁹ Heylin's *Cosmographie* (1665), p. 723.

³⁰ Schlatter's *Israels Geschichte* (1901), p. 133.

³¹ *Ant.* xviii. 2. *Ib.* xx. 6.

³² *iv.* 9.

³⁴ *l.* 26.

³³ *Scripture History*, p. 45.

³⁵ *St. Luke*, p. 42.

new methods for the world to follow has always suffered at the hands of those who did not understand him.

The fighter for human rights and liberty who pays the penalty for his daring, who is heaped with calumny and vilification and branded with the epithet of heretic, infidel, and blasphemer in his own day, is generally remembered by future generations with magnificent monuments in loving memory of his unselfish labours on behalf of mankind.

Ingersoll himself has said, "The infidels of one age are the aureoled saints of the next."

And as it was with Hypatia, Bruno, Servetus, Galileo, Spinoza, Thomas Paine, and Lincoln, so it is with Ingersoll.

Robert G. Ingersoll was a destructionist in the same sense that Columbus was when he destroyed the belief in the flatness of the earth. He was a destroyer in the same sense as the fathers of this Republic were, when they destroyed a despotic monarchical government. He was a destroyer in the same sense that Lincoln was when the great emancipator destroyed the abhorrent institution of slavery.

"The destroyer of weeds and thistles is a benefactor whether he soweth grain or not," said Ingersoll, and he did both.

He destroyed hatred and eradicated prejudice from the human mind. He helped to free the intellect from the superstition of a degrading religion and to emancipate the race from the tyranny of fear.

He also planted seeds; seeds which have taken root, and from which have grown precious fruit.

Here are but a few of the gems of Ingersoll. Let these few gems be an introduction to you to become more familiar with the writings of this man.

Contrary to what is known as Ingersoll's belief, the great Agnostic believed in heaven, and here is his description of it:—

If upon this earth we ever have a glimpse of heaven, it is when we pass a home in winter at night, and through the window, the curtains aside, we see the family about the pleasant hearth; the old lady knitting, the cat playing with the yarn; the children wishing they had as many dolls or dollars or knives or somethings as there are sparks going out to join the roaring blast; the father reading and smoking, and the clouds rising like incense from the altar of domestic joy. I never passed such a house without feeling that I had received a benediction.

How much understanding, happiness, and joy has this gem brought to those of wedded life! And from what volume could better advice be given?

It is not necessary to be great to be happy; it is not necessary to be rich to be just and generous and to have a heart filled with divine affection. No matter whether you are rich or poor, treat your wife as though she were a splendid flower, and she will fill your life with perfume and joy.

And do you know, it is a splendid thing to think that the woman you really love will never grow old to you. Through the wrinkles of time, through the mask of years, if you really love her, you will always see the face you loved and won. And a woman who really loves a man does not see that he grows old; he is not decrepit to her; he does not tremble; he is not old; she always sees the same gallant gentleman who won her hand and heart. I like to think that love is eternal. And to love in that way and then go down the hill of life together, and as you go down, hear, perhaps, the laughter of grandchildren, while the birds of joy and love sing once more in the leafless branches of the tree of age.

And this is what he said of love:—

Love is the only bow on life's dark cloud. It is the morning and evening star. It shines upon the

babe and sheds its radiance on the quiet tomb. It is the mother of art, inspirer of poet, patriot, and philosopher. It is the air and light of every heart, builder of every home, kindler of every fire on every hearth. It was the first to dream of immortality. It fills the world with melody—for music is the voice of love.

Love is the magician, the enchanter, that changes worthless things to joy, and makes right royal kings and queens of common clay. It is the perfume of that wondrous flower, the heart, and without that sacred passion, that divine swoon, we are less than beasts; but with it, earth is heaven, and we are gods.

Ingersoll believed in the "Democracy of the home and the Republicanism of the fireside." He said that "men are oaks, women are vines and children are flowers," and how many men have been made more gentle, and women more tender and children holier by these words?

When your child commits a wrong, take it in your arms; let it feel your heart beat against its heart; let the child know that you really and truly and sincerely love it. Yet some Christians, good Christians, when a child commits a fault, drive it from the door and say: "Never do you darken this house again." Think of that! And then these same people will get down on their knees and ask God to take care of the child they have driven from home. I will never ask God to take care of my children unless I am doing my level best in that same direction.

Call me Atheist, call me infidel, call me what you will, says Ingersoll, I intend so to treat my children, that they can come to my grave and truthfully say: "He who sleeps here never gave us a moment of pain. From his lips, now dust, never came to us an unkind word."

On one occasion, after delivering this excerpt in an address in Washington, a United States Senator sought him and said, "Colonel, you have converted me. For years I have been estranged from my only daughter because she did not marry to please me, but now I shall go to her to-night, and beg her forgiveness for allowing a selfish pride to keep her from my arms and heart!"

And not even Shakespeare has surpassed in poetic beauty and expression this gem:—

The laugh of a child will make the holiest day more sacred still. Strike with hand of fire, O weird musician, thy harp strung with Apollo's golden hair; fill the vast cathedral aisles with symphonies sweet and dim, deft toucher of the organ keys; blow, bugler, blow, until thy silver notes do touch and kiss the moonlit waves, and charm the lovers wandering 'mid the vine-clad hills. But know, your sweetest strains are discords all, compared with childhood's happy laugh—the laugh that fills the eyes with light and every heart with joy. O rippling river of laughter, thou art the blessed boundary line between the beasts and men; and every wayward wave of thine doth drown some fretful fiend of care. O Laughter, rose-lipped daughter of Joy, there are dimples enough in thy cheeks to catch and hold and glorify all the tears of grief.

Many have asked what did Ingersoll believe, did he have no creed? Oh, yes! he did, and this is the way he expressed it:—

THE CREED OF SCIENCE.

To love justice, to long for the right, to love mercy, to pity the suffering, to assist the weak, to forget wrongs and remember benefits—to love the truth, to be sincere, to utter honest words, to love liberty, to wage relentless war against slavery in all its forms, to love wife and child and friend, to make a happy home, to love the beautiful in art, in nature, to cultivate the mind, to be familiar with the mighty thoughts that genius has expressed, the noble deeds of all the world, to cultivate courage

and cheerfulness, to make others happy; to fill life with the splendour of generous acts, the warmth of loving words, to discard error, to destroy prejudice, to receive new truths with gladness, to cultivate hope, to see the calm beyond the storm, the dawn beyond the night, to do the best that can be done and then to be resigned—this is the religion of reason, the creed of science. This satisfies the heart and brain.

Like Shakespeare, it is doubtful whether there will ever live another man to possess Ingersoll's brilliancy of language. His expressions glittered like diamonds and pearls. But it will not be many years more before the heart of humanity will be indelibly impressed with the genius of Robert G. Ingersoll.

JOSEPH LEWIS.

Correspondence.

THE CALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I hope you will extend your interesting paragraph on "The Call" in a recent issue. The Call! What bosh! What a game it is! and threadbare at that, and yet eagerly "swallowed" by a lot of stupid fanatics who will believe anything. Strange, the Lord never calls "Sky pilots from the greater to the less. From the £1,000 a year to the £450. When will seriously-minded people see through such utter clap-trap and humbug?

There was a notorious case some years ago of a man—now a leading divine in Nonconformity, who had his stipend—after strenuous efforts by bazaars, monthly offerings, etc.—made up to, and guaranteed, £450 per annum; upon which he assured his flock that "he was quite satisfied," and that "he was their pledged pastor for life." Three months after, however, he solemnly announced to the faithful that "the Lord had called him elsewhere" to a stipend, as it turned out, at £1,500 a year, and manse. "He would pray a week about it, as to whether or not he should obey the Call." The Sunday following he announced "that, although the wrench would be great, he must obey the Call. The Lord had called him to a higher sphere of work."

What arrant humbug it all is! Again, there are hundreds of men of marked ability, Anglican and Nonconformist, who never *do* get a Call, while the "duds" and donkeys who "picnic" at Convocations and Synods get "the Calls," and get on. G. G. PORTER.

AGNOSTICISM AND ATHEISM.

SIR,—It is evident from "Ephphatha's" "Agnosticism: A Rejoinder," that whatever he may know about Agnosticism, which is not Atheism, he knows nothing whatever about Atheism. It must be quite new to readers of this journal that the great Atheists have not dealt with "philosophic Theism—as expressed by Unitarians, Modernists, Dr. Walter Walsh, Bergson, etc."

I can only ask our good critic to go to *Theism or Atheism?* by Chapman Cohen; *A Plea for Atheism*, by Charles Bradlaugh; *Good Sense*, by Merlier; *The System of Nature*, by D'Holbach (the French edition), and, finally, to the work of a man who for a good part of his life refused to call himself an Atheist—George Jacob Holyoake's *Trial of Theism*. It will be interesting to see how much "Agnosticism" different from "Atheism" "Ephphatha" will have left when he has tried to answer these books. H. CUTNER.

Leave me but the truth, and I will not envy my rivals, their Church, and both the Old and New Testaments.—*Schopenhauer*.

It is better to work for the prevention of miseries than to multiply places of refuge for the miserable.—*Diderot*.

Mr. G. Whitehead's Mission.

Mr. G. Whitehead writes: "The seven meetings addressed at Nelson were the most enthusiastic and successful I have been connected with at this town. Good collections, innumerable questions, and several platform opponents testified to the interest displayed. In addition, the crowds remained after the meetings were over, sometimes till one o'clock in the morning, discussing the points raised." A new recruit, Mr. J. Clayton, has undertaken to address weekly meetings, which should have an inspiring effect on the district. Mr. Whitehead will be in Bolton from August 16 to August 29.

E. M. V.

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.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 6.15, Mr. R. H. Rosetti, 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. H. B. Samuels, a Lecture.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 3, Mr. H. Constable, a Lecture; 6, Mr. E. Saphin, a Lecture.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY.—Ramble to The Chilterns. Conducted by Mr. Brooks. Train Baker Street 9.58 a.m. Cheap return Amersham, 2s. 11d. Tea at Chesham Bois.

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

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

BLACKBURN.—Mr. G. Whitehead's Mission, August 9 to 15.

BOLTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Town Hall Steps): Friday, August 20, and Sunday, August 22, at 7.30, Messrs. Partington and Sisson will speak.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Branch of the N.S.S.).—Ramble to Picketlaw. Leader, Mr. W. H. MacEwan. Meet at Clarkston at 12 noon. (Via yellow car "4 D" to Clarkston. Join car at Charing Cross, Jamaica Street, or Bglington Toll.)

LEEDS BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Square): 7.30, Mr. I. Davis, "The Reason for Freethought."

THE BEST WAY to come to truth being to examine things as they are, your response is of course a certainty. The claim that we can serve you better and at less cost you can effectively examine by writing now 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 104s. 6d.; or Ladies' Fashion and Pattern Book, costumes from 60s., coats from 48s.*—MACCONNELL & MABE, New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

"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.

WANTED, *Crimes of Christianity, Bible Heroes*, and other works by G. W. Foote; price and condition to M., c/o Freethinker Office, 61 Farringdon Street, 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

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING.

By **CHAPMAN COHEN.**

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

Cloth Gilt, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

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.

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

A GRAMMAR OF FREETHOUGHT.

By **CHAPMAN COHEN.**

(*Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.*)

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

Cloth Bound, with tasteful Cover Design. Price 5s., postage 3½d.

A Book for all.

SEXUAL HEALTH AND BIRTH CONTROL.

By **ETTIE A. ROUT.**

With Foreword by Sir Bryan Donkin, M.D.
Price 1s., postage 1d.

The Egyptian Origin of Christianity.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS AND MYTHICAL CHRIST.

By **GERALD MASSEY.**

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

Price 6d., postage 1d.

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANISM.

By **BISHOP W. MONTGOMERY BROWN, D.D.**

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

Price 1s., post free.

Special terms for quantities.

PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS.—Continued.

THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH.

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

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

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

WHAT IS MORALITY?

By GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

A Careful Examination of the Basis of Morals from the Standpoint of Evolution.

Price 4d., postage 1d.

HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

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

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

Price 3s. 6d., postage 4½d.

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.

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.

RELIGION AND SEX.

Studies in the Pathology of Religious Development.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price 6s., postage 6d.

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.

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

THE FOURTH AGE

BY

WILLIAM REPTON

A Psychological Study of War-time, dedicated to the living few who do not consult newspapers for ready-made opinions, and the noble dead who are now beyond reach of politician's promises, editorial lies, and the patronage of the priest.

Price ONE SHILLING

(Postage 1d.)

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

For Commercial and General

PRINTING

J. S. REYNOLDS, Ripley, DERBY

(Rationalist)

Telephone: 106.

Personal Attention to all Orders and Enquiries. Modern Machinery. Up-to-date Type Faces. Experienced Workmen.

PIONEER LEAFLETS.

WHAT WILL YOU PUT IN ITS PLACE? By CHAPMAN COHEN.

WHAT IS THE USE OF THE CLERGY? By CHAPMAN COHEN.

PECULIAR CHRISTIANS. By CHAPMAN COHEN.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By A. D. McLAREN.

DOES GOD CARE? By W. MANN.

DO YOU WANT THE TRUTH?

Price 1s. 6d. per 100, postage 3d.

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. FOOTER AND CO., LTD.), 61 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.