

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. 40

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1926

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>A Census of Belief.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	609
<i>"The Unfailing Christ."—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - - - -	611
<i>A Search for Truth.—Minnermus</i> - - - - -	612
<i>The Story of Evolution.—E. Anderson</i> - - - - -	613
<i>The March of Materialism.—W. Mann</i> - - - - -	618
<i>A Lonely Gleam.—Andrew Millar</i> - - - - -	619
<i>The Jungle.—W. J. Lamb</i> - - - - -	620
<i>Some Real and Alleged Atheists.—J. M. Wheeler</i> - - - - -	620
<i>Society News</i> - - - - -	622

Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, etc.

Views and Opinions.

(Concluded from page 595.)

A Census of Belief.

It is not what a man believes, but *why* he believes that is of importance to the world. Of course, if a man believes the right thing and acts on it he will go on definite lines, just as a train will run along a set path so long as it keeps the rails. But that is as much as may be said. No new path will be found, no better truth will be discovered. It is for this reason that it is of paramount importance to know on what grounds a man bases his belief, whether that belief, as a matter of fact, be either right or wrong. And it would have been of paramount interest to know just what reasons induced the readers of the *Nation* and the *Daily News* to reply, Yes or No to the questions asked. One would probably have discovered that in very many cases no real belief existed, but only assent to a mere verbal formula. For it is quite impossible for a man to believe a thing that he does not understand. In every case his belief can only extend so far as his understanding of the proposition before him, and the profession of belief is rightly made when the state of mind falls short of complete proof. A man simply cannot believe where understanding is absent, and in every case of religious profession, there is either a rationalizing of the formula in such a way as to make the terms cover an understandable proposition or there is a mere sign of assent which means no more than the absence of a rejection. But for the mind to be active in any direction, for or against, implies understanding. That should be plain to anyone who spends a few minutes considering the nature of mental processes.

Reticence and Religion.

The *Church Times* says that a serious objection to the taking of a plebiscite on religious belief is that "English people who are really religious are often reticent on the subject.....The persons who would fill it up would be, in general, those whose opinions, on either side, were least seriously held." If that be true, then there are fewer really religious people about than we were inclined to believe. For our experience is that people are not really reticent about religion, but are quite aggressive. The very religious

person will bring his religion before you at all times and at all places, and make quite a nuisance of himself. He will pray at you, and he will insist on the law taking notice of his religion; that is, if he be a Christian, he will thrust tracts on you, hold up the traffic for a religious procession, insist on saying grace at a public dinner, regardless of the beliefs of other people, and in a thousand and one ways keep the fact that he is religious always before you. That is the case, so long as he believes. A Christian who has a genuine conviction of the truth of his religion cannot help making a public nuisance of himself, because his religion is the one thing that matters, and the egotism engendered by Christian belief prevents his fully realizing that there are actually other people in the world. The *Church Times* can hardly claim that a religion which spends about four millions annually on Foreign Missions, and conducts a large number of missions at home, is a religion the believers in which do not like to talk about it. The *Church Times* is not, consciously, a humorous journal, or one might imagine it was poking fun at its fellow believers. It does really believe what it says, and when one looks at the things in which it believes that seems a very hard thing to say about it.

Hiding the Truth. * * *

The statement that people are disinclined to talk about their religion must be read in the light of the fact that the figures—small as they were in relation to the whole of the population, showed so large a proportion of men and women who definitely rejected the Christian religion, and even fundamental religious beliefs. Had the figures shown very few unbelievers one cannot help concluding that they would have been hailed as proof of the strong hold the Christian religion had upon the people. But, in any case, it simply is not correct to argue that really religious people are reticent. That is not the case in any part of the world. Where the belief is genuine and sincere and general, there is no hesitation whatever in publicly proclaiming it. Religious ceremonies do, as a matter of fact, in most cases, begin as public or social professions. The ceremonies are performed in public, not in private. The Mohammedan will take to his prayers wherever he is when the time for prayer arrives—so long as he is with a Mohammedan community. The Christians of a few generations ago showed little hesitation in talking about their religion, and in Scotland, when Scottish piety was untouched, men spoke publicly of God as familiarly as though they were speaking of a local rate collector. It is when men and women begin to be doubtful of the veracity of their beliefs that they show a disinclination to discuss them. Not alone are they likely to be faced with a direct challenge from those who do not believe, but there is a half-conscious shrinking from bringing their beliefs definitely and openly in contrast with the facts of experience and of actual knowledge. Where a man is confident of the truth of what he believes, there is never a disinclination to avow it. It is where the belief is weak, accom-

panied with a fear of having it definitely disproved, that the opposite course is followed.

* * *

Brotherhood and Religion.

There are two reasons why people are reticent about their opinion concerning religion. First of all, it is not "good form" to discuss religion, because it is universally recognized to be the one thing that breeds bad feeling, and so destroys the possibility of friendly intercourse. All over the country it is an almost universal rule that while politics, or art, or science, or literature may be the subject of general conversation, religion must be taboo. Once that is introduced, bad feeling develops. There is nothing like a discussion on the value of Christian brotherhood to make the believer in it wish to hang, or imprison, or ill-use the "other fellow." And the more he is filled with it the greater his vindictiveness. Hence the general rule, and the more Christian those in control are, the more strongly they insist on the enforcement of the rule. It is idle to pretend that this is because religion is too sacred a subject for discussion. The great Christian writers of the past have all been great controversialists, many of them are so still, although they are not so ready as they once were to discuss with non-Christians. But while the unbeliever was a somewhat rare phenomenon, the fact of being on ill-terms with him did not matter very much. It was when unbelievers became numerous, and could be found in every association, that the danger of discussing religion was made plain. The danger did not, of course, come from the side of the Freethinker, it was entirely due to the Christian. He simply could not maintain friendly relations with a man who did not believe. It is Christian brotherhood that threatens the maintenance of friendly relations on the minor scale of club or association, as it has so frequently ruptured them on the major one of social life. In spite of theory, hard facts drive Christians to acknowledge that their religion is the one Christians cannot differ on and yet behave decently to one another.

* * *

Whoso Would be a Man—

The other consideration which makes many people disinclined to state their real opinions on religion has already been touched upon, but it is worthy of another word or two. When we find a man in the position of Sir William Gregory, the editor of a scientific magazine such as *Nature*, laying it down as almost indisputable that no one should be permitted to bring his disbelief in immortality before the notice of others, we have a perversion of intellectual rectitude difficult to conceive in a man in his position. But the hideous fact is that it is the working rule of a very large number of our public men, and Sir William was only stating what is very generally acted upon. We imagine that no thoughtful person can read the elaborate, sometimes painfully elaborate, attempts of many of our public men either to explain with what deep regret and with how much pain they gave up orthodox Christianity, or to hide their actual Atheism under some term which lead religious people to believe that they have some kind of religion left, without feeling that they are not giving the public their real convictions, but only a rationalized form of them. Of course, for this Christainity is responsible. It has made truth speaking such a costly luxury that it has affected the moral courage of most, and the practice has become so general that public men apparently feel no shame in truckling to the more ignorant section of the community in these matters. But it is quite certain that so long as this

type of mind exists an enquiry as to what religious belief prevails is bound to be inconclusive; first, because many are too timid to reply; and, second, because those who do reply will not state their real beliefs. All we shall get will be a reply that will not too seriously offend Christians. And we venture to say that if the *Daily News* and the *Nation* had promised to print the names and addresses of those who replied, the number would have been cut down considerably. The promise of secrecy made by the papers is evidence that Christians still have power to make it impossible for large numbers to speak openly and truthfully about religion. That is indeed the crowning triumph of Christianity. It has made it safer for a man to be an hypocrite than to be straightforward.

* * *

Opinion and the Vote.

We quite agree with the *Christian World* that the truth of creeds cannot be settled on the basis of a majority vote. That is a rule it is more important to observe in these days of a universal vote than in previous times. In the world of opinion majorities and minorities have—or should have—no existence. Yet it is to the majority vote that Christians appeal for the maintenance of their power and privileges. What is it but a majority vote that maintains so much of the orthodox Christian Sunday as now exists? What else but a majority vote keeps religion in the schools, relieves church and chapel from payment of their just share of public taxation, and also perpetuates many legal and other privileges? The only ground for these things is that Christians are in the majority, and insist upon the maintenance of a particular set of privileges because of a majority. So that while, when the returns are unfavourable to the claims of Christianity, it is urged that you cannot settle opinions on the basis of a majority vote, when it is a question of receiving State aid or of receiving certain State favours, the fact that the opinion so supported is that of a majority is amply sufficient. If the *Christian World* were consistent, and really believed in what it says, it would stand for the complete independence of the Christian opinion from all sorts of State support, and leave it entirely to the individual to maintain it in whatever form he thought fit. Still, it is something to get a Christian to state a sound principle, even if one cannot expect him to act up to it. Where the interests of religion are concerned, principles are apt to have but little weight.

* * *

The Doom of the Gods.

The one thing that emerges from this enquiry is the growth of unbelief. In spite of all the pulpit talk about a revival of religion here and there, in spite of the empty verbiage about man's craving for religion, that much is evident. And it is not merely a growth of unbelief in Christianity, but in the fundamentals of religious belief. Little more than a century ago it was not so much a question of the rejection of the belief in immortality and a God, as of some other conception of God and a future life against that supplied by the Christian religion. A century has seen orthodox Christian belief practically banished from educated circles, and left to the Salvation Army, the more ignorant forms of Nonconformity, and the highly superstitious sections of the Church of England. The fight is rapidly becoming a fight of fundamental beliefs. And all this has been gained by a body of men and women fighting against the most powerfully organized form of superstition the world has ever seen. We have made the majority of educated Christians ashamed of their inherited religion. True, on the other hand, they still retain

enough power to prevent many who do not believe from openly avowing it. But freedom from this form of coercion will come. Just as Freethought has managed to give the people a freer Sunday, freedom from the terrorism of orthodox Christian teachings about hell and a future life, just as it has made some of the more elementary truths of the origin of religion common property, so it will one day make it possible for men and women, in public life and out of it, to say openly and plainly where they stand. And when that day comes there will be such an exodus from the Christian Churches as has not been seen from any other religion. The age of compromise is passing.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

"The Unfailing Christ."

THE Rev. H. J. Cody, M.A., D.D., LL.D., rector of St. Paul's Church, Toronto, Canada, preached in Geneva Cathedral on September 12, in connection with the meetings of the League of Nations. His text was Isaiah xlii. 4: "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth." The first sentence in the sermon, which appeared in the *Christian World Pulpit* of September 23, is as follows: Our hope, amid the present stress of things and the occasional godless aspect of the world, is built on the Enthroned Christ, who neither fails nor is discouraged till he has caused his will to be freely done in earth as it is done in heaven." Clearly Dr. Cody's optimism is boundless and rests solely on hope. Of course, there is nothing but hope on which it can rest. All the facts of history emphatically discredit Christian optimism. Evidently realizing this, Dr. Cody says:—

We do need fresh cheer and confidence. Since the war there have been tendencies not a few to disillusionment, disappointment, and discouragement. We have at times lost nerve, if not faith. Some have become cynical and have roundly asserted that nothing was settled by the long struggle, and that the whole effort was in vain.

This is not the time to discuss what the war did or did not accomplish for the good of mankind, but in view of the passage just quoted from the discourse under review, it is interesting to recall what the parsons assured us, before it came to an end, it would most certainly bring about, namely, the suppression of all anti-Christian movements, and the complete triumph of the Christian Faith. They used to exclaim, with great fervour: "Behold, the nation has come back to God, and is humbly on its knees." Such wicked journals as the *Literary Guide* and the *Freethinker* would no longer be tolerated. All the people would be wholehearted Christians. It was less than ten years ago that such glowing predictions were so confidently and enthusiastically indulged in, and yet Dr. Cody tells us to-day that religion is at a serious discount, and that evil tendencies are at work everywhere. As a matter of fact, the Christian religion was never at a lower ebb than it is at the present time. The masses of the people stubbornly decline to have anything at all to do with it. Many of them have tried it and found it wanting.

Few clergymen realize how profoundly indifferent to religion the majority of mankind really are. They have lost faith in its reality. The supernatural has no existence for them. Churches and chapels are deserted simply because they stand for nothing of vital importance in the estimation of the crowd, and partly because their services are, in many instances, conducted by woefully incompetent persons. Dr. Cody speaks of international problems of immense

difficulty and complexity with which the League of Nations has to deal, and the solution of which is impossible without Divine guidance; but he forgets that the League is not a Christian institution, and that some of the delegates may have no religion at all. Therefore, we see how futile on his part it was to say: "To strengthen us for the high task of winning world peace and co-operation, we need nothing less than a Divine reinforcement. Such we receive by the Spirit of him who fails not nor is discouraged."

Let us come to solid facts. Has anything ever been accomplished in this world which transcended man's ability to achieve? This is a most vital question, and no affirmative answer is permissible unless it is supported by some indisputable occurrences. A man once claimed at a meeting in Hyde Park that he had been supernaturally born again, but those who knew him intimately declared that he never showed the slightest evidence in his life that he had undergone such a miracle. What is true of individuals is equally true of nations. There are several well known sayings which illustrate the truth of the contention that God is a purely mythical being, such as "God helps those who help themselves," which implies that the actuality of Divine help cannot possibly be demonstrated. Another significant adage is, "God sides with the strongest," which he never fails to do, if he does anything at all. The great Napoleon exclaimed, "The good God is always on the side of big battalions," which is only a polite way of saying that such a being does not exist. Now we return to Dr. Cody's sermon and its utterly absurd statements about Christ's triumphant activity in the world. The preacher says:—

His triumphant goal is by faith already reached. "Till he have set judgment in the earth." Some day this enthronement will be complete and all men will know it. Judgment, justice, righteousness, truth, goodwill, shall be established in the earth. *Deus vult*. This is our hope and our challenge. Christ the perfect servant of the Lord has already changed the history of the world.....He has given us the power which will change men's hearts and energize their wills. He has set in our sky a star of hope for this world and for that which is to come.

Surely a more fantastic passage was never written. What on earth are we to understand by the assertion that Christ's "triumphant goal is by faith already reached?" No goal has ever been or ever can be reached by faith. Such a feat is infinitely beyond human performance. Equally absurd is the claim that "Christ has already changed the history of the world." On ecclesiastical authority we are informed that the tenth Christian century was the very worst, most wicked period in the history of the world. If Christianity exerted any influence over the first ten centuries it inevitably follows that it changed them decidedly for the worse. That is true of the Church in the whole period of its ascendancy. Of course, we know that Christ has had absolutely nothing to do with the history of the world, for, if he ever lived at all, Matthew Arnold's beautiful lines have been true of him from the start:—

He is dead! Far hence he lies
In the lorn Syrian town,
And on his grave, with shining eyes,
The Syrian stars look down.

Of course, we do not forget that Dr. Cody is a Christian minister, and that his profession compels him to think and speak well of his Lord and Master; but even his profession does not entitle him to distort history. We have read several histories of the Church by Italian, German, and English scholars, and we wish to call special attention to those by Dean Milman and Philip Schaff. Now our contention is that no honest man can read those works and

say that he feels proud of the Church. We have already referred to its woefully corrupt condition in the tenth century, but, alas! it never was anything like thoroughly purified in any subsequent period. A few popes were good men, governed by noble aims and sublime ideals; but many were the slaves of carnal lust and wicked motives. Take John XXIII., against whom an indictment was drawn up, in which he was painted as "wicked, irreverent, unchaste, a liar, disobedient, and infected with many vices." Yet he sat on the papal throne, though known to be an "oppressor of the poor, persecutor of justice, pillar of the wicked, statue of the Simoniacs, addicted to magic, the dregs of vice..... a mirror of infamy, a profound inventor of every kind of wickedness." Or take Pope Alexander VI., than whom a worse man never lived. He practised vice openly and became a criminal of the deepest dye. Some popes were acknowledged unbelievers. Leo X. possessed many excellent attributes of character, but entirely lacked religious knowledge and piety. Enough has been said to show that numerous popes were anything but paragons of truth and virtue, and the Church under them could not have been the home of holiness and moral splendour. To what conclusion do the facts as we know them drive us? To the only possible inference that the Christ of the Church is a myth of its own creation, or that as the Redeemer of the human race he has been the most colossal failure on record.

J. T. LLOYD.

A Search for Truth.

The mind hath its hundred gates.—Landor.

We are upon earth to learn what can be learnt upon earth, and not to speculate on what can never be.—Landor.

WHEN Mark Twain met Rudyard Kipling, the meeting was a memorable one. Recording his experiences afterwards, Twain said: "We two are remarkable persons. Between us we cover the whole of knowledge. Kipling knows everything and I know nothing." Curiously, I find myself in the same modest position as Mark Twain. Not that I have met a celebrity; but I have, in my innocence, lapped knowledge in unwonted places. I have been reading the publications of the Catholic Truth Society, the pamphlets issued by Mr. Kensit, of the Protestant Ditto Ditto, and also the leaflets of the Christian Evidence Society.

Everything connected with Truth, philosophers tell us, should be innocent and good, like Mary's little lamb in the poem. Yet, after reading these unhappy publications, a decent citizen can only tolerate them with something almost approaching fortitude. For the writers of these little booklets all claim to know Truth, or at least to have a nodding acquaintanceship, yet they give the lie direct to each other. One shouts of an infallible Church; another bawls of an infallible Book; and the third prattles prettily of a scientific basis for belief; and they call one another very nasty names.

As to truth, however, we are told, it should be in its essence and quiddity, its pure state. One and Indivisible, like the First Republic of 1792, or the three quaint persons of the Christian Trinity. The famous scholar, Professor Cudworth, gives it as his opinion that "Truth is the most unbending and uncompliant, the most immutable and adamant thing in the world." Yet hard-headed County Court judges have been known to say that people bend the truth in no uncertain fashion when gold is their

object, and that this distressing habit is only limited by the shutting up of the Courts.

It is said that Christian evangelists are wont to chortle of "gospel truth," but, as a rule, these persons are quite untrammelled with any acquaintance with philosophical subjects. Highbrows, such as psycho-analysts, who would sniff at anything so crude and juvenile as "gospel truth," speak glibly of objective truth, subjective truth, complex truth, contingent truth, secondary truth, formal truth, and even, transcendental truth. The religious pamphleteers, be it remembered, add to this "Catholic" truth, "Protestant" truth, and other pleasing sectarian brands. It is enough to make the learned Mr. Cudworth turn in his coffin, for the forgiving list is anything but "adamantine" and "unbending." And in some way it seems to contradict the clerical pretension that pure, unadulterated Truth is the first drink of young curates and the last tippie of aged Archbishops and Bishops.

Although not mentioned in the foregoing list, I, in my innocence, rather like what is called "sterilized" truth, or truth which is not over-proof, but watered down to ordinary and average intelligence. There is no bluff here concerning the pure, absolute article, for it is relative only, and always contingent upon something else. This is an excellent, serviceable article, warranted to wear well and to keep its colour. Its qualities can be vouched for by men like Sir Oliver Lodge, thousands of clergymen, and by many tame Labour leaders. For instance such a man will declare the Genesis story of creation to be a pretty bedtime story for adults, or that two and two make five, or black is often white, as it may be when you have been to a club meeting. When challenged to explain his position more fully the speaker says the truth of his remark may not be absolute, but is contingent on something else. If you follow the red-herring you are asked to read the context, which generally means a book on another subject. If you decline to be made a fool of, the debate is off! And if you are wise, so are you.

You must not put me down as an absolute ignoramus. Of course, I have heard of "Absolute truth," the pure unadulterated article. Since a boy I have always had a yearning impulse to go out and look for it; but life is short and boyhood's dreams do not last for ever. The yearning has been real enough, too, just as a South Sea Islander might, after talks with a European, think that skating on ice was a pleasant pastime. I have even read books on the subject, such as *Lessons on Truth*, written by haughty, cultured Americans in a style in which no one could ever tell the truth, even by chance. Indeed, my numerous Christian friends tell me that I have read about it, dreamed about it; talked about it; done everything except find it.

Being of a retiring nature, I fear that I shall never find Absolute Truth. There are two (or more) sides to almost every question. As the ancestral motto of one of the olive-skinned, reigning houses of India plaintively expresses it: "Even the crocodile is good to its own family." The bare, blunt fact is sudden changes are not popular and that stands in the way of Truth. The outcry that greets every great innovation is partly due to imaginative ignorance, and partly to the effect of custom, which makes cowards of so many. A certain and numerous type of person does not want to see upsetting changes and earnestly hopes that the talk about them is all moonshine. If Jack Jones is to be president of a British Republic, let it be later rather than sooner. And to some extent quite a lot of people are like that in England. Nearly everybody is conservative in his habits and would like to regard the routine of existence as fixed

for their lives. "After us, the deluge," as the Old Turks used to say. Moreover, in spite of all that has been achieved by science, so many people are a little stupid and unimaginative. They mistrust innovations merely because they have no experience of them. They disbelieve in the New merely because it is so different to the Old. The only hope of the future is with the young people, and they must be first freed from the trammels of the priests, who thrive on ancient ignorance.

We were, I think, discussing Truth, temperately, reasonably, and, I hope, agreeably to the principles of the famous Dr. Pangloss, that this is the best of all possible worlds. I do not believe that the notorious College of Cardinals, or the members of the more respectable Convocation of Canterbury, know less about this subject than I do. And now at dinner parties, when faces are flushed and many words are exchanged by men and women who take different sides on the great question of Absolute Truth, I am compelled to sit mute and mortified. To avoid apoplexy afterwards, I take refuge in the smoke of a "Reina Putrida," a thing of beauty, made of cork-lino and brown paper, with a highly-coloured portrait of the late-lamented Marie Lloyd upon the box-lid.

MIMNERMUS.

The Story of Evolution.

II.

(Concluded from page 604.)

THE ORIGIN OF THE NATIONS.

WE must go back into the past some three million years to find an animal, definitely distinct from any other, which first had a form approaching that of mankind. It was in the tertiary, or third of the four periods into which the age of the earth is divided.

During this period the climate was warm, but not so hot as it had been, and many large animals, including the pterodactyl, had become extinct. In the first part of this period, the Eocene (first new forms), which lasted 1,250,000 years, the immense deposits known as London clay, were being laid down by big rivers. The coal seams had sunk into the ground, and crocodiles, tortoises, a few birds and a tree-living animal—the lemur family—fed upon the vegetation. The lemur appears to be in the line of mammal descent.

In the second part of the Tertiary period—the Miocene (less new forms)—lasting about one million years, we find besides the older animals, many new mammals: gibbon, chimpanzee, mesohippus (horse), and, it is assumed, the precursor of mankind. This would be an ape-like animal walking nearly upright, covered with hair, teeth sharp and long. By climbing about among the trees the paws have developed into hands and the arms become long and muscular. Dr. Haeckel gives him the name of Alalus. He is a terror to all other animals and does not hesitate to attack them when searching for food or on the slightest provocation. He moves about the forest in company of numbers of his fellows of both sexes and all ages, and the female is even more ferocious than the male, especially in defence of her young offspring. They eat fruit and roots, digging the latter up with feet and fingers, which are furnished with strong nails, and sleep huddled together for warmth among the undergrowth or on the branches of large trees.

For another 750,000 years—during the third part of the Tertiary period or Pliocene (more new forms)—development went on and some change

occurred in the skeleton, facial expression, and other characteristics of the Alalus, until he became less arboreal, or tree-living.

A great advance was made in the succeeding ages. This was in the first part, called the Pleistocene (most new forms), of the Quaternary or fourth period of the earth's age. The conditions on the surface of the earth changed extensively, for there was a great spread of cold which covered a large part of the northern hemisphere. We have not yet discovered the causes which produced the change in temperature, though some think they must have been astronomical or a shifting of the poles of the earth. It appears that there were several glacial periods with warm intervals, although the Rev. H. B. Hutchinson in his *Prehistoric Man*, writes:—

It is clear that we must give up the idea of a great ice sheet having buried up the whole country except a few of the highest peaks. And, instead, we must think of the so-called ice age as a period of local and more or less coalescent glaciers.

Whatever the cause or the exact conditions, it is clear that the effect was some shortage of food in certain districts, forests were destroyed and their denizens starved, or driven into the open. These individuals of the human race, which had now definitely evolved, who had longer legs, were naturally better equipped for running over the ground, and such would have a better opportunity to catch some animals for food, or escape from danger. This resulted in a quite new type of mankind. From a fruit and root diet he became a flesh-eating animal, and a great idea grew in the mind when he discovered that a large stone, held in the hand, assisted to kill the quarry which he chased through the lands to its lair. He became the Paleolithic (early stone) man, still living together in hordes, hunting in bands, feasting together on an equality, learning in the course of 500,000 years to chip flints into daggers and knives, and using the chips to scrape the skins of animals to form rude shelters, or cloaks, as protection from the wind.

It must not be supposed that improvement took place simultaneously over the world. Changes would occur in the habits of one horde or at one place while others made no advance. In some places the bands would die out from the unhappy circumstances. Even in historical time some hordes of "early stone" men were in Europe, as we read in the writings of the Latin historian, Tacitus, who was born in the reign of Nero. He gives the following picture of the Finnish tribes in his time:—

They are woefully savage and miserably poor. Neither arms nor homes have they; their clothing is skins; their bed the earth. Their arrows, for want of iron, are tipped with bone.....heedless of men, heedless of gods, they have attained that hardest of results, the not having so much as a wish.

The second part of the Quaternary Period is called the Prehistoric, and covers 250,000 years up to about 20,000 years ago. The principal changes in mankind during this period were a more upright carriage, an increase in the size and shape of the head and brain, and the loss of hair upon the body. He is the Neolithic, or new stone, man. His principal activities were improvements in weapons and tools, polishing flints and other stones to a sharp edge, fixing them to wooden handles as axes and spears, making domestic articles such as bone needles, sewing skins together, discovering the production of fire, building temporary huts, taming dogs, cattle and sheep, and forming tribes which roamed about, hunting, and occasionally fighting other tribes. The deposit known as Raised Beaches and Peat were being produced in this period

and quantities of relics of these tribes are found buried in them.

Hordes of Neolithic man spread over the world and in comparative late times settled in particular districts, making occasional raids into surrounding tracts. Tribes were formed with priest-chiefs and families collected within the tribes. These families were clusters of children owning the same mother, fathers not being recognized for many ages. The woman was the head of each family, and the men occupied nearly all their time in hunting and fighting. The ultimate stage was the commencement of cultivation. This enabled progress to be made in many ways to add to the comfort of the individuals. Homes were formed, burial places prepared, crops of millet harvested in skins dressed for clothing. Ornaments added to the pleasure of life and civilization was within view. To the flocks and herds were added goats, asses, pigs, and the domestic fowl. Finally horses were tamed in a few places and gave unconquerable power to the tribes who had them.

Now came the Historic Period, in which is included the earliest written records of early tribes. By joining together, a number of tribes formed the first nations, and among them new discoveries enabled armed bands to overcome less advanced communities. The Bronze Age dawned, cave-dwelling gave place to lake-dwelling and fresh-water fish varied the diet of beef, mutton, and other flesh and cereals:—

M. Troyon, a former writer on the lake dwellings, believed that the Bronze Age in Switzerland was inaugurated by a new race, who came and conquered the old Neolithic people, but this conclusion is not generally accepted. Dr. Keller thinks that the change took place gradually and peacefully, and that the same race continued on through the Bronze Age into the beginning of the Iron Age. It is possible, however, as Professor Virchow thinks, that during the Bronze Age the original Lake Dwellers were joined by, and mixed with, a new race without any violent transition. Dr. Munro suggests that the original founders of the lake dwellings in Central Europe were part of the first Neolithic immigrants who entered the country by the regions surrounding the Black Sea and the shore of the Mediterranean, and spread westward along the Danube and its tributaries till they reached the great central lakes of Switzerland, where they established their settlements. Remains of lake dwellings have been noted by travellers in Asia Minor (Rev. H. B. Hutchinson, *Prehistoric Man and Beast*).

The variations in the several sections of the human race are so extreme that it appears impossible for all to have branched from one stem, or root, and that the environment produced the differences. Dr. J. Deniker states in *Races of Man*:—

Negroes are not black because they inhabit tropical countries, seeing that the natives of South America, who live in the same latitudes, are yellow; the Norwegians and Great Russians, who are fair and tall, live side by side with the Laplanders and Samoyeds, who are dark and of very low stature.

Other writers have shown differences which cannot be bridged by ordinary rules. We may say, therefore, that there were at least four stems: White, Yellow, Nigrito, and Brown-skinned, races. At the present time none of the sections are pure-blooded, for intermixture has been going on for ages, but some individuals in all sections carry the original traits, in a more or less distinguishable way, and, from these, indisputable conclusions may be drawn.

E. ANDERSON.

The reward of a thing rightly done is to have done it.—*Seneca*.

Acid Drops.

We are indebted to the *Methodist Recorder* for the following passages from an interview with the Secretary of the Methodist Episcopalian Mission Board, New York:

The Constitution governing Mexico was adopted in 1917. It extended and further developed the reform laws initiated by Benito Juarez between 1857 and 1859, at which time the Church and State were formally but never really separated. The new regulations affecting the Church and the ministry are very interesting, and have their roots deeply set in the Roman Catholic and Spanish dominance of the New World. For three hundred years Spain dominated Mexico and for three hundred and fifty years the Church was one with the State. During this time, by her own testimony, she acquired half of Mexican real estate values, and was responsible for the whole educational system which resulted, up to 1859, in no less than one per cent. of the population being able to read and write. Throughout all her history the Roman Church sided with the foreign imperial power, the Roman hierarchy was the aristocracy and the force of reaction.

It is quite evident from this and other sources of information that either the State had to submit to being strangled by the Church or it had to curb the power of the Church. This is the alternative that every country in the world has had to face sooner or later wherever the Christian Church has been allowed to interfere in secular matters.

We should dearly like to hear the opinion of Calvin and Luther, and other "good" shades doing the harp-twangling stunt in heaven, in regard to the following explanation from a pious editor. A fearful and perplexed reader was seeking certain vital information. The editor replied that in Christ's time, the names "Satan," "devil," and "evil one" were associated with temptation; but this does not necessarily mean that there is a "personal devil." The Jews used a more pictorial manner of speech than we do. The wisest thing for Christians to do is to concentrate on the fact of evil, and not to worry about its source. Christ used the terms figuratively. The ingenious explainer adds that a belief in a personal devil is by no means a necessary part of the Christian faith; evil exists, and will in the end be overcome by God's power.

If all this is true, then the Lord must have been wilfully deceiving the early fathers of the Church, and also many millions of Christians for nineteen hundred years. For all these earlier Christians were given to understand that there was such a thing as a personal devil, and that the statements of Biblical writers were to be taken literally. We hope the pious enquirer was not of a nasty sceptical turn of mind. Should he have been so, he might have said to himself, if evil exists and there is no personal devil who could have created it, then the Lord God must have been the culprit. And if God created evil, what possible sense is there in this talk about evil's being in the end overcome by God's power?

Over 16,000 persons have already signed a petition to the Surrey County Council asking for the opening of cinemas on Sunday in Wimbledon. This is a painful fact to record. It reveals so plainly the depth of depravity to which the citizens of Wimbledon have fallen. We hope the "Lord's Dayers" won't worry over it too much. The Lord will give the sinners more amusement than they will like, when they take their exit from this wicked world and queue up in the Celestial Palace of reformatory entertainment.

Our contemporary, *Punch*, has signed the pledge. It intends to take in no more advertisements for alcoholic liquors. We hope it will not turn pious as well as teetotal. For that would mean it had parted with its sense of humour, and henceforth would no longer be a

first-class smiter of cant, pretention, and hypocrisy. In regard to these commodities, we can assure our humorous friend that it will always be able to discover plenty of these to need smiting, while a large portion of the nation remains religious. For there is something about Christianity that never fails to attract a certain unlovely type of character.

General Booth told an Albert Hall gathering that the "Army" was setting before a vast number of young people a high ideal. All we will say to that is: What a pity it is that the inculcating of a high ideal requires such a vast amount of bawling and screeching and ranting about "blood!" We are glad the ideal isn't higher. If it were, the Salvationists might consider a double amount of noise was necessary and Sabbath peace is disturbed quite enough already.

The *New Age* takes Miss Christabel Pankhurst to task for wasting her talent on other world matters to the neglect of this world. The powers that hold men slaves will never object to multitudes of individuals like Miss Pankhurst who make a diversion of the "second coming," and no nonsense is too absurd so long as the flavour of piety does not disturb established interests and cause men and women to think. Our contemporary discovers that religious reformers ignore the solution of human problems; we feel sure the *New Age* is sufficiently aware that the bulk of organized religions are, and have been, impediments to that progress all good men desire.

Something in the nature of heaping coals of fire on the head must be the opening of a Mosque at Southfields on October 3. The missionaries have asked for it. With the Bishop of London in Canada and the Viceroy of Mecca in London, the religious pot is kept boiling and the gaiety of nations maintained.

East Ham Council, by 21 votes to 13, decided to permit the Sunday opening of cinemas. Opposition was made by the Free Churches and Sunday School Union, and much sympathy will be extended to these two bodies who are unable to maintain a copyright of Sunday. It is curious that there are still fanatics at large determined to keep the seventh day a choice of two evils for the ordinary man. The business instinct of the Sabbatharians leaves nothing to be desired.

The bigots of the Lord's Day Observance Society are being kept very busy in these days. They have been protesting against Sunday afternoon boxing at the Ring, Blackfriars. The Home Secretary replies that he regrets he has no authority to intervene in the matter. He "regrets!" Very illuminating, is that reply. It gives one a glimpse of the kind of prohibitions that would be enforced if ever the narrow-minded gained political sway in this land of the free.

The proposed revival of Lambeth Regatta, to be held on Sunday, moves the Alliance for the Defence of Sunday to call upon the pious to protest. The Secretary asks: "What is to be the limit of our toleration? Does the opinion of Christian people count for nothing?" The good man, spluttering with indignation at this Sabbath desecration, hasn't phrased his first question quite accurately. He should have asked: "What is to be the limit of our intolerance?" If he had said this, people would have been better able to take the true measure of these squealing busybodies. Our Sabbatharians have quaint notions of fair play. They claim the right to choose their own particular kind of Sunday amusement, yet deny that right to others. That is how they put into practice the Golden Rule they profess to venerate. They appear not to realize that their Master meant it

to be applied to all the Christian's conduct in relation to his fellow citizens. Much as we dislike having to put the Christian right on a matter of Christian practice, we feel it our duty to do so in this particular instance.

Some Christians are fond of accusing the Freethinker of being a Christian without his knowing it. After reading the following extract from a letter in the *Daily News*, our readers will perhaps realize the quality of the insult. A Derby foundry worker with forty years' experience writes: "Teetotal and religious employers and officials are as a rule disliked, not without cause. We invariably get fairer and more humane treatment from non-Christians."

The British and Foreign Bible Society, we read, has in the last four months reduced six languages to writing for the first time. It has now added a portion of the Scriptures in these languages to its former total of 579 editions of the Bible in foreign tongues. There is one language we are sure the Society will never succeed in translating the Bible into. And that is the language of sweet sanity. The Society cannot work miracles.

Mr. Eden Phillpotts in his new play, "The Blue Comet," demonstrates how people would behave when the end of the world is announced. Whether it shows Dean Inge kissing the toe of the Pope we do not know, but in 1712 the return of a comet announced by Whiston had some curious effects: As a divine and philosopher, Whiston enjoyed a high place, and his predictions that the total dissolution of the world would take place on a certain Friday made the following startling commotion: (1) A gentleman who had neglected family prayer for more than five years, informed his wife that it was his determination to resume the laudable practice the same evening; but his wife, having a ball at her house, persuaded her husband to put it off till they saw whether the comet appeared or not. (2) The South Sea Stock immediately fell to 5 per cent., and the India to 11; and the captain of a Dutch ship threw all his gunpowder into the river, that his vessel might not be endangered. (3) Two hundred and twenty-five clergymen were ferried over to Lambeth, it was said, to petition that a short prayer might be penned and ordered, there being none in the Church service on that occasion. (4) Three maids of honour burnt their collection of plays and novels, and sent to a bookseller's to purchase each of them a Bible, and Bishop Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*. (5) The run upon the Bank was so great that all hands were employed from morning till night in discounting notes and handing out specie. Considerably more than seven thousand kept mistresses were legally married on Thursday in the face of several congregations. Sir Gilbert Heathcote, head director of the bank, issued orders to all the fire offices in London, requiring them to keep a good look-out, and a particular eye upon the Bank of England. All of which goes to prove that the gentleman's wife and the director of the Bank of England were prepared to wait and see whilst the clergymen sieved the wind. Mr. Phillpotts must be careful or his prophecies on the stage may interfere with the profound discussions on the Sacrament now taking place, not to mention the traffic problem that is being solved in all directions.

According to a newspaper a working man has the beginnings of wisdom when he has begun to see, or feel, the catch in Christianity, and he objects in this forcible language: "After the heartrending grind of dull and uninteresting daily toil, coupled with a miserable wage, and the ever-threatening spectre of unemployment, a man will not sit in a church and be told that he has strayed from the way like a lost sheep." Now that he has made a start he will find better reasons if he takes the trouble to search. He might, to begin with, ask what clergymen are doing, or have done, to make his life any better in working conditions. If they are not

too busy with the revision of the Prayer Book or the transcendental meaning of a bit of baked flour they will tell him—social engagements of tea-fights, and mothers' meetings permitting.

A glance at Papal Finance may explain why children are born with innate religious ideas or why the moon is made of green cheese. It may also explain why the Catholic faith rejoices to find the profoundly ignorant and keep them so. The revenues of the Vatican, we are told, are drawn from the following sources:—

The indirect revenues derived from duties on briefs, bulls, investitures, dispensations, nominations, promotions, and the conferring of titles and knighthoods. There are large sums coming in daily for masses and special blessings: on more than one occasion wealthy Catholics have been known to make an offering of 100,000 lire for a Papal Mass.

From which we conclude that Henry VIII. was also a business man, but historians do not put it in this way.

The Bishop of Birmingham says that it is to-day difficult "to get well-educated youths of character and ability to enter the ministry." That is now a common complaint with most of the churches, and it is what one may expect. We venture to say that no self-respecting man can embrace the profession of a clergyman and accept Christianity in its proper sense. If he becomes a clergyman he must give a new interpretation to the old creed in order to justify his position to himself. If he is a man of small ability he can accept Christianity as it should be accepted. But you cannot have it both ways. For a man to say that he believes in Christianity implies that he is either giving a new meaning to the term, or that he is too undeveloped to doubt the orthodox faith.

The *Church Times*, by the way, is wrath with Bishop Barnes for linking together "Magical Sacramentalism" and "Spiritualism and Second Adventism." We do not really see any cause for complaint. We quite agree that Second Adventism is about the last word in human folly, and that Spiritualism is with its advocates little better than crude superstition. But what is the Sacramentalism of the *Church Times* but a redressing of crude superstition without the excuse for accepting it that its original believers had? It is quite amusing to see these Christians accusing one another of believing in crude superstitions, or repudiating the beliefs of other religionists as being unreasonable. Talk of the pot calling the kettle black!

In writing about the best ways of defending Christianity, the Rev. Newton Flew unconsciously pays a good compliment to Freethought. The early apologists, he declares, appealed to Prophecy, to miracles, and to "the self-evidence of the Incarnation from its sublimity and power." But the first two arguments, he added, do not carry much weight to-day. The reverend gentleman is right. And the reason why these arguments have lost their power is that they have been riddled through and through with Freethought criticism and ridicule. We thank Mr. Flew for the compliment. We may as well add that we greatly fear the third argument is now only a ghost of its former self. Freethought would appear to be an excellent reducing cure for too fat Christian arguments.

"Blasphemy" is getting so common nowadays that much of it passes without notice. But here is Sir Henry Wood, who suggests that as harp strings are likely to snap under varying atmospheric conditions, it may be that the angels would prefer to listen to gramophones. There does appear to be something in the suggestion. One can imagine the wear and tear of the angelic tempers if strings started breaking in the middle of a show performance. And harps are so terribly old-fashioned. On the other hand, the sight of David winding up a

gramophone, or Peter presiding over the heavenly record office does seem to be a little out of place. We suggest as a suitable subject for the next Church Congress, "Should we have gramophones in Heaven?" It is the kind of subject about which clerics might rise to great heights of enthusiastic support or denunciation, and there would be no fear of offending anyone. And we are quite sure that Bishop Barnes would be able to prove that when the Bible says "harps" it means gramophones.

It is a thousand pities that magistrates have not a little more control over their tongues, and do not spend a little more of their leisure time in acquiring information on some very ordinary things. Mr. Lulker, the Willesden magistrate, had before him the other day a man who had deserted his wife for another woman. The magistrate's comment was, "This is not Turkey." But we have never heard that wife desertion is a common offence in Turkey. Even when practised, and it is not universally practised even in Turkey, polygamy is not wife desertion. We can assure Mr. Lulker that it is, on the other hand, quite a common offence in Christian England. One would have thought that experience in a police court should have taught Mr. Lulker this much.

The tipsters were recently banished from Hyde Park—the racing ones we mean, the religious ones are still there. But on Sunday last, according to the *Daily Express*, one of them turned up as a preacher of religion. Well, he is not the only one who has taken up with religion when other means of getting money from a credulous public have failed. Many of the cases of converted infidels and the like come under this head. And the Society for the Propagation of Christianity among the Jews might show some choice specimens, if they only would.

The Rev. Arthur Hoyle says that in his youth the young fellows who were being trained as parsons were taught to regard themselves as something of a speciality in which God was particularly interested. Well, but that is the way with the medicine-man from the savage onward. The medicine-man is feared because he is believed to be in special contact with the gods, and when the crude form of this wears out we have the "call" to service which forms part of the established humbug or ordination. Later still, and as a survival of this, we have the special sanctimonious air that characterizes a very large number of the clergy of all denominations.

How to Help.

There are thousands of men and women who have left the Churches and who do not know of the existence of this journal. Most of them would become subscribers if only its existence were brought to their notice.

We are unable to reach them through the ordinary channels of commercial advertising, and so must rely upon the willingness of our friends to help. This may be given in many ways:

By taking an extra copy and sending it to a likely acquaintance.

By getting your newsagent to take an extra copy and display it.

By lending your own copy to a friend after you have read it.

By leaving a copy in a train, tram or 'bus.

It is monstrous that after forty years of existence, and in spite of the labour of love given it by those responsible for its existence, the *Freethinker* should not yet be in a sound financial position. It can be done if all will help. The Paper and the Cause are worthy of all that each can do for them.

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.

W. J. RUSSELL.—Thanks for cutting. We have not yet seen the work, but will try and do so.

T. F. HAUGHTON.—We really cannot say when the clergy will be honest enough to get up in their pulpits and say, "We have been teaching you what is not true. There is no heaven, there is no hell. We are sorry we have for so long misled you in these mistaken ideas." That would be long misled you in these mistaken ideas." That would be to assume that all the clergy will suddenly become straightforward. There is no precedent for such an assumption. The completely honest ones leave the profession. Those who remain play the game of harmonizing the previous teaching of an admitted error with the claim to have been teaching nothing but the truth.

H. IRVING.—Received. We are quite well, and are not afraid that work will do us any harm. So long as we can steer clear of worries we do not mind anything else.

E. H. HASSELL.—Shall be glad to receive copies of the papers. Bound to be of use.

W. CLARKE AND W. WRIGHT.—Next week.

H. CHILDS.—There is no longer any question as to the legality of a bequest for Freethought purposes. The House of Lords decision settled that for ever. A bequest to the *Freethinker* could never have been challenged at any time. Your informant was quite wrong on this point, and, as a matter of fact, no such case has ever arisen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

All Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to "The Pioneer Press," and crossed "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.

Birmingham bigots have secured another victory, but we hope it will be a temporary and an expensive one. It will be remembered that some years ago the local Branch was refused the further use of the schools for Sunday evening meetings. Every other body in Birmingham, Socialists and Christians were permitted to carry on, but Freethought could not be tolerated. Several times since the Branch has made application for the use of the rooms, and last week a sub-committee recommended that the embargo should be removed, and the schools let to the N.S.S. on the same terms and conditions as they were let to other people. There was considerable discussion on this recommendation before the Education Committee, and it was at length referred back, on an amendment moved by Councillor Smith. The voting was 15 for the adoption of the recommenda-

tion and 17 against. A narrow majority, and one which should inspire the local Freethinkers to renewed efforts. Some curious things were said in the course of the discussion, and we intend dealing fully with the whole subject next week. One thing is certain, and that is, that Birmingham Christians have seriously underestimated the character of Freethinkers if they imagine that their exhibition of petty bigotry will have any other effect save that of inspiring them to renewed efforts against the ancient enemy of progress. We venture to prophesy that one consequence will be the circulation of a much larger number of the *Freethinker* next week in Birmingham than is usually the case.

Last Sunday was a general holiday in Glasgow, and for that reason the Branch postponed its Bradlaugh Sunday till to-day (October 3), which marks the opening of its winter lectures. Mr. E. Hale, the President of the Branch, and Mr. F. Mann, the Secretary, will be among the speakers. We hope there will be a good gathering of friends and others. There is nothing like giving the season a good send off.

A very good letter, signed "Ultra Violet," appears in the *Barnsley Chronicle*, apropos of the attempt of the Sunday School Union to close the playing-ground on Sunday in the local park. "Ultra Violet" very pertinently asks:—

You will observe in the arguments for closing the playground, the words "rob," "take away," "restrain." The movers of the amendments are prepared to do all that these words imply, but only for the "future good" of the children. The "future good" is undefined, but the eagerness to get the children for the purpose of "moulding their early habits"; to model the children like themselves—perfect beings—is an instance of that blushing modesty and touching humility peculiar to the Christian.

What difference is there between the S.S. Union and the Holy Office? The Inquisitors, as men, were as kind and benevolent as the movers of the amendment. Their reasons for torturing, maiming and burning heretics alive, were the same as those of our advocates of an unhealthy Sunday for children. They were anxious to do their victims a good turn. The victims were seldom grateful. The religious principle actuating both is the same. The difference is one of power. The pale copyists of the Inquisition can be treated safely with contempt. That is the day of physical culture. Modern science stresses the saving of bodies here and now. It declares that moral health is associated with physical health. Dr. Cyril Burt who spoke at the British Association, says that the largest number of offences by children are committed where there are no parks or playing fields.

That is very much to the point, and we further agree with the writer that if the majority of working men had wisdom there would be no need for compulsory education, and their representatives on public bodies would not be survivals of the Dark Ages. Unfortunately, candidates for public bodies are too fond of playing to the noisiest and the most bigoted section of the community, and the Sunday School Union and similar religious bodies are adepts at the art of terrorising those whose chief aim is to see themselves in office.

Mr. R. H. Rosetti will lecture to-day (October 3) at the Secular School, Pole Lane, Failsforth, both afternoon and evening. In the afternoon he will speak on "Christianity and the Growth of Militarism," and in the evening, "Gods and Godmakers." Friends in Manchester and district will please note.

On Sunday next (October 10) Mr. Cohen commences his winter lecturing at the Leicester Secular Hall. He will speak on "Freethought, Religion, and the Press." The lecture will commence at 6.30.

The open-air propaganda of the North London Branch was brought to a close in Regent's Park on Sunday last with an address by Mr. A. D. McLaren on Charles

Bradlaugh. To-day (October 3) the Branch opens its winter session at the St. Pancras Reform Club, with a debate between Mr. T. F. Palmer and Mr. C. E. Ratcliffe. Further particulars will be found in our "Guide" Column. North London Freethinkers who would like to help in making these meetings better known can do so by applying to the Secretary, North London Branch N.S.S., 8 Bartholomew Villas, N.W.5., for copies of the winter programme for distribution. Admission to the meetings is free.

The March of Materialism.

IN the lately published work by Dr. P. McBride, entitled *The Riddle of Personality (Mechanism or Mystery)*,¹ we have the problem of mind and personality discussed from a purely scientific standpoint. In fact, Dr. McBride accepts and adopts the claim of the Materialist, that consciousness and mind are the result of the activity of the brain. Of the metaphysicians who discuss mind "as if it were something quite outside physiology," he observes:—

They have evolved methods of debate which it is difficult even for a well-educated man to follow. In the first place their language is often not readily intelligible, and in the second they rely so largely upon dialectic that many who attempt to study their works consider their arguments as of the nature of verbal quibbling. They seem to put aside those sciences which rest upon accurate observation and to put in their places subjective impressions of their own upon which, together with forced logic, they mainly rely. The metaphysician has been compared by a legal luminary, quoted by Sir Ray Lankester, to a blind man in a dark room looking for a black cat which is not there (p. 7).

As Dr. McBride points out, "what affects the brain tends also to involve the mind." A small dose of alcohol may produce a passing brilliance, but a large amount will turn a clever man into a fool, or a refined man into a ruffian. "In the delirium of fever the wise man will babble nonsense. A blow on the head will concussion the brain and for a time there is no mind" (p. 8).

Again, a number of brain areas have been mapped out as centres of action, or control, and we know, partly as the result of experiments on animals and partly by observation on human beings whose brains have been injured, the localities concerned with speech, with sight, hearing, taste, and smell, also with the control of the limbs. Such facts as these have made it impossible for modern apologists of the soul theory to divorce the mind from the brain. Therefore they have invented the doctrine of parallelism, probably the most childish theory ever expounded by educated men to save from collapse an ancient superstition.

The exponents of parallelism admit that when the mind acts, certain changes do take place in the brain. But they declare that the two processes are parallel, or concomitant, and not of the nature of cause and effect. In fact, they declare that mind, or soul, plays upon the brain just as a musician plays on a piano, or a trombone, and if the brain is defective or injured, then the thoughts will suffer accordingly.

Are we to understand, then, that each one of us is provided at birth with a perfect soul, and that the results of its operation are governed by the quality of the brain provided for it? How, then, do they account for the imbecile and the lunatic? How do they account for the idiot who is born with only half, or a quarter, of the normal supply of brains?

The evolutionist can account for them as a reversion to our primitive ancestors. But how can they be reconciled with the idea of an over-ruling and intelligent providence which the parallelist has at the back of his mind? For, it is almost needless to say, that it is only the old-fashioned, theologically-biased minds to-day who hold such a puerile theory.

Under the heading, "The Materialistic Theory of Mind," which Dr. McBride fully accepts, he observes: "Facts such as these lead the Materialist to the—to him—inevitable conclusion that without a brain there can be no thought, and, as a corollary, he deduces that the brain is the only organ of thought, and that, therefore, of necessity when it ceases to act, there must be an end of thinking so far as the individual is concerned" (p. 10). And as the mind comes to an end, so it had a beginning. It is not the immortal being that the pious fondly imagine. For, as the Doctor further remarks: "We have every reason to believe that the infant at birth is a mindless being." For proof of which he refers to the very elaborate observations of Professor Preyer, the physiologist, upon children, from the time of birth and during the succeeding weeks, as recorded in his book, *Die Seele des Kindes (The Soul of the Child)*. His conclusions are that the infant does not see during the first few weeks, although it can distinguish light from darkness; a faculty, by the way, it shares with the microscopic animalcula of pond water, which is certainly devoid of mind, and even plants turn towards the light. Reflex closure of the eyes, that is, the automatic closing of the eyes against an approaching missile, is absent for some weeks. At first the eyes stare blankly into space; later, at any fixed object; then they begin slowly to follow a moving object, and in the last the child passes from looking to observing. At birth the infant does not hear for the first few days. Not until the child has developed all its senses can the mind begin to evolve. Preyer traces this evolution step by step. Dr. McBride quotes him as saying: "But by the repetition of feelings of opposite kinds, there are gradually brought into action memory, the abstractive faculty and judgment. The most important factor for the beginning of intelligence is astonishment and the related feeling of fear. By desire for all that gives pleasure, the will-power of the child is gradually awakened."

In the light of these facts, what becomes of the famous gift of "Free-will," with which we are told God has endowed us, to enable us to choose between good and evil? The infant has no will. There can be no will before there is desire, and there can be no desire before the senses have developed enough to create desire. Without will power man would have developed no more mind than a vegetable. "Thus," says Dr. McBride, the laborious investigations of Preyer would seem to justify the conclusion that at birth the infant has virtually nothing which we can call a mind, and that its acquisition is the result of experience of life" (p. 14).

The unit of the brain and the nervous system is the neurone, of which there are nearly ten thousand millions in the brain alone. It is in these neurones, or nerve cells, that the impressions of past events, or of the things we have learned, are stored up, and we can call them up and compare them; and "we can imagine," says Dr. McBride, "how numerous may be the combinations of thought in a brain where most of them have myelinated." And further:—

Thus we are led to imagine the cultured adult brain to be made up of neurones combined in patterns of images in such a way that a stimulus reaching almost any point may through time revive all the others. We say advisedly through time, because

¹ Heinemann's Medical Books Series, 6s.

the particular stimulus may have to pass through many other patterns, i.e. revive many memories, before it reaches its destination. Most of us have had the annoying experience of forgetting something we ought to know perfectly well; for instance, a proper name. We find that attempting to reach it by the obvious method of picturing the individual, his place of residence, or some other fact about him, fails, and then after a little time it is suddenly remembered. The explanation which suggests itself is this. For some reason the obvious memory routes have become blocked, but after a time the neurones which correspond to the name are reached by some more devious course taken by the nerve impulse. (Dr. P. McBride, *The Riddle of Personality*, p. 20.)

Equally satisfactory is the explanation of the "subconscious mind."

W. MANN.

(To be Continued.)

A Lonely Gleam.

THE outdoor Sunday meetings had been poorly attended all the summer—perhaps like the religious, the economic platitude was beginning to pall; perhaps owing to the fact that a Labour Government was in office many thought the battle won; some may have been disappointed to find a change of government had made so little difference; most no doubt were merely apathetic and indifferent, like "my friend Careless, who would not take his hand out of his breast to prevent the world going to destruction"—a very common attitude this, exemplified in the millions who merely follow sport and grow frenzied only over the result of a race or a match, who scan the newspapers eagerly to see who has won, and are only faintly interested in what matters most to the individual, the nation, and the world; others were dutifully and domestically controlled, walking out wife or sweetheart or family, enjoying their Sunday leisure in a very excusable way. All might be well dressed or trying to be, and here was a significant sign of the times; a hopeful emulation, attracting all, rich and poor, learned and ignorant. The apparel oft proclaims the man. Rustian and shoddy are no longer good enough for the outer person of the working man and woman. The two things are more closely allied than one might suppose, and inner culture is likely to follow outer elegance. "Blessed be ye poor," and other falsities and futilities of the Sermon on the Mount are fast losing their paralysing influence, and, with them, the very kernel of the Christian ethic is found wanting, and only the empty shell remains. And yet the average Socialist speaker continues to point to the "Galilean" as a great social reformer, one whose ethics will dominate the new world of propagandist effort and dreams. Could anything be more fatally false and futile? It is more likely that the growing spirit of man will leave this Socialism behind it also, a fit companion of a discarded Christianity.

Not even the "comrades" attended the meeting in question, nor the "poor o'er-laboured wight" leaned upon the wall to hear the "message"—which, indeed, would have proved meaningless to him, and only a kind of "religious" comfort. Somehow an audience would not fall, like manna, from the skies; the revolution seemed far away, nor would the sandy shore give up its stragglers. A great concourse of eager seamews, busy and noisy in the shallows, settled their own affairs—a reproach to man. What could governments do for them? Get them shot, or protect them—about all they could do for humans—so far, at least, as getting them shot was concerned! Far away on some shadowed hills a lone gleam of

sunshine was lying, a lovely wistful gleam, extinguished as we looked, the great lamp lighting in turn a more distant, cloudy scene, mysterious, majestic in a misty region of—to one of us at least—far remembered hills of home and boyhood!

So time runs on; so old scenes recede into their never, never land, lighted but rarely by a wandering ray of sun, remembrance, or regret: so the rainbow removes, so man's hopes elude him: only the great machinery of the universe is constant and sure—no thanks to it either but only resignation or adaptability. So certain is the great machine the scientist can predict appositions of stars and planets millions of miles away, a thousand years from now. The science of Sociology is not yet on so sound a footing, but will be when all astrology (superstition) has been eliminated from the calculations. So on a Sunday night like this, in such a scene of man and nature, one looks around, comparing the vastness and complexity of existence with the puerile expression of some very muddled thinking.

Our speaker was very young—in philosophy if not in years—but with all that pathetic assurance of the average lay preacher; indeed, he had quite a pulpit tone, but to so meagre an audience made his speech bravely and eloquently enough, yet saying nothing one could remember as very striking. It fell upon the ear like a sermon in church: we listened as religiously as in church and were as little edified. It was "the preaching of the Word"; we felt, "It is good for us to be here," and so suffered gladly; we were at least enjoying the fresh air!

The chairman at the close invited questions, and none forthcoming, appealed at last to a member of the audience, who in the past had often stirred the meetings to interest, to "save the situation." The individual thus addressed was at the moment studiously looking away as though following the sun-gleams on the distant hills, in reverie perhaps, in pity rather than in scorn. Familiarly appealed to by the friendly and good-natured chairman, the man complied at last, and said it was true he had often "saved the situation," but also true he got no thanks for it! He had no questions to ask, but, as the meeting was small and informal, and no one in a hurry home, he might offer a few comments, necessarily crude and undetailed, but, he hoped, suggestive. The verses by Burns and Kipling recited by the first speaker were excellent and appropriate: those by the democratic poet in praise of Liberty, which sentiment was the very breath and pulsation of his manhood; those others by a mere jingo imperialist, yet giving the world "assurance of a man" and a Freethinker—if he did not call him that—but mere platitude in a man of Kipling's type, only rich in the splendid word-power of one who was neither Socialist nor Freethinker in the ordinary sense of the words. Other great men, continued the second speaker, mentioned by the first, were not Socialists, while they might be social reformers—a distinction not without a difference. Indeed, it would seem that the world's greatest benefactors were individuals belonging to no party or sect; or, at least, their services to humanity were above and beyond any party or sect to which they might happen to belong. The Socialism advocated by the first speaker seemed too much of a moral or religious crusade, while, as a matter of fact, it was not morals and religion that were immediately necessary, but intelligence, and original practical thinking. He was far from denying the value of morals in society, but the "goodness" *per se* of the people was to a large extent the cause of their subjection to bad economic conditions. Buckle had pointed out that morals were necessary and stationary from ancient times, but that knowledge, intelligence,

etc., were ever-growing, ever-changing things. Without these, morals would not take us anywhere. Ingersoll, also, the great American, had said: "Intelligence is the only lever capable of raising mankind." Morals, alone, were they those of Jesus Christ, Keir Hardie, or Ramsay MacDonald, would, without relationship to other qualities, be of little help in social affairs. Encouraged to proceed, the last speaker wished to assure the lecturer and his hearers he was not opposed, but always favourable, to the wise study of social questions. He was not seeking, and in fact scorned, notoriety (just "swank," said, at this point, the eminent and imperturbable first speaker, with smiling condescension). He knew, said the second, a little about moral philosophy—"A little," said the first, wittily. "Yes, just a little," said the second, "but evidently you know less; and I think I know your measure exactly. As for swank, I will "swank" you in a moment to teach you civility! You are a little lacking in that also." The little breeze having passed good-humouredly on both sides, the last speaker referred to emulation of social distinctions being common to all classes; how the poor despised the poorer, in our little townships, with infinite scorn on the strength of a few shillings more a week or a house a little larger. These also were constant factors in the great game of "getting on," and small and contemptible, and truly anti-Christian as they were, formed yet, perhaps, one of the main motives or avenues to a higher life. By this time the regular speaker was probably well out of his depth, and perhaps properly scandalized at this corruption of his Sunday sermon, but little more was said, the meeting ending a little lamely; but the situation was so much "saved" and what is here reported may be found full of suggestion to the Freethinker, like the lonely gleam referred to amid the cloudy glooms at the close of a perfect day. One good purpose was certainly served: it was a little wholesome opposition to the Sunday monopoly of the Churches

ANDREW MILLAR.

The Jungle.

MY GARDEN.

A garden is a lovesome thing, God wot!
 Rose plot,
 Fringed pool,
 Ferned grot—
 The veriest school
 Of peace; and yet the fool
 Contends that God is not—
 Not God "in gardens" when the eve is cool?
 Nay, but I have a sign;
 'Tis very sure God walks in mine.

—T. E. Brown.

A JUNGLE is a pleasant place, God wot!
 Cool stream and shady grot,
 And silver fountains playing in the sun:
 What fun
 To chase the pretty cobras on the run!
 Come ye, devoid of hope,
 And mark the leopard and the antelope
 Disporting freely in a garden fair;
 There is no parting there:
 And yet I know—
 Some fools have said there is no God below;
 But they are wrong—
 For life is one sweet song,
 And full of cheer:
 The tiger runs before the gentle deer:
 I knew that God is here!
 A jungle is a thing divine, I vow!
 Bow wow!

W. J. LAMB.

Some Real and Alleged Atheists.

II.

(Concluded from page 605.)

AMONG moderns, the Atheism of the sceptics Hobbes, Bayle, and Hume may be questioned. Hobbes' principles may lead to Atheism. His questioning the existence of Satan may be applied to Satan's antagonist; but Hobbes himself professed to be of the religion of the State, whatever that religion might be. Bayle's articles tend to scepticism and Manicheism. Hume refutes the theistic positions only in dialogue. The fact that his posthumous essays are more decidedly sceptical than those published within his own lifetime confirms the view that Professor Blackie is right in classing him with real Atheists. It must not be forgotten that in Hume's time Woolston, Ilive, and Annet were imprisoned for milder heresies than Atheism.

Spinoza, the God-intoxicated, as Novalis calls him, was generally termed an Atheist in his own time, and nothing could more strikingly illustrate the progress made in thought than the invariable respect with which this great thinker is now everywhere mentioned, and the pains which are taken to distinguish his opinions from absolute Atheism. Toland, like Spinoza, though sometimes with the Atheists, is rather to be classed among the Pantheists. N. Saint Glain, the translator of Spinoza into French, must also be acquitted of the charge of Atheism along with his master.

It may be contested how far Averroes, Pomponatius, Cæsalpinus, and Telesio, with their various shades of Pantheism and Materialism, come strictly within the category. The same may be said of Claudius Berigardus, Nicolaus Taurellus, the first German philosopher, and John Gerard Rom. Campanella's *Atheismus Triumphatus* might be better entitled *Atheismus Triumphans*. But no doubt his twenty-seven years of imprisonment had not induced any desire for further martyrdom. Though termed Atheists by their adversaries, all these, no doubt, would have denied the hard impeachment.

Matthias Knutzen, of Holstein, it is said, openly professed Atheism, and had upwards of a thousand disciples in Germany about 1674. He travelled to make proselytes, and his followers were called Conscientiaries (*Gewissener*), because they held there is no other deity than conscience. Whether Knutzen escaped the penalty of his opinions is uncertain, and his sect, if indeed he formed one, does not appear to have lasted. His contemporaries, Friedrich Wilhelm Stosch and Theodore Ludwig Lau, are also accused of Atheism.

It is not until the dawn of the age of reason in the eighteenth century that Atheism appears openly and undisguised in scientific garb. Lamettrie, La Grange, Holbach, Naigeon, and Diderot wrote as Atheists, yet their pronounced writings were published under assumed names. They had no desire for martyrdom. The *System of Nature*, which appeared in 1770, attributed to Mirabaud,¹ who died in 1760, helped to rear a school of acknowledged and unacknowledged Atheists. Its real author was Holbach, one of the most militant Atheists that ever lived, and he was assisted by the friends whom I have named. The influence of the work was profound. Priestly said that all the philosophers and men of letters he met with during a visit to France were Atheists. Rousseau declared he had only met three priests who believed in God.

¹ Mirabaud may have been an Atheist, but he is not to be confounded with Gabriel Honoré Riquetti Mirabeau, who certainly was one.

The great French Revolution has often been called an Atheistic movement, yet some of the most noted actors were Deists rather than Atheists. Dr. James Buchanan, indeed, in his *Faith in God and Modern Atheism*, describes the first French Revolution as actuated by anti-Christian Deism, and the second French Revolution by Atheism! Robespierre was a militant Deist, and paved the way for his own fall by pompously acting the Pontiff at the feast of the Supreme Being. Billaud-Varennes said: "*Avec ton Etre Supreme tu commences m'embêter.*" Marat, Couthon, Sain-Just, Fouquier-Tinville, and the Jacobins generally knew how to conjure with the name of God. Mirabeau, Danton, Brissot, Vergniaud, Guadet, Cloutz, and Chumette were Atheists. Miss Blind calls Madame Roland an Agnostic, yet she frequently spoke of God, the soul, and a future state, at a time when Mongez, a member of the Institute, could say he "had the honour to be an Atheist."

At the suggestion of his friend and fellow-Atheist, Lelande, Pierre Sylvian Maréchal compiled a Dictionary of Atheists, to which Lelande added a supplement, in which he states that he is prouder of his Atheism than of his scientific attainments, and that, although at the age of nineteen he thought, with the rest of the world, that the heavens prove the existence of God, he now sees in them nothing beyond matter and motion. The *Dictionnaire des Athées* has often been ridiculed for its debaptising so many Christians to insert them in its catalogue. Thus we find in it most of the Fathers—Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Sts. Chrysostom and Augustine! Luther, Melancthon, Pascal, Bossuet, Jurieu and Fenelon! our own Locke, Newton, Berkeley, Clarke, Cudworth, Hall, and Sherlocke!—nay, even Paul of Tarsus, John the Evangelist, and Jesus Christ! The name of God the Father ought to have been added to complete the list of notorious Atheists!

It is only fair to Maréchal to note that one of the purposes of his collection was to point out how many even of the supporters of theology had rendered themselves liable to the charge, and allowed some glimpse of philosophy to stand out in contradiction to their superstition. Pascal is included for saying that we neither know the nature nor the existence of God, and that reason is unable to demonstrate the being of a God. Jesus Christ is included, apparently in joke, for saying: "Take eat; this is my body." The remark is appended that to make bread into God is going further in Materialism than Spinoza. In short, the *Dictionnaire des Athées* is not to be taken too seriously. We find the word OR (*gold*) included for the purpose of introducing some lines declaring that most of the world treats gold as God.

Many of the names most unjustly entitled Atheists in Maréchal's work are copied from previous Atheographers. Father Hardouin, the Jesuit, has stigmatised Jansenius, Malebranche, Quesnal, Pascal, Nicole, and others, as Atheists. The Protestant Reimann, in his *History of Atheism*, had enlarged his list with the names of many Catholics, as Bembo, Bellarmine, Malebranche, Leo X., Father Sanchez, etc. Buddeus enumerates a number whose Atheism is doubtful. Indeed, it may be said there is hardly a single philosopher of ancient or modern times, who has shown any originality of thought, who has not been accused of Atheism by one of the Atheographers Garasse, Mersenne, Voetius, Kortholt, Calver, Parker, Struve, and Jenkin Philips.

In England, Shelley was one of the first to openly accept the name of Atheist. The Atheism of James Mill, of Bentham and Grote, though often suspected, was scarcely known in their own lifetime. A proof of how slowly the *odium theologicum* passes away in England may be found in the fact that many of

the most astute Atheistic productions have been published anonymously or under pseudonyms. I may mention the *Inquiry into the influence of Natural Religion*, by Bentham and Grote; the examinations of Mr. Gillespie's argument *à priori* by "Antitheos," "Aliquis," and "T. S. B."; the astute examination of the Rev. B. Godwin's lectures on Atheism, published at Bradford; and the examination of Theism, by "Physicus." A hundred years after the death of Hume an able lady writer thinks it necessary, in criticising the design argument, to call herself by the pseudonym of "H. Lawrenny." Of those who have followed Shelley in proclaiming their Atheism several have come to prefer some other designation. This was the case with Richard Carlile. Charles Southwell argued that it was absurd for anyone to call himself an Atheist, since it meant but the negation of nothing. Atheism was impossible, because Theism was unthinkable. Mr. Holyoake, who has refuted Paley and written *The Trial of Theism*, prefers the designation of Secularist. Professor Huxley has coined for himself the name Agnostic, a term accepted by Leslie Stephen, Mrs. Lynn Linton, and other followers of Spencer and Darwin. John Stuart Mill, despite the dubious character of his posthumous essay on Theism, would probably have accepted the designation of Agnostic; and the same may be said of Lord Amberley and Professor Clifford, though we think the last would not have refuted the more definite appellation of Atheist. The position expressed in the lines, "I say not that there is no God, but that I know not," is the one adopted by almost all who profess and call themselves Atheists. Some there are who, looking upon the idea of God as the foundation of all superstition and slavery, say, with Proudhon, "*Dieu c'est le mal.*" Men like Bakounine may rather be called anti-Theists than Atheists. They do not so much question the existence as the authority of God.

Many of the French Freethinkers frankly call themselves Atheists; nor is the term refused by scientists such as Hovelacque, Letoureau, and Lefevre. Caro considers Renan, Taine, and Vacherot as representing three types of opposition to Theism. Comte declared that the heavens declared only the glory of Kepler and of Newton, and it is not easy to see how the confinement of attention to phenomena can be reconciled with Theism. None the less, his Atheism has been questioned, and his followers—Litré, Lafitte, Bourdet, Wybouroff, Blignières, Bridges, Beesley, Kaines, Congreve, and Harrison—prefer the designation of Positivists.

In Italy there are many ready to recite their creed in the words of the poet Guerini: "*Primo di tutto, dico, che non credo in Dio*"—"First of all, I say, I do not believe in God." In Germany, Büchner, Schlaeger, Specht, Vogt, Moleschott, and Czolbe, though properly called Materialists, do not object to a name which has been applied not only to Feuerbach, Strauss, and Schopenhauer, but to Fichte, Schelling, Krause, and Hegel.

As the odium attached to the word Atheist slowly dwindles, we may expect to find less heed given to its repudiation. A very large number who refuse the appellation only do so because they so cordially agree with M. Buzot when he refused an article on the existence of God, sent to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, on the ground that "the question lacked actuality."

J. M. WHEELER.

O, mighty power of truth, which can easily defend itself by itself against the skill, the craft, the ingenuity of men, and against all treacherous inventions!—*Cicero.*

Society News.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S.

On Sunday, September 6, the South London Branch celebrated the 93rd anniversary of the birth of Charles Bradlaugh, by means of a special demonstration in Brockwell Park, and in spite of the dull weather, a very fine meeting was held. Mrs. H. Bradlaugh-Bonner attended, and very gracefully accepted a floral offering presented by the Chairman, Mr. E. Coles, on behalf of the Branch. Mr. Chapman Cohen, whose appearance elicited a warm round of applause, paid a splendid tribute to the memory of the great pioneer in a speech which was followed with exceptionally close attention by a large and appreciative audience. One solitary, and misguided, follower (?) of the meek and lowly Nazarene, who ventured an ignorant interjection, found he had caught a Tartar in the President, who very neatly and effectively—but so blandly—turned the tables. Messrs. A. B. Moss, E. Saphin, and J. Darby also spoke eloquently in their praise of the sterling qualities of the great reformer in whose honour we had assembled, and we take this opportunity of expressing our very sincere thanks for their timely assistance. Particularly in the case of Mr. Moss, we feel that the self-sacrifice displayed by all those participating in the proceedings was in itself a fine tribute to the respect in which the name of Charles Bradlaugh is still held. Among those present were Mr. Bonner, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh-Bonner (looking the image of his illustrious grandfather), Mr. Gilmour, of the R.P.A., with Mrs. Gilmour, and Mr. Erle D. Side. One friend came up from Southampton for the occasion, and we feel confident that he felt more than recompensed for his long journey. Will local friends please note that we continue our outdoor meetings throughout October? A. HEATH (*Hon. Sec.*)

MR. G. WHITEHEAD'S MISSION.

In consequence of the rainy weather we had to be content with six meetings for the week spent in Nelson. These meetings would have been better attended had they been better advertised. At many places big audiences can be gathered together without advertising, but Nelson is not one of them, and we suffered accordingly. I have to thank Messrs. Metcalfe and Clayton for their valuable help. Commencing Tuesday, October 5, I shall be speaking for a week near the Institute, West Ham.

G. WHITEHEAD.

Obituary.

The older generation of Freethinkers in Liverpool and district will learn with deep regret of the death of Mr. Laurence Small, B.Sc. Mr. Small was a very old member of the Liverpool Branch of the N.S.S., and was once very active in its work. He lectured frequently, and took part in many controversies in the public press. Being a teacher he found bigots up to their usual game of terrorism, and they undoubtedly did, for many years, succeed in injuring him so far as they could. Had he been content to play the hypocrite they would not have minded this at all, for it is conformity, not honesty, that the average Christian seeks to impose on his fellows. Mr. Small has not been actively engaged in the Cause for some years, but he never lost his sympathy with it. He died at the Queen's Hotel, Brighton, and was buried in the Smithdown Cemetery. Owing to his retirement from public life, not so many of his old friends were present at his funeral who would have wished to pay this last tribute of respect to an old fellow-worker had they had the opportunity.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.—INDOOR.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (St. Pancras Reform Club, 15 Victoria Road, N.W., off Kentish Town Road and three minutes from Camden Town Tube Station): 7.30, Debate—"Was the General Strike Worthless and Immoral?" Affirmative, Mr. T. F. Palmer; Negative, Mr. C. E. Ratcliffe.

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7, Dr. C. W. Saleeby, "Eugenics in the Light of Lamarck."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11, John A. Hobson, M.A., "The Essentials of Industrial Government."

THE NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (101 Totenham Court Road): 7.30, Mr. E. C. Saphin, a Lecture. Thursday, October 7, at the same hall at 7.30, Mr. E. C. Saphin, Lantern Lecture.

OUTDOOR.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 3, Mr. F. P. Corrigan, a Lecture.

THE NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Hyde Park): 11.30 and 3 p.m. Speakers—Messrs. Botting, Hart, and Peacock.

COUNTRY.—INDOOR.

FAIRSWORTH SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Sunday-school, Pole Lane, Fairsworth): Mr. R. H. Rosetti will give two addresses at 2.45 and 6.30.

GLASGOW (Bakunin House, 13 Burnbank Gardens, Glasgow): Thursday, October 7, at 8, Mr. Guy A. Aldred, "Bruno and Galileo." Questions and discussion.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY, Branch of the N.S.S. (No. 2 Room, City Hall, "A" Door, Albion Street): 6.30, "Bradlaugh Sunday." Speakers—Mr. E. Hale and Mr. Fred Mann. Questions and discussion. Silver Collection.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Dr. Bertrand P. Allinson, "How to be Healthy though Civilized."

SUBDUING CIRCUMSTANCES to ourselves, and not ourselves to circumstances, we have made it possible for Freethinkers anywhere, and everywhere, to have their clothes made by advertisers in this journal. Support your favourite journal by writing at once 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 105s. 6d.; Gents' Overcoat Patterns, prices from 48s. 6d.; or Ladies' Fashion and Pattern Book, costumes from 60s., coats from 48s.*—MACCONNELL & MAHE, New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

YOU WANT ONE.



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

LECTURES ON EVOLUTION

Mr. JOSEPH McCABE will lecture in the ESSEX HALL, Essex Street, Strand, W.C., on FRIDAYS, OCTOBER, 22, 29; NOVEMBER 5, 12, 19, and 26. Commence at 8 p.m.; Doors open 7.30 p.m. For tickets (1s. each lecture) and further particulars apply, enclosing stamped addressed envelope, to

Mr. F. L. MONNAIE,
87, Ashbourne Avenue, Mitcham, Surrey.

UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

For List of Birth-Control Requisites send 1½d. stamp to
J. R. HOLMES, East Hanney, Wantage, Berkshire.
(Established nearly Forty Years.)

PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS

MODERN MATERIALISM.

A Candid Examination.

By WALTER MANN.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited)

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

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

176 pages. Price 1s. 6d., in neat Paper Cover, postage 2d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK.

For Freethinkers and Enquiring Christians.

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

NEW EDITION

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

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

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

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

DETERMINISM OR FREEWILL?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

NEW EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

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

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

A Book with a Bile.

BIBLE ROMANCES.

(FOURTH EDITION.)

By G. W. FOOTE.

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

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

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 1s., postage 1d.

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

A Chapter from

The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.

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

Price 2d., postage ½d.

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.

REALISTIC APHORISMS AND PURPLE PATCHES.

Collected by ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.

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

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

THEISM OR ATHEISM?

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

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

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

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.

HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

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

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

Price 3s. 6d., postage 4½d.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

By GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

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

Price 4d., postage 1d.

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

THREE AUTHORITATIVE WORKS. ALL AS NEW

TABOO AND GENETICS

A Study of the Biological, Sociological, and Psychological Foundation of the Family; a Treatise showing the previous Unscientific Treatment of the Sex Problem in Social Relationships

By M. M. KNIGHT, Ph.D.; IVA LOWTHER PETERS, Ph.D.; and
PHYLLIS BLANCHARD, Ph.D.

Part I.—The New Biology and the Sex Problem in Society; Part II.—The Institutionalized Sex Taboo; Part III.—The Sex Problem in the Light of Modern Psychology

Published at 10s. 6d. net. Price 4s., postage 5½d.

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC METHOD

By Dr. OSKAR PFISTER

With Introduction by Professor FREUD and Professor G. S. STANLEY HALL

A Comprehensive Introduction to the Subject, with special reference to Education
591 pages and 3 plates

Published at 25s. net. Price 6s. 6d., postage 9d.

THE CAVEMAN WITHIN US

A Study of the Play of Primitive Impulses in Human Society with Suggestions for turning these to Useful Purposes

By W. J. FIELDING

Published at 10s. 6d. net. Price 4s., postage 6d.

DECADENCE, AND OTHER ESSAYS. On the Culture of Ideas

By REMY DE GOURMONT

Published at 7s. 6d. net. Price 3s. 6d., postage 4½d.

Only a very limited number of each of these books is available. Those desiring copies should order at once

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

Printed and Published by THE PIONEER PRESS (G. W. FOOTE AND CO., LTD.), 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.