

# AN OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP BARNES.

The

# FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper

VOL XLVII.—No. 44

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1927

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>An Open Letter to Bishop Barnes.—The Editor</i>	689
<i>Christian Experience.—J. T. Lloyd</i>	691
<i>One Dam Thing After Another.—Mimnermus</i>	692
<i>The Theology of Dean Inge.—B. S. Wilcox</i>	692
<i>The "Freethinker" Endowment Trust.—Chapman Cohen</i>	697
<i>The Church and the People.—Arthur B. Moss</i>	698
<i>The Contemporary Outlook.—Curtis Bruen</i>	699
<i>Romance and Paraffin.—William Repton</i>	700
<i>American Notes.—George Bedborough</i>	701

Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.

## Views and Opinions.

### AN OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP BARNES.

My LORD,

I am not a Communicant of your church, but I have for long been a student of its history, of its teachings, and of the religious beliefs it enshrines. This must be my apology for addressing you on a matter which you may regard as one which concerns solely yourself and your fellow believers. But, if further apology be needed from me, I may add that as an English citizen, I am, in some sense, by law a member of your church, I am compelled to contribute towards its upkeep, and as a parliamentary voter I have an indirect voice in the conduct of the Established Church and in the shaping of its teachings.

I read with considerable interest, and with some amusement, the "scene" in St. Paul's Cathedral between yourself and Canon Bullock-Webster on October 9. Respecting that quarrel, Christians are sharply divided in opinion between those who support the Canon in his endeavour to keep Christian teaching "pure" and unsullied by admixture with infidel science, and those who sympathize with your own endeavour to broaden Christianity so that it may not, at least flagrantly, contradict what most educated people know to be the truth.

As an outsider, a Freethinker, I am in the happy position of being able to sympathize with you both, although I doubt whether either will thank me for it. I sympathize with Canon Bullock-Webster because he stands for the historic teaching of the Christian Church, and for that mass of beliefs which you rightly characterize as belonging to savage culture. To me Canon Bullock-Webster is something that I would it were possible to preserve with us for ever. Science has lost much in not being able to recover more than the remains of the material organism of primitive man, leaving us to build up by way of inference from the customs of existing savages, what he thought of the world around him. I agree with you that Canon Bullock-Webster helps us to see the

savage as he was—speaking a more perfect language, and wearing different clothes, but substantially unaltered in his mental outlook. More important still, he helps us to realize what Christianity was, and is, in the unadulterated state.

Your opponents, however, are not concerned with this point of view. Their position is that the Christian Church has always taught most of the things which you repudiate; it has within living memory strongly denounced the things you accept; and they say that a Christian priest must either accept these things or clear out of the Church. That, looked at in the light of Christian history, is a mild demand, and most merciful treatment. Once upon a time prison or the stake would have been demanded, and one or both would have been your lot.

These men, you must remember, are not vitally concerned with whether what science says is true or not. On that head, my Lord, it is useless appealing to them. They do not care whether it is true or not. Their position is that God has told them certain things, and these things are true because God said them. And they argue that a Christian priest must either accept these things or retire from the Church. In reply you say, in your open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "No man shall drive me to Tennessee or to Rome," which may be heroic, but does not meet the point, which is, "Ought a Bishop who does not believe in the teachings of a Church any longer remain in its service? That is a question which, so far as practice goes, you must answer for yourself. But it is inevitable that many others will answer it for you.

On the other hand, let me assure you that I sympathize with the position in which you as a man of intelligence find yourself. You observe that religion in this country is in a rather critical condition. You see that there is a sharp division between educated men and women and those who like Canon Bullock-Webster really belong to some period about the time of the Stone Age. You see that if some kind of "re-interpretation" of "God's Word" and of Church teaching is not attempted it will leave Christianity the possession of the less intelligent, with its teaching classified as being on the same level as charms and lucky days. You observe also that it is no longer a question of discussing at what date the books of the Bible were written, whether the Christian conception of God is better than that offered by other religions, or whether certain doctrines are tenable or not. All these questions are largely out of date. The vital question to-day is whether any form of religious belief, even that in God and a Soul, are intellectually tolerable. And I fancy you realize that unless growing enquiry can be stilled by timely concession, unless some kind of accommodation is effected, there will be soon no Anglican Church worth bothering about.

The the the let ce-on- the the ne. at

I venture to think I am right in these assumptions because of an interesting piece of self-revelation which is contained in the letter to the Archbishop, which I have already mentioned. In that you say:—

A dozen years ago I found myself Master of the Temple, and, as such, minister to that congregation which, with its legal nucleus is probably the most intellectual in England. Soon I discovered that while ancient pieties and the stress of war brought men and women to worship in the Temple Church, there were relatively few among them for whom Christian dogma had any vitality . . . I thereupon began to preach sermons in which I clearly set forth my own belief and doubts. I found immediate response—and shrewd criticism. I was thereby encouraged to read widely. I learned the value of plain speech. If honest conviction is expressed in simple language and maintained by reasoned argument, the strength of its appeal is great.

That confession is very interesting, but you will perhaps not take offence if I say that it arouses suspicion, and it invites question. It is rather hard to believe that until 1915 you were unaware of the bearings of, say, the theory of evolution upon religious beliefs. The world had been ringing with it for more than half a century. You were born, trained, and lived in the midst of it. Was it not until you went to the Temple that you thought about it at all? I hardly think that can be the case, for you frankly say that it was because you found the majority of your congregation had not much belief that you resolved to speak out. It could hardly be that so soon as you discovered that this audience had little belief you decided that it was *you* who were in the wrong. That is not consonant with what we know of parsonic psychology. One is almost driven to the conclusion that you set forth your own pre-existing doubts and beliefs, because you found either that you would lose touch with your congregation if you did not, or because you decided that you could let out a little of the truth with a fair prospect of safety. Anyway, it is instructive to note that the pulpit preached one thing, until the pew made it plain it wanted something else. The layman led, the priest followed.

One is also led to speculate as to what would have happened had you never been at the Temple, had your congregation been of the average unthinking, sheep-like kind. Would you, like so many of your brethren in the Church, have remained silent? And if you ever find yourself in charge of a congregation where there is less belief than there was with the Temple worshippers, will you be inclined to say still more on the lines of unbelief? Are we to understand that confession of faith made by up-to-date parsons is determined by the kind of congregations they address? I believe it to be so in a great many cases, but it is not often that we have the position so clearly indicated.

I venture, my Lord Bishop, to call your attention to another paragraph in your letter to the Archbishop. You say you reject the doctrine of Transubstantiation because "as every student of comparative religion knows it has affinities with the magico-religious beliefs of a lower cultural level than that of our present civilization." That is a very mild statement of a very important truth. Perhaps you are not quite sure whether your present congregation is ready to hear the whole truth. Every student of comparative religion knows, as you say, that the practice of killing and eating the God belongs to a state of primitive savagery. But if he knows this, every student of comparative religion also knows that the whole circle of religious ideas upon which Christianity is built comes to us from, and properly belongs to, the same level of culture. To you, the only interest, in

the custom of eating the god is an anthropological one, or that of enquiring why people ever came to believe in such a peculiar and, to our modern minds, so revolting a doctrine. But you know the origin of religious cannibalism, and knowing this much I cannot understand how it is you do not know more. Only the man who reads the subject with a mind bemused, or with eyes closed, can be blind to the fact that every one of the religious beliefs which exists among civilized men can be traced to no better and no other foundation than the mistaken speculations and the hideous practices of primitive savagery. Would it not be better to tell the whole truth at once, and play the part of a real pioneer? Or is it that by telling your present congregation that science does not support the Biblical story of creation, or of the origin of languages, it is hoped to prevent their finding out the truth that all religious ideas current to-day are no more than the developments of a primitive delusion.

My Lord, I said, in commencing, that I was not of your Church. But I venture to lay claim to a relation to your heresy. I am a humble soldier in a great army of men and women, an army that for more than a hundred years has fought in order that in 1927 you might hold up your head and speak out some of the truth about religion. Men and women, whose names I daresay you have hardly ever heard, were sent to prison by your Church, time after time, for venturing to say the things you now say with impunity. They did not wait for a congregation that asked for their message, but went out into the highways and byways, and made unwilling congregations listen to them. So much of Christianity as has been made tolerable to the civilized mind of to-day is the result of their making Christians ashamed of their creed. So much of the liberty which you enjoy has been purchased by their work and by their sufferings. I am delighted to find you endorsing what they did, and at so great a distance of time, even though you have mastered but the elementary part of their teachings. But why not follow their example and their teaching in their entirety? You cannot civilize Christianity. You can only cover its savagery with the cloak of pseudo-culture. You cannot make Christianity reasonable. You can only make it hypocritical. For the honest, intelligent, educated man or woman there is only one proper place in relation to the Christian Church—and that is outside.

My Lord, I have this week dealt only with the attitude you have taken up in the Church. In the sermon, before the preaching of which Canon Bullock-Webster made his protest, you laid down what you considered to be the right relation between science and Christianity. I will deal with that next week.

For the present I beg to subscribe myself,  
Your Lordship's obedient servant,

CHAPMAN COHEN.

#### A SURPRISE.

A *Methodist Times* writer has experienced a rather sad shock. He saw a poster headed: "What About Sunday?" and thought at first sight that it might be a wayside appeal to people "to recognize the sacred obligations of the Lord's Day as a day of rest and worship." He discovered, however, that the poster was an advertisement for the Metropolitan Railway encouraging travel on Sunday "for personal pleasure." As Sabbatharians never do anything on Sunday for personal pleasure, and object to other people doing anything on that day for personal pleasure, it gives the *Methodist* writer much personal pleasure to protest against the Railway Company's tempting people to enjoy personal pleasure on the Sabbath.

## Christian Experience.

THIS subject has been regarded for fifty years by Christian apologists as possessing supreme evidential value. Indeed, some have even maintained that it constitutes the only positive proof of the truth of the Christian religion. One is not surprised, therefore, to learn that it was the chief topic of discussion at the recent meetings of the Congregational Union, held at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Several well-known leaders read papers and delivered addresses on it. The Rev. John Bevan, of Balham, went so far as to declare that "belief is in many people a sort of congenital impossibility." Then, he added: "Faith is the highest and best spiritual sense . . . But can't we teach that there are other senses which, although they afford no clue to the man of the Divine origin of his good thought or noble feeling, are nevertheless means that God is using? I tell you there are crowds of people inside the Church and out of it, who cannot see God, but who yet can answer a call of duty, respond to the cry of need, and be stirred to self-sacrifice. They do not connect their impulse for service, their answer to the call of duty, with God at all." That is perfectly true, and what it proves is that it is not necessary to be a Christian or even a believer in God in order to live a good, noble, and useful life. Of course, Mr. Bevan contended that it is God who unconsciously inspires such people to be what they are; but he has no means by which he can establish the truth of his contention. Besides, history tells us of some eminent men and women who, although they enjoyed the most ecstatic Christian experience, were not only immoral but capable of committing most horrible crimes, a fact which shows that the Lord is not always mindful of his own.

Mr. B. L. Manning, M.A., Bursar, Fellow, and Lecturer of Jesus College, Cambridge, read a paper entitled "Christian Experience in all the Centuries," which is published in the *Christian World Pulpit* of October 20. Mr. Manning is evidently a firm believer in the historicity of the New Testament, for he treats the Apostle's recorded experience on the road to Damascus and his being caught up into Paradise as actual events. The mystics he calls, "the aristocrats of all religions," whose experience is not that enjoyed by ordinary Christians. His first point he states thus:—

Through all the centuries there is an inward experience to which every generation testifies. So constant is the experience that one generation often borrows the language of another as expressing its meaning better than any words that it can provide for itself. It is the experience of God when the soul is at the foot of the cross: the realization, whether sudden or gradual, of the Love of God as it there appears to the devout. From the beginning until this October 11, 1927, there has not failed in the Christian centuries a succession of men for whom the supreme experience of their lives is that in which they confess before the cross: "He loved me and gave Himself for me."

We are not disposed to cast the shadow of a doubt upon the accuracy of that extract. We frankly admit that from the commencement of our era there have always been men and women who verily believed that they lived in sweet communion with God in Christ. Mr. Manning waxes exceedingly eloquent in his description of that experience. But the question inevitably arises, does Christian experience serve as convincing evidence of the objective truth of Christianity? and the answer is emphatically in the negative. In the first place Christian experience varies in exact proportion to the varieties of Christian

belief. Surely the experience of a Unitarian cannot be identical with that of a Trinitarian. The experience of Bishop Barnes must differ considerably from that of Canon Bullock-Webster, who displayed his Christian spirit by interrupting a service at St. Paul's Cathedral in order to denounce his lordship as a person unfit to occupy any pulpit in Christendom. Then we are informed that there are several hundreds of different sects of Christians, with different beliefs, rites, and ceremonies, and of necessity their experiences vary vastly. The only conclusion to which we can come is that beliefs are the roots out of which experiences spring. Curiously enough, apart from faith in him there is no God at all. A man whom the present writer knew most intimately lost his faith. For years it had been a dreadful struggle to retain even the semblance of it, but ultimately it took its departure never to return. Friends who were in his confidence commiserated him, saying, "You will never experience peace of mind again. God will not let you alone for a moment until you come back to him." As a matter of fact, God has preserved an absolute and unbroken silence from the moment his belief in him vanished. How do you explain that silence, that non-interference, that utter unconcern on God's part on the assumption that he exists? It is wholly inexplicable, and the only rational inference is that there is no God. Mr. Manning only takes his existence for granted, as he does that of Christ and of the cross, as interpreted by himself and those who agree with him. Is he not aware that God exists only to and for those who believe in him, and leaves all others severely alone?

Mr. Manning is really a back number with a vengeance. Listen to what he says about progress:—

In the thirteenth century it seemed possible, indeed inevitable, to work all knowledge and experience into a comprehensible and coherent culture that confirmed the Christian faith at every point; you see this in a scheme like that of St. Thomas Aquinas. Christianity appeared to be the inescapable issue of any rational life. The nineteenth century made common a somewhat mechanical dogma of progress based on that crude biology, whose lingering echoes we heard again recently. At such periods Christian experience came to depend more than usually on a particular view of this world's events. But that was exceptional. At most times when the Christian soul has turned its eyes outward, it has seen in this world-order a prospect bleak enough to chill rather than to kindle faith in God; and this it has frankly confessed.

Now here are two facts of the utmost significance. The first is that Mr. Manning looks upon scientific discoveries with ominous suspicion. His reference to Sir Arthur Keith's address from the chair of the British Association is anything but gentlemanly. He is positively convinced that science can never redeem the world. The second fact is that Christianity has already completely failed to do so. This is the twentieth century of its active existence, and yet this Cambridge Congregational divine is compelled to acknowledge that "the horizon at most periods in the Christian centuries has held dismal and threatening phenomena." Poor man, how horribly miserable he must feel as he contemplates such pessimistic facts. In despair of the triumph of the faith he tells the following black lie:—

And now comes Materialism, with its children, international and interclass war, threatening to extinguish European civilization.

Materialism has never harboured the spirit of destruction. Materialism is simply an intellectual interpretation of the universe, and not by any stretch of imagination a form of government. If the author

is thinking of the Russian Soviet Government, we can assure him that, whatever its attitude to the rest of the world may be, Materialism is, neither directly nor indirectly, responsible for it, and it is wickedly unjust on his part to dogmatically assert that it is.

Now that it is candidly admitted even by Mr. Manning, that Christianity has signally failed to reorganize society on sane and just lines, why not give science its inning? Faith having gone under in disgrace, why not allow knowledge to try its luck? Meanwhile the Churches stand in the way, but if the people continue to desert them as they have been doing of late, their opposition will ere long cease to act, and the way will be clear for the dissemination of scientific information on all conceivable subjects, and for the wise application thereof to the solution of all the great problems of twentieth century society.

J. T. LLOYD.

### One Dam Thing After Another.

"The scientific spirit has already established a more exacting standard of truthfulness in history and in controversy."—Dean Inge.

"The creed of Christendom is gradually melting away like a northern iceberg floating into southern seas."

G. W. Foote.

THERE is a loud fluttering in the dove-cotes of Orthodoxy. Since 1906 there has been a decrease of no less than a million and a half scholars in the Sunday schools, and there is not the slightest prospect of any stoppage in the decrease. The clergy are thoroughly alarmed, Anglican and Free Churchman alike, as well they might be. Nor is the shortage of Sunday school scholars the only trouble. The churches and chapels are half empty, and only a few popular preachers escape facing a beggarly array of empty benches. Sunday is devoted by enormous numbers of citizens to amusement, and this number is constantly growing. Despite the anathema of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches the Divorce Courts are crowded, and Secular marriages in Registry Offices are growing in favour. Things are in such a parlous state that the Bishop of Winchester has thrown up the sponge, and asks why it is that "the idea of God cuts no ice in these days."

The alarm of the clergy is sincere, for their bread and butter is bound up with the continued popularity of the Christian Religion, which is the only form of religion worth worrying about in this country. There are about 50,000 priests in Great Britain and Ireland, ranging from the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his modest £15,000 yearly, to the pastor of a tin tabernacle, who relies on the threepenny-bits of the faithful in his congregation. No wonder the clergy show such unexpected heat in the present controversy. Past controversies have dealt with dogmas; this one with cash. And, as the age of miracles is past, this cash must be raised or the clergy are threatened with bankruptcy.

The Dean of Manchester declares that not even fifty per cent. of modern children have a Bible, or possess more than a mere smattering of knowledge about it. The *British Weekly*, the foremost Free Church journal, says bluntly that "if a census were taken (of church attendance) the figures would be so sensational, that in order to avoid discouragement and panic it would be wiser not to print them." Even so, the large majority of present-day worshippers are elderly persons, and in a few years' time will be dead. What is to happen to the churches then? They cannot be largely recruited from the Sunday schools, for they are on the down grade as well as

the churches. It is the beginning of the end of Orthodoxy.

The clergy are finding plenty of reasons for the shortage of worshippers, but never, by any chance, the real one. They say that preachers of to-day lack power and personality, and are poor speakers. Hymns are too sickly and sentimental. The squabbles of ecclesiastics and rival churches are not edifying. All these things may play their part, but the growing indifference to religion in the country is primarily due to the spread of Freethought and to the result of education.

Organized Freethought has been working in this country for over half a century. Compulsory education has been in force for about the same length of time. The clergy now address a vastly different audience to what they did in the ages of ignorance. The Churches can never play the same part in the national life as they played before the facilities for information became as great as they are to-day. Even in their schooldays, many a bright boy and girl must be conscious of the serious contradiction between the Secular instruction imparted by the teacher, and the religious instruction imparted by the priest, or even by the parents. Science is in our day advancing from victory to victory, and has enlisted in its service the keenest intellects and the most disinterested characters of our time, and cannot be smothered by the tenth-century nonsense preached by priests and taught by their dupes. Superstition dies hard, but if the scientific way of looking at things prevails, and it will prevail, the fifty thousand clergy of this country will find their occupation gone.

Of recent years the Christian Religion has ceased to interest the great mass of the people, as it did right down to the end of the nineteenth century. It is out of date, and no longer means anything serious to most of the community. The coup-de-grace came when even the dullest citizen saw the divorce between Christian precept and practice during the awful upheaval of the World War, when the flower of the manhood of one entire generation was sacrificed on the altar of the Moloch of Militarism. All the priests of Christendom cannot put the clock back. The knowledge of the twentieth century is not necessarily the ignorance of the tenth century. And the decay of the churches is not quite such a national disaster as the well-paid clergy would have us all believe. For the Christian Superstition is completely out of touch with the times in which we live. It is not only decaying, but it has an aroma like that of the crowded cabin of a small Channel steamer on a rough day.

MIMNERMUS.

### The Theology of Dean Inge.

ON reading the account of a speech by Dean Inge at the Conference of Modern Churchmen recently, we were much struck by his far-seeing sagacity and his very evident grip of the modern mind and trend of thought. There can be no doubt that the Dean has a perfect fund of knowledge at his command on a very wide range of subjects, and that he possesses the ability to apply such knowledge in the right manner. There are few clerics who have the courage to speak their minds as he does. Dr. Barnes, of Birmingham, is certainly another, and likewise the Bishops of Norwich and Exeter. Of course, it must be remembered that these four are in a somewhat fortunate position. Bishops and eminent Deans can afford to be outspoken, where a mere vicar or curate must always consider the views and wishes of his superiors. We point out this fact in order to be quite fair in the matter, and in order that it should not be thought that we are overlooking a most evident truth. As has often been pointed out, there are hundreds of

clergymen who really do deserve the pity, not the censure, of any thinking man. They have adopted a profession to which they honestly thought they were suited, at an age when youth knows more of enthusiasm than of experience. The vital years of their lives, say from the ages of eighteen to twenty-three, are spent entirely in acquiring a certain kind of knowledge. Later on the hard school of experience causes them completely to change their views, but they find themselves irrevocably committed to a life which is no longer to their taste. If we are candid with ourselves we must admit that there are few of us who would have the courage to take such a bold step as to cast off a parson's collar once we had assumed it. Besides which, the said vicar or curate by this time is very probably married and has responsibilities which he cannot shirk. He knows himself to be unfitted to gain a decent livelihood in any other walk of life, and he is therefore practically compelled to make the best of a bad job, and to try to do what good he can, and at the same time violate his principles as little as possible.

But, as we have said, men like Dean Inge can go a good deal further than their less fortunately placed colleagues. Apparently they are in no danger of losing their jobs on account of their unorthodoxy. The Dean will speak with the utmost freedom on such subjects as evolution, in a manner which causes us to agree with him wholeheartedly. He has the "modern ideas," and he speaks in terms which the modern thinking generation understands. But always his final conclusions seem to be entirely incompatible with his early utterances, and they leave us completely bewildered, and, to be quite candid, rather inclined to doubt his sincerity. Let us take an imaginary sermon by the Dean, and let us imagine that a keenly critical "Modern" is sitting listening to it:—

"The world in which we live to-day is very different from that which our fathers and grand-fathers knew. Science has taught us a thousand new facts and caused us to revolutionize our ideas completely." (Agreed.) "This is essentially a materialistic age, and anyone who aspires to leadership in the world of thought must realize this and adapt his ideas to the new conception of the Universe. Superstition and the Unknown are no longer a cause of fear, for in the light of past experience Man looks forward boldly, knowing that Superstition ceases to exist the moment that the lamp of Knowledge is turned upon any phase of it." And so on and so on; all of us are familiar with the line of argument indicated. Now the critic, before referred to, is obviously in entire agreement. Furthermore he is justified in expecting that the preacher is about to expound a new philosophy to meet the new needs. But this astounding theologian invariably concludes his discourse on lines such as the following: "In this new world of which I have been speaking, the only guide to which we can look to bring us through to a firmer understanding of God and his inscrutable ways is that which has existed for two thousand years, and has been the mainstay of our civilization, the Christian Church; we must turn back to Christ to discover that new conception which will alone strengthen us in the march forward."

We are frankly puzzled as to how a man can have progressed so far on the road of understanding, and still be unable to realize that it is too late to look back. It seems to us that he is in the lamentable condition described by Christ himself: "He that putteth his hand to the plough and looketh back is not fit for the Kingdom of God." As a thinker and a philosopher, and, with certain reservations, as a moral guide, we have the utmost respect for Jesus of Nazareth. His courage and his devotion to Truth calls for the admiration of all noble men. But to pin one's whole faith and hope of salvation for all time to his teaching is to fall into an error which we are certain he would have been the very first to condemn. Should he return now we are quite convinced that he would freely admit that he was very wide of the mark in some of his speculations. And the more Science advances the more obvious does this become. There can be no disrespect or disloyalty in such an opinion; it is merely the acceptance of the inevitable.

For instance, he was firmly of the opinion that the end of the world was very close indeed to his own time. It has been shown that he was wrong; there can be no two sides to this question, we must admit it and adjust our ideas accordingly.

No, the Dean must go further yet if he wishes to make that appeal which we are quite sure he is sincere in wishing to make. This, we should have thought, is obvious to him. Why he does not do so is a mystery. Without in any way wishing to detract from an intellect for which we have a great admiration, the only solution we can think of, is that there is a line which even Bishops and Deans may not cross.

B. S. WILCOX.

## Acid Drops.

The row about Bishop Barnes still goes merrily on. A Yorkshire paper calls out for his trial for heresy, although, in that case, the Church might find itself in a rather awkward position. It would have to say precisely what is meant by certain things, and that would rouse more dissent, and probably mean still greater division in the Church. The Church is only comparatively safe so long as people are permitted to go on using the same formulas while attaching quite different meanings to them. But if some responsible body is driven to say just what is meant by certain things, the fat will be in the fire. So we do not think there will be any trial for heresy.

The Bishop of Durham regrets the tone of Bishop Barnes, and wishes he could see better the mystery which underlies spiritual truth. That is just about as clear as mud. If Bishop Barnes could only see the mystery which underlies another mystery, it would be better for all concerned, thinks he of Durham. His advice is: If the road is not clear, turn out the lamps. Canon Peter Green thinks it unfortunate that Bishop Barnes should think of many of his fellow ministers as idolaters. An idolater is only a man with a different idea of God from another believer, but some parsons think that the calling of names should be permitted only to themselves. The Bishop of Lichfield says that the sacramental gifts have no magical efficiency unconditioned by the faith of those that receive them—which means that if we eat the consecrated bread it is just bread. But if a Christian believer eats it, magical efficiency occurs and it becomes the flesh of Jesus Christ. Well, for our part, we hope that whenever we eat bread it will remain bread. We strongly object to having a meal of human flesh, whether it be a bite out of our next-door neighbour, or bits of a god who became man. We would sooner turn vegetarian.

And that reminds us. What would a believing vegetarian do who took the sacrament and found it by magical efficiency turning into flesh? Would he refuse to swallow it, or would he leave his vegetarianism outside the Church door?

The Bishop of Exeter says that Christ has given his instructions, and it is for us to do what we are commanded to do. So as Christ said they must eat his flesh, all vegetarian and other scruples must go by the board. A large number of laymen have rushed into print on the same subject, and quite a large number are quite prepared to swallow the bread as actual flesh, so long as the Church says it is so. And while we are at it let us remember that these grown-up men and women who are discussing whether a biscuit can, through the magical words of the priest, become real flesh, and a drop of cheap wine, through the same agency, become blood, these people are all under the delusion that they are civilized! That is the greatest wonder of it all.

Canon Storr, speaking at Leicester, says that he would sooner be tried for heresy by a jury of six lay Atheists than by the whole Bench of Bishops. We congratulate Canon Storr on knowing the kind of tribunal that would

be likely to act with fairness in such a situation, and also on his judgment in not relying, where religion is concerned, on the sense of justice possessed by his fellow believers.

There would be just a possibility of Bishop Barnes being brought under the Common Law of Blasphemy, although it is not very likely to happen. But it is certain that the way in which he has spoken of the Sacrament is very offensive to large numbers of Christians, and if he were to speak in the same way before an audience of High Churchmen, there would most probably be a breach of the peace. But we do not expect that he runs any danger of a prosecution. If he were an avowed Freethinker the chance of imprisonment might not be so remote, particularly if a judge of so well established a reputation for religious fervour as Mr. Justice Avory had the trying of the case.

A correspondent of the *Christian World* writes protesting against a remark made by the parson who preached the funeral sermon over the body of the girl murdered in Richmond Park. The preacher said that "God in his infinite wisdom had sent this family sorrow upon sorrow." This is regarded as "a wicked and blasphemous lie, and a direct contradiction of what the majority believe about the character of our loving father in heaven." But how on earth was the parson to put it? Suppose he said, "God has not seen fit to interfere and prevent the murder being committed"? That would still leave him with the responsibility attaching to his non-interference, and no man would like it said of him that he stood by while a girl was being murdered. Suppose the preacher said that God in his wisdom had so arranged things that murder was bound to result from the course of things. That still leaves the responsibility with him. Or suppose it is said that God left man with the "freedom" to kill or not to kill, and having once given this freedom would not take it away? That leaves us wondering in what way that benefits the girl who was killed, and she ought to have some voice in the matter. Or suppose we say that God did not know of the murder until after it was committed, and so could not interfere? What, in that case, becomes of the God who knows when every sparrow falls to the ground. It does seem that so long as one believes in God that he cannot be kept out of it. The only advantage of the talk about the "loving father in heaven" is that a mass of verbiage prevents believers realizing how silly all their chatter is.

The President of the Turkish Republic is determined to follow the example of some other countries and secularize the State. Addressing a Congress of the People's Party, he said that the ideas of Sultans and Caliphs are religious Utopias and figments of the imagination. He says that the new Turkish State has no connexion with religion, and appears to be determined to keep religion from interfering in secular matters. The Canonical law has been practically abolished, and a civil code, borrowed from Switzerland, substituted. On one occasion he is said to have thrown the Koran aside, with the remark that "progress cannot be fettered by rules and regulations laid down for a past generation." A consequence of the President's attitude, and of the almost complete elimination of religion from State affairs, is that attendance at the Mosque has fallen off in a very marked manner. If things go on in this way we may expect to see the Christian clergy joining hands with Mohammedan priests in some protective measures against the common enemy. After all, they are both in the same business. The addresses are different, that is all.

A man at Dundalk, Ireland, was taken by armed men to a stable, stripped of clothing and tarred and feathered. The judge, in awarding damages, said the treatment was unchristian. We quite agree; the classic Christian method was burning or torturing. All these men might plead in defence is, that times have changed, and different methods prevail. But judges are inclined to be very conservative in their outlook.

The Rev. W. Stuart-Fox, of London, in eruption at a meeting of the British Israel World Federation, says:—

We have met to defend the Bible against pseudo-scientific philosophy. These beliefs in evolution are hits at Genesis, and instead of reading and believing the Bible, we are told to regard the gorilla as our ancestor. The holy sect of Mrs. Partington and her mop still survives.

Those who doubt that the Englishman is a genuine lover of liberty should reflect that a Parliamentary Committee has just recommended that members of the audience at a theatre may be permitted to purchase a bar of chocolate after eight o'clock. Precautions are to be taken to see that they are genuine members of the audience—we presume they will have to carry some sort of sworn guarantee round with them. But it is good to note that the Englishman will assert his right to eat chocolate at any hour of the evening even though the foundations of the Empire may rock. Vive la Revolution!

Mr. Sidney Dark says that he would sooner be a fool with St. Francis and Pasteur, than be wise with the modernists and unbelievers. Mr. Sidney Dark is, we believe, editor of the *Church Times*, so his choice is quite understandable. And it is quite common; for it is surprising how many are indifferent to being foolish so long as they are with a host of respectable people. It is a wonder that Mr. Dark never concluded that there is no particular merit in sharing follies of even great men. For our own part we would rather join in the flashes of common sense that even fools may manifest, than share in the follies of the greatest man that ever walked the earth. But we edit the *Freethinker*, and Mr. Dark edits the *Church Times*, so he has more to thank folly for than we have, and is more interested in encouraging a respect for it among his readers.

The following, from a "pastoral," has been read in all Roman Catholic Churches in Ireland:—

We appeal to all our people, and to every one of them, to cast out for ever the spirit of rancour and animosity wherever it has found a lodgment, the spirit of hatred and vengeance that has been the bane of Ireland through the centuries, and put in its place the spirit of forbearance and conciliation, of goodwill and brotherly love, that alone can make the nation great.

This appeal comes rather incongruously from a Church which, in its various publications, incites hatred against Protestants and Freethinkers, lovingly dubbed "heretics." The appeal is, of course, meant to be applied only to political rancour. Animosity against heretics may still be regarded as a virtue by all good Catholics. For the Church has not yet expurgated the spirit of hatred against non-Catholics from either her publications or the discourses of her spokesmen. To have done that would not have been in line with the true Catholic tradition, and the Church believes in being consistent, especially in her hatreds.

It seems to the *Sunday School Chronicle* a little unfortunate that Church Congresses and Free Church Assemblies should be made the special occasions for Christian Churches to wash their dirty linen in public. In surveying the newspapers lately, our contemporary has been grieved to find that the things which have caught the newspaper man's ear have mostly been those telling against the Churches rather than in their favour. We beseech the *Chronicle* to grieve no longer. The newspaper men are only trying to level things up a bit. They have so often to print the Churches' free puffs, that in fairness to public opinion they like their readers to see the other side of the Churches' lily-white character.

Apropos of the Channel Swim hoax by Dr. Logan, a journalist takes Dr. Logan severely to task. Worse still, he says, she hoaxed in a department of life where any hoax is morally wrong. The truthfulness of their news, he adds, is a matter of conscience with newspaper

men, and deliberately to impose on them is like making a jest of sacred things—cruel to them in proportion to the honesty and conscientiousness in which they follow their calling, and dangerous to the public interest; the fable of the boy who cried "wolf" is very much to the point. There is a touch of Mr. Pecksniff about this journalist's righteous indignation. Seemingly, he forgets there has been a war, during which the journalistic conscience in regard to purveying false news went a trifle rusty in retirement. The proverb of the pot calling the kettle black is very much to the point.

This paragraph appropriately follows the one above. A "Churchman" in the *Daily News* hands us our case in the full-bodied and full-throated praise of Anglo-Catholicism:—

Go to an Anglo-Catholic Church in some poor district, preferably the East End of London, and you will see how potent is the appeal. The warm colouring and emotional ardour of Anglo-Catholicism glow like a flame against the panoramic background of squalid streets, pinched lives, and souls starved of beauty.

Strindberg put the matter better when he wrote that if you want to keep the poor quiet, tell them lies about Heaven. And the appeal of Heaven has always been strongest where social conditions have been almost beyond endurance. In the meantime, the quarrel between Protestant and Anglo-Catholic, to the disinterested observer amounts to this; will the patient take his mental poison hot or cold?

According to statistics, we are reminded that there is a total loss of 122,762 Sunday scholars to the Protestant Churches. So that while two bodies are contending what to give to followers of Christianity the supply is falling off. The fable of La Fontaine comes to mind. The country girl carrying on her head a basket of eggs to market pictures herself in some lovely headwear brought by the money from the sale, and tosses her head—with obvious and fatal results.

We suppose that it is near enough for the public, when Miss Sybil Thorndike states she reveres the memory of Miss Cavell, and feels that through the medium of the screen it will be possible to convey the great lessons of patriotism and self-sacrifice she taught. Either Miss Thorndike is right or Miss Cavell is wrong, for it is graven in stone for all to see that the brave nurse who gave her life said that "Patriotism is not enough." Lord Hugh Cecil very rightly states that the world is smaller, and Nurse Cavell sounded one of the first notes in a world where kindness and force lie before it for choice. There are difficulties in any scheme of universal application, and what may have been right during an era of wooden ships will have to undergo some re-valuation. We invite Miss Thorndike to read the inscription on the Nurse Cavell monument—and we wish her success in her film venture.

A Catholic correspondent contributes three-quarters of a column of tittle-tattle about the Pope in a daily newspaper, and on the same page, a contributor has an article "Afraid of the Fairies." The following extract comes at an appropriate time during the tea-cup storm created by Sir Arthur Keith:—

In death itself there is not peace—all funeral processions take the most tortuous route possible to "dodge the Devil." I have even seen the body of a beloved priest carried thus to its last resting place, for holiness is no armour against the ultimate evil of the supernatural. St. Patrick may have brought a new faith to Ireland, but he did not altogether remove the old faiths, and the fear in the heart of the Western peasant is a thousand times older than the Christian prayer upon his lips.

This appears to be a very healthy specimen of a dead horse.

An interesting letter appears in the *Times Literary Supplement* over the name of S. Reinach, in connexion with "The Inquisition." The writer, in referring to an

article, emphasizes the part played by the good shepherds of history as follows:—

In fact the people, when not systematically excited by the clergy, never used violence towards heretics; and I could produce many texts to the effect that heretics and workmen or peasants lived on the best terms, especially in Southern France.

Churches, Catholic and Protestant, suffer from their history, and gain nothing from their attitude towards life in the present. Their opposition towards commonsense nowadays has to be more subtle; the Jesuits of to-day must work overtime, and the Protestants must place the pea under another thimble—the thimble of personality.

There is a fine art in denouncing the enjoyment of Sunday that can only be attained by years of constant practise in dealing in half-truths. The Rev. H. Purnaby admits that Sunday Observance is waning. He also admits that we cannot go back to the depressing Sunday of our puritan forefathers, and having gone this far he sounds the note of warning:—

Yet it is certain that public opinion would receive a tremendous shock if the specifically religious use of the Sabbath were given up.

And that is putting the question in the wrong light; nobody with half a grain of fairness wants the Churches to refrain from minding their own business; it is only when they want to interfere with others spending Sunday in their own way that we find the real reason. And that is, whatever they say to the contrary, simply trade jealousy.

It is high time, says a pious weekly, that the Church as a whole faced up to the problems of adolescence, and claimed the lads and lassies for the service of Christ. The young men, we are told, are lost simply because the Churches do not lay their plans to hold them. In a purely helpful spirit, we suggest that the Churches anxious to catch and hold youthful clients should experiment with Scout troops, lad's brigades, boys' clubs, choral societies, P.S.A.'s, concerts, and bun-struggles. We feel sure they would be more effective as a magnet for attracting the youthful fancy than is the plain and simple Jesus.

West Ham has a new by-law, sanctioned by the Home Office, making it an offence to cause annoyance to neighbours by the operation in public of a loud-speaker or a gramophone. The by-law might have been made more useful if it had covered the annoyance caused by bawling, ranting, and blaring Salvationists. Perhaps, however, the indicting of this particular public annoyance is not considered expedient in a Christian country where public men fear to offend Christian voters. Or maybe, the annoyance is thought to be worth tolerating, since it begets in the non-pious the noble qualities of fortitude and resignation.

"In view of the critical state of affairs in the Church as to the threatened new Prayer Book," joint action is being taken by the Protestant Church Societies with the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith. If the Christian brotherhood of man is to be properly bedded-down in the social fabric, our Protestant friends are the people for doing the job properly. With God on their side they ought to make a success of it.

The *English Churchman* quite believes that many of the men behind the New Prayer Book would be quite prepared if they dared to rush the measure through Parliament in the small hours of the morning, as they did once before with a Bishops Bill. It adds:—

We do not know what power there is to prevent this sharp practice, but we ought to be prepared for any amount of unscrupulousness, which is a special quality of ecclesiastics.

When next we accuse clerics of having this "special quality," the reader will know where we got the notion from.

If the Church attacked the land laws, says a weekly paper, it could do more good in a year than text-slinging against "sins" does in a century. We presume that a training in text-slinging specially fits men of God for the task of undertaking land law reform. But how can the Church attack the land laws? Any radical and proper alteration would mean cutting off no small part of the revenues of the Church, and a parson will never work to that end.

There is a kink in the mind of most of us, says a *Daily Chronicle* oracle, which makes us more ready to believe lies and absurdities than to acknowledge truth when we hear it. The writer must have been keeping bad company. We advise him to give his Christian friends the go-by. Because they have the above-mentioned kink, he must not infer that the rest of mankind has it also. He is reasoning fallaciously from the particular to the general. A good many people never had the kink implanted by a Christian priest, and many more who did have it introduced have since got it eradicated.

A new film will shortly be released entitled "The King of Kings." It hardly needs be said that it portrays what is supposed to be a life of Christ. It has been suggested that it may be preceded by the revue "One Dam Thing After Another."

It is said that one result of the exhibition of this picture will be to "standardize the conception of Jesus." We have no doubt but that some pious folk will be quite certain they know what Jesus looked like, once they see him on the "pictures," and it would also be a boon to the Churches if only the things could be standardized. Every Church has been trying to do that during the whole of its existence.

Why not a picture about Christ? What Hollywood is interested in is something that will bring in the dollars, and the Jewish interests have no objection whatever to do this by playing upon popular superstition about Jesus. The late Wilson Barret showed how easy it was to "spool" the chapel and church-going public with the "Sign of the Cross," and he must have enjoyed many a laugh at the way it was done. And many novelists and dramatists have found the superstition of the population quite an easy field of exploitation. And what is the success of the much over-praised and much advertised "Ben Hur" (one would like to know how much was spent in getting the newspaper praise of this very commonplace film) but an exploitation of popular ignorance—historical and religious, but mainly the latter?

The subject was Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, in the *Times Literary Supplement*, and the treatment of it was like the curate's egg—good in parts. Queen Henrietta-Maria, the wife of Charles I, was the cause of a famous oration by Bossuet. In the jungle of history that Catholicism cannot, like Lady Macbeth, wash out, the writer of this panegyric lets slip the following gem:—

Just as the misfortunes of her mother and the English Civil War had their origin in the schism of an English king, so in order that Madame be saved to the true Church it was necessary that her father's house be overthrown.

This is the metaphor of the mind at work to-day that shows the medievalist still at large. What does it matter if nations tear each other to pieces if a symbol of temporal greatness be saved to one of the hundred "true Churches"? The impartial historian, sitting on the fence, meditating on the folly of savages, might be pardoned for thinking that a national "scrap" over a drainage system, or even universal clean teeth, might be a more fitting object of dispute.

Convicted of the crime of "sleeping out," a man was recently awarded two months' hard labour. This was his fifteenth conviction. We should advise the tramp carpenter of Nazareth to defer his "second coming" until such time as the law of the land is a trifle more humane.

It is surprising, says a religious weekly, how, despite modern means of spreading knowledge, many people still have erroneous ideas about mission work and missionaries. Surprising? Not very; the ideas people have about missions come from parsons and missionaries. The true ideas about missions are available, but clerical influence prevents the modern means spreading the knowledge.

The Archdeacon of Gomer says Sunday Schools are supremely important. He is not satisfied with the religious instruction given in day-schools. He wants it to be far more definitely Christian. He hopes the day will come when the Churches will be able to unite to secure in the day-schools a representation of the Christian faith that would help to build up the child's moral and religious life and character. For a change, it would be quite refreshing to hear a priest publicly expressing an interest in that side of education which has nothing to do with his own trade.

Mr. Crook Palmer, of Hyde Park Lane, told a heckler that God is responsible for the Bible, and no one else. These Christians are all alike; they always try to put the blame on the other fellow. We think Mr. Palmer might have softened the blow a little, by pointing out that God wrote the Bible in his spare time, in between the serious business of creating worlds. The reader would then feel more inclined to forgive the "purple passages."

We have moved during the last generation into a much gentler world, declares the Dean of Chester. And Bible-reading has gone out of fashion. Merely a coincidence, of course.

The Rev. Frederic Wynn, Baptist minister at Pontesbury, Salop, was knocked down and killed by a railway train at Shrewsbury Station. His death will be officially described as due to an act of God.

During a service at St. Paul's, Kings Cross, Halifax, Mr. William Shuttleworth had a seizure and died in the vestry. Now if this had occurred at a lecture by a well-known Secularist . . .

Since the separation of the Church and State in France, official prayers for the Republic have ceased—in the Church as well as elsewhere. Now the Archbishop of Paris has decreed that they shall be resumed. That is all very well; but if the Lord keeps an eye on what is going on he will know that these prayers are of an unofficial character and may not take any heed of them. If he does not keep an eye on the French newspapers, it seems quite wrong of the Archbishop to mislead the deity by offering up prayers which may easily be mistaken for the genuine article. And the Lord has enough worries just now, without adding to them.

The Bishop of Chester says that "you simply cannot say your prayers if you are suffering from an attack of indigestion." Perhaps not, when the attack is very acute, but the Bishop must know that many prayers have little but indigestion to explain their origin.

Sir Richard Gregory told a good story at the 33rd Annual Dinner of the Readers' Pensions Committee. He said he was once talking to Sir Josiah Stamp about the perfection of the written word in the Bible. A sentence in the Bible conveyed a full and definite meaning:—

"Let's see," returned Sir Josiah. "We opened the Bible and came upon the sentence, 'And David danced before the Ark,'" went on Sir Richard. "Sir Josiah said, 'How do you read that sentence?' I replied, 'It is clear without question. It means that David danced in front of the Ark.'

"It can mean equally," retorted Sir Josiah, "that David danced before the Ark was, and that David danced before the Ark danced."



## The "Freethinker" Endowment Trust.

We are glad to record a big jump forward in the acknowledgements this week, but, *Oliver Twist* like, we are anxious for more. We have still a moderate distance to go, but what has been done so far ought to encourage others to do their share. There are thousands of Freethinkers in the country who know the *Freethinker* and its work, and readily recognize the good it has done and is doing. More with regret than pride, we can claim it is the only paper of its kind in the country, and it does the work that no other paper does.

We are glad to acknowledge, this week, a cheque for £10 from Mr. George Bernard Shaw, who accompanies it with the following note:—

"As you know I am not a Materialist nor a Mechanist, nor a Neo-Darwinian; and the Freethinker, like all the relics of the old National Secular Society, is too much tainted with these heresies to represent my views. But as it does a good deal of work that needs doing, and that nobody else will do, I think its extinction would be a loss to Freethought. And I am willing to back this opinion to the extent of £10 for the Endowment Trust."

This bears out our statement that there is no paper in the country that is doing the work the *Freethinker* does, much as we should like to see other papers press the same point of view. But there is no likelihood of the *Freethinker* becoming extinct, it is just a question of easing the burden of anxiety that must rest upon the shoulders of anyone who is responsible for its continuance. We do not mind how hard the work is, but we dislike worry of that kind. We can take a fight with a laugh, but we like it to be a fight that we are really interested in, and not a fight to pay the rent or satisfy the demands of paper maker and printer.

Mr. F. A. Hornibrook, in enclosing his third cheque for ten guineas, says: "There was never a time when it was more important to maintain the *Freethinker*, and I sincerely hope that all friends of Freethought will rally to the Fund. A little extra effort by all interested would bring the sum required within the next week or two. It would be absurd to fail now that we are so near achieving success."

Mr. L. Creese writes:—

The balance required *must* be found to obtain that conditionally promised. If this is not done a few weeks before the time fixed, I suggest that certain persons be invited to meet together to solve the problem, and I would include myself in the number.

Though I have been a Freethinker for twenty-six years, I never realized the necessity of action until you awakened my slumbering faculties at Weston-super-Mare last year, and subsequent study of the matter has convinced me that all Freethinkers should be active.

With regard to the suggestion made by Mr. Creese, we can only say that we are calling people together every week, and that alone should be enough. But we are willing to try any plan that promises success.

### SEVENTH LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£	s.	d.
PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLEDGED	5,654	1	3
Grateful	100	0	0
G. Bernard Shaw	10	0	0
Pa Reha	5	0	0
Jersey Friends	5	0	0
H. C.	5	5	0
J. Stirling	0	10	0
E. Wilson	0	10	0
F. Lonsdale	0	10	0

### Subscriptions—(contd.)

	£	s.	d.
J. G. Finlay (2nd Sub.)	0	10	0
F. A. Hornibrook	10	10	0
L. Creese	10	0	0
J. Brodie (3rd Sub.)	0	8	0
A. Mitchell	1	1	0
Mrs. M. J. Wadham	0	5	0
J. Davie	5	0	0
R. C. Proctor (2nd Sub.)	0	15	0
J. H. Laycock	1	0	0
Dinah	0	2	6

Total £5,810 7 9

Promised on condition that a further

£574 12s. 3d. is contributed by

December 31, 1927 ... £1,615 0 0

Cheques and postal orders should be made payable to the *Freethinker* Endowment Trust, and crossed Clerkenwell Branch, Midland Bank, and directed to me at 61 Farringdon Street, London E.C.4.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

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

D. C.—We would have replied direct, but you omitted to put any address on your letter. Saturday morning is the most convenient day for the papers to reach us, although anything special may be used later. Many thanks.

H. CORNISH.—The most agreeable testimonial at present is for everyone to hurry up and raise the Endowment Trust sky high. Then we can go ahead with other plans.

T. SHELLEY.—We should have no objection to publishing an article on the subject named, provided it fell within the scope of the objects of this journal. There is certainly room for such a criticism.

H. BLACK.—Thanks for the article. We had not seen it, and it will prove useful by way of text. The *Guardian* however, misses the main fact, which is that it was the development of the evangelistic movement, and the "revival of religion" which diverted much of the energy of the people from social into religious channels. The Methodists had little sympathy, and showed much open hostility to the efforts made for the improvement of the lot of the working classes in the early part of the nineteenth century. This is well brought out in Hammond's books on the state of the people from 1766 to 1832.

P. MURPHY.—We cannot publish in the absence of name and address, although both may be withheld from publicity if desired.

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.

All Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to "The Pioneer Press," and crossed "Midland Bank, Ltd," Clerkenwell Branch.

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.

To-day (October 30) Mr. Cohen will lecture in the City Hall Saloon, Glasgow. In the morning, at 11.30, his subject will be "The Priest and the Child," and in the evening, at 6.30, "The New Warfare Between Religion and Science." Freethinkers should do their best to induce some of their open-minded Christian friends to attend both meetings.

A friend wrote us the other day for something dealing with the subject of the Sacrament, a particular view of which Bishop Barnes rightly said belonged to the stage of savage culture. It is, as we have often pointed out, pure religious cannibalism. We replied to the enquiry, and we repeat the answer here, that we did not know of

a better pamphlet than the one by Mr. J. T. Lloyd on *God Eating*. The price of the pamphlet is 3d., and can be sent from this office post free for 4d. We suggest that some of our readers should procure two or three copies for circulation amongst their religious acquaintances.

Mr. John M. Robertson will lecture to-day (October 30) in the Chorlton Town Hall, Manchester. In the afternoon, at 3 o'clock, he will speak on "Fifty Years of Modern Thought," and in the evening, at 6.30, on "The Present Posture of Christianity." Trams run to the door of the Town Hall, which is opposite All Saints Church. For the benefit of friends from a distance, tea has been arranged in the hall. The place ought to be crowded.

We are glad to hear that Mr. Mann had a good audience on the occasion of his first visit to Birmingham. The hall was well filled, and the lecture was listened to with the greatest appreciation by everyone. There were many expressions of a desire to hear Mr. Mann again.

Mr. L. Creese, of Bristol, would be very glad to cooperate with anyone in that city to form a Branch of the N.S.S. There ought to be a Branch there, and we should be glad to put anyone who will write us in communication with Mr. Creese.

We are glad to see the *Daily Express* calling attention to the plight of a German visitor in London, who was astonished at finding the doors of the Zoo closed to the ordinary public on Sunday. The *Express* points out that Sunday is the only clear day on which large numbers of people can visit the Zoo, and calls upon the members to take one other day for themselves and leave Sunday to the people. It adds, "So it has come to this, that a citizen from the land which has given us the priceless word 'Verboten' can read us in Britain a lecture on liberty, and leave us without a word to say in reply or in defence." We should like to see the *Express* conducting a campaign against other Sunday closings, as well as that of the Zoo.

Those of our readers who are interested in the question of the Abolition of Capital Punishment, will note that a public meeting on the subject will be held at Friends House, Euston Road, at 8 p.m., on November 3. Lt.-Com. Kenworthy, Lady Barlow, and Dr. Hollander will be among the speakers.

### Obituary.

MRS. W. H. DEAKIN.

It is with the deepest regret that we record the death of Mrs. W. H. Deakin, which occurred last month in a nursing institution at Torquay, in her sixty-third year.

Mr. and Mrs. Deakin were old members of the N.S.S., and original members of the Secular Society, Ltd., and during their twenty years' residence in India, never lost touch with the Freethought movement in England. During the war Mrs. Deakin worked strenuously in connexion with the Women's War Work Association in Bombay, and for her invaluable services received the medal and Order of M.B.E.

In her husband's many and varied interests, she was his constant companion and helper. An accomplished artist and enthusiastic photographer, she produced some beautiful pictures of India, which helped Mr. Deakin in popular lectures delivered at Worcester. She helped greatly in the Art Classes of the Victoria Institute and the University Extension lectures.

Mr. and Mrs. Deakin had just completed a new home in Torquay, when death laid his hand upon her. Her unvarying kindnesses and ever ready help endeared her to many who mourn her loss. Our deepest sympathy is extended to Mr. Deakin, who is so sadly bereaved in his declining years of his dearest friend and companion.

E. M. V.

### The Church and the People.

THE Church is a State Institution. In a sense, whatever our views, and whether we like it or not, all English citizens are nominally members of the Church. Although I have more than once informed the young curates of the parish in which I live, that I am an out and out Freethinker, they nevertheless call upon me periodically, because they say that I am one of their parishioners, and they are consequently interested in my welfare. The last time one of the curates called upon me I invited him in and I read to him one of my articles in the *Freethinker* in reply to Miss Maude Royden, the famous woman preacher, and he said he was very interested in my arguments, but did not attempt to controvert them. I also showed him the unique work of the late Dr. J. Herbert Junius Hardwicke of Sheffield, a copy of which the author presented me with, entitled *Evolution and Creation*, which he was unable to get any firm to either print or publish for him, and although he was a surgeon and a physician, he set up a composing-room behind his surgery, he illustrated, set up the type, printed and published the work himself; and the young curate who had just come out of college with the degree of Bachelor of Arts, said he was very interested with this extraordinary work, but did not attempt to answer any of its arguments. Moreover, he was quite satisfied that it was of no use trying to convert me to Christianity, because he found that I knew more about the evolution of religious beliefs than he did; so he expressed himself again as "very interested" in all I had said, and hoped that I would allow him to call upon me again.

I said, "Certainly. Call whenever you like. I shall be able to show you a large number of Freethought works that you will find just as interesting as the one I have shown you to-day." And then with a smile upon his countenance he departed.

Poor young fellow! I hope I did not shake his faith too violently. Anyhow, he asked for it; but I expect that he will not call again in a hurry.

During the last month or so I have been holiday-making in the country and at the seaside; but all the time I have been looking out for articles on religious subjects in the various Sunday papers, to see if I could find any that were worth making an article out of for the *Freethinker*. To tell the honest truth, I could not find any that I considered worth controversial powder and shot. This week, however, when I am at home again, I find an article in the *Sunday Herald* or *Sunday Graphic* (whichever you like to call it) entitled "Why Churches are Empty," which I think is open to a good deal of criticism.

It is by the Rev. W. Pennington Bickford, who we are informed "preaches to crowded congregations" at St. Clement Danes in the Strand—the "Oranges and Lemons," where there is a very small resident population. This of course, implies that he draws his congregation from parishioners of other parishes from various parts of London. As he presumably always gets a good audience, it is rather singular that he should take for his subject: "Why Churches are Empty."

Why not let the clergy who get such sparse congregations try and supply the answer?

However, this is what he says. When he asks the question, "Why do not people attend Church?" one answers: "I want my rest."

ANOTHER: "I don't like the Parson." "He and I don't hit it."

A THIRD: "Look at them that do go, what beauties they are. No Church for me, I say."

A FOURTH: "Go to Church to hear the drivel one

does, prayers rattled through, the Bible read in a way you can't understand or hear a word."

FIFTH: "Then there are some who are ashamed to be seen entering a place of worship; to be thought religious they deem a weakness unworthy of themselves."

SIXTH AND LASTLY: "To-day, unfortunately, we have to meet a greater stumbling-block, a new dead-lock. What is it we hear said to-day: 'What of your parsons and your bishops, why you are all at each others throats, and cannot or will not agree among yourselves what you can do and cannot do; what you mean to do in your places of worship. What can you expect of me? I'd rather be outside, thank you, and let you fight it out among yourselves.'"

Now it will be observed that all these objections to going to Church, except one, are given by persons who are nominally Christians; the one solitary exception comes from those who are probably *nothingarians*, and who are ashamed to be seen entering a place of worship and "to be thought religious they deem a weakness unworthy of themselves."

The Rev. W. Pennington Bickford does not appear to have come across any avowed Freethinkers, either in his parish or in his walks abroad. He has apparently not spoken to one who has replied: "I am a Freethinker and I do not go to Church because I regard the Christian Religion as an old and effete superstition. I neither believe in its doctrines, its miracles, nor its alleged teachings, and I look upon the character of the Christ of the Gospels as purely mythical." The rev. gentleman does not appear to have met such an one, and yet that there are tens of thousands of such persons in London nobody with their eyes and ears open can doubt. And yet he goes on to say: "All these (above answers) rise up before me as so many spectres as I write, and my heart grows heavy for so much truth lies in many of these answers; but I am one of those who believe that deep down in every man's heart there lies a hidden treasure, and that is his faith in a God. It may not be the same as yours or mine, but the precious seed lies dormant there! Perhaps unkindness has prevented its growth, being misunderstood, sickness, bad luck in business, the utterly unchristian spirit, words and life manifested in a Professed Christian."

Can any rational being conceive of more absurd reasons for any man abstaining from going to Church or becoming an Atheist?

Evidently the rev. gentleman knows nothing about the evolution of the God idea. He does not know that the savage was the first God-maker, and that the more man knows of nature the less he believes in God. But the Rev. W. Pennington Bickford goes on to declare that he has "firm confidence that there is no one who does not believe in a God, although strange as it may seem he does not always know it himself." Think of that and try and measure the ignorance and conceit of a clergyman of the Church of England who would make such a statement in a popular Sunday journal in the twentieth century!

But if the people do not go to Church, where do they go on Sunday? My answer is: In the summer they go to the parks and listen to the bands; they go up the river; or into the country—and when the evenings are dark in the West End they go to the Cinema and see the latest pictures. All over London the picture theatres are open on Sundays, and if it were not for the superstition of Christians the ordinary theatres would be open also; and people seeking recreation, amusement or instruction would be able to get it on the one day of the week that the vast majority have leisure enough to enjoy it. The Opera House should be open also, and those who love good music would then be able to get it without hindrance

from the narrow-minded and bigoted section of the community. But every Sunday during the winter months tens of thousands attend regularly the concerts of the National Sunday League. The real reason why the great masses of the people do not go to Church is because they feel themselves out of harmony with the religious atmosphere. Christianity has done a lot of evil in the past, as the story of its history will reveal to every open-minded person who is prepared to look the hard facts of life in the face. But Christianity is on the wane—dying fast; some think that it is virtually dead already. As the distinguished novelist, Mr. H. G. Wells, makes one of the characters in his latest work *Meanwhile* say: "Christianity passes. Passes! It has gone! It has littered the beaches of life with churches, cathedrals, shrines and crucifixes, prejudices and intolerances, like the sea-urchins and starfish and empty shells and lumps of stinging jelly upon the sands here after a tide. A tidal wave of Egypt. And it has left a multitude of wriggling theologians and confessors and apologists hopping and burrowing in the warm nutritious sand. But in the hearts of living men, what remains of it now? Doubtful scraps of Arianism. Phrases. Sentiments. Habits."

What will the Rev. W. Pennington Bickford think of this?

ARTHUR B. MOSS.

## The Contemporary Outlook.

(Continued from page 684.)

In the Atheistic progress of modern thought, theism has come into its historical position. Atheism was the denial of theism. To Atheism theism was a proposition which might be affirmed but was denied. But this denial has been effected by the transitional gainsayers of theism. Theism is in the discard. Thought has come into a place where its denial is no more meaningful than an affirmation of nominalism could be. The possibility of the significant affirmation has passed. From the position beyond theism such argument is meaningless. To metaphysics it can no longer have any content. Theism has grown meaningless and void. It has been long shed.

The answer to agnosticism is analytical and historical. The genetic relationship of all forms of theism to thorough-going animism fixed the utter untenability of agnosticism. We do know and there is no question about it. There is no uncertainty about the factual status of animism. Theism is but a more conventionalized animism. There is only an insignificant quantitative difference between maintaining a multiplicity of independent animi, a limited specialized number, or even a single one. The place and significance of the animistic conception throughout its career is definitely indicated. It is basically an hypostasis, an insertion of a construct beneath phenomena. This is the fundamental invalidity of the whole animistic method. Such a procedure is factually entirely irrelevant and illegitimate. The entire account of the animistic method makes its status too patent to excuse the agnostic evasion of relegating its central conceptions to the unknown to safely retain them as stated. This is a wholly untenable dodge to keep the notions without facing the absurdities inherent in them. Under such circumstances the indefinite partial or contingent acceptance of theism on the fallacious ground of unknowableness is a base elusion. The unknowing is a very willing ignorance. The history, invalidity and worthlessness of the entire theistic assumption are

open to all. The recognition of its status disposes of the methodological error.

But still there are those few apologists who gratefully bow to animism for the legacy it has bequeathed them. Each order of thought has its excrescences which somehow persist after it. For that short interim they remain to distort and confuse. The morgue of theism still preserves such reminiscent survivals. The actual utilization of the method is of the past, but it still bears an influence. The incomplete eradicability of the aboriginal psychology and its primitive thought process allows animism some partial permanence. It is only slowly submerged. It is perhaps ontological and atavistic, and so able to recur through unemerged continuance or forced regression. Even though it has elsewhere undergone very complete dissolution, the animistic attitude is sometimes applied to the universe as a whole. Yet here its use is as absurd as within any other range. Striking a body that has occasioned one some discomfiture when one knows it to be incompetent of a substituted stimulus is equally rational with maintaining such an animate relationship toward the cosmos which is patently no more capable of a conditioned reflex. The alleged psychic outlet of such cosmic regard might be more effective in an actual assault upon the material occasion of injury. The two situations are comparably ignoble. The nature of the cosmic sentiment does not make it less so.

In the course of time the specific characteristic of what is recognized as the religious response comes to be merely psychology with a certain false reference. Its basic criterion is the misinterpretation of a class of psychic events along traditionally established lines. In the shallow and ungenue late fictional and pragmatic purposed reinstatement of the theistic conceptual outfit this was tacitly recognized. But only actualities can get a response. The assumed reaction to a rectification is sterile. It can at most garner a false attribution. The psychological events were no doubt genuine and intrinsic, but they were given a false extrinsic placement. That is what made them religious. If the fact is taken as the unit of communication, there are two orders of facts, internal facts, facts with external reference. The outer facts are stated, the inner facts expressed. In the statement the construct is integral. In the expression it is extraneous to the experience. In the so denominated religious experiences the construct was represented as a component.

Few could unhesitatingly summon the hardihood to deprive others of whatever evasions are their needful retreat from life as it is. But when their such speculative bastardies are objectified, institutionalized, propagandized, held between others and the open approach to authentic experience, they are in no wise to be condoned. They are to be divested and destroyed. An alleged complete psychic implicitness is their last argument. To safeguard and enlarge their conceptuality they would effect its dissemination and perpetuity. But in this very psychic implicitness is the most radical indictment than can be brought against theism. The declaration that it is implicit in their experience means that their experience is depreciated by that very implicitness. In the end it seems best that the hurt and the allure, the need and the essay of living should be congruous, that all should be sought and perhaps met on the same plane on which the want came into being, that none should be guided elsewhere and perhaps none left to escape.

These are considerations which have a far reach. The factual citation of the correlation of metatheism to intelligence is at hand.<sup>1</sup> If any would question

the meaning of intelligence, the answer is that such is essential to any genuine apprehension of experience which, without it, is diffuse and lacking its full import. Without intelligence the other entrants of experience are as colour without design. In some instances experience may have intrinsic coherence of its own. But for the most part without intelligence experience must remain unintegrated and largely aberrant. This intelligence is not only a psychological but a cultural faculty as well. To carry the finest cumulative intelligence of man, the completest and foremost philosophical attitude and equipment, is requisite to the fullest living. Metatheism is clearly in this position of advance. It is the ultimate formula though many may hedge. Theism and its intricacies of elaboration have been put by as of no further account. This progress was elemental. The end has been attained. There is no return.

CURTIS BRUEN.

(To be concluded.)

### Romance and Paraffin.

THE presiding genius who filled up the valleys between countries with water called the sea, besides making it difficult for two-legged life to easily exterminate one another also gave to mankind a solace, a source of wonder, a mystical illusion where the wings of romance hovered—from the pursuit of the Golden Fleece, to such tender and moving stories of Tristram and Iseult and Hero and Leander. Youth at the prow and pleasure at the helm was alliterative romance, the sea is kind, the restless winds of freedom lisp, roar and chatter over thee our mother. With greediness, and in the spirit of adventure, a ten ton fishing smack was boarded at Ramsgate. And we set sail for a fortnight's deep-sea fishing, the skipper, his mate, an old man like Father Neptune, and myself in a sweater, with a copy of Shelley, carefully wrapped in brown paper. Would it not be the seventh heaven to hear the murmuring of summer seas, to be rocked to sleep in the oldest cradle in the world? Romance said yes.

A brave showing was made up till six o'clock in the evening—we had left at three in the afternoon. I sat in the stern of the boat; the spray coming over made it impossible to read. The sun began to sink and I was hungry. Below, I made an attempt to eat salt bacon and biscuits—no bread had been brought on board. Into the kettle, tea, sugar, milk and water were put, and the lot brought to the boil. Spartan diet; in a few days I should get used to it. My stomach, however, did not altogether take to this violence. I nibbled and sipped, and quoted Macbeth to myself; "May good digestion wait on health, and appetite on both." Shakespeare, even at sea, was consoling.

Before it grew dusk, I tried to enter the world in which the skipper's mate lived; he rightly regarded me as a curiosity. When I asked him if he could swim, he replied, "What's the use in that?" Great waves were heaving as though they wished to eat us, smack and all. Then I went down below to sleep.

In a half-awake slumber for about an hour, with the steady snoring of Father Neptune on the opposite bunk, I began to experience sea-sickness. To be on my back, quelled the inner angry rage, and as an ironical variation vermin began to bite. Father Neptune was sleeping, sweating and snoring; did they bite him I wondered? In the midst of internal disorder, a cat was sitting on a mat regarding me with—was it pity? Then, between scratching and bodily adjustment, the brain began to play tricks. "The cat is on the mat," sniggered one little devil. "A cat may look at a King," said another, with an absurd sense of dramatic fitness. Another one of the crowd began, "I love little pussy

<sup>1</sup> *The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological and Statistical Study.* James H. Leuba, 1916.

... "With insistence, the little devil with his "the cat is on the mat" ruled the roost. Father Neptune got up and took the tiller over from the mate, who was soon in the land of dreams. Thoroughly uncomfortable, I arose, and thinking that fresh air would, in some miraculous manner cure a turbulent stomach, I succeeded in reaching the top of the steps, where I sat down with my head over the compass lit up with a small paraffin lamp. Pah, what a stink paraffin had! At village fairs I loved the smell of it; here on the boundless deep I loathed it. If I had staggered on deck the consequences would have been beyond imagination. I steadily sat in the position watching the needle dither, tremble, swing and falter; my body inside and out was thoroughly seasoned with paraffin. In the finish, the cold and discomfort drove me down to the bunk. Father Neptune, at the tiller, was singing, and I heard his ditty to the sound of the wind through the rigging and the flapping of sails.

"I thought that she loved me,  
But I found it was not true."

I had no stomach for his song. Later, the net was lowered; they could have cheerfully lowered me with it. Then, with ropes round the steam winch, it was raised. The lovely lights on the fish as they flopped about on the deck were, perhaps, worth the discomfort that had now turned to despair. Once, a huge boulder was raised in the net and cast back again with suitable oaths. Dawn began to break. We had been trawling in Rye Bay, which was now left behind, and the little doll's houses at Hastings looked to me like the promised land. Father Neptune gave a huge conger a mighty kick, and its flabby body quivered in a corner among the crabs, hooks, and spars. My retreat from the sea was made on the skipper's shoulders at Hastings. When my feet touched the earth the houses seemed to be rocking, and the earth was curving. The catch of the night was sold for eighteen shillings. Three men's wages, the wear and tear of tackle, the coarse food, the danger of drowning, for eighteen shillings to make one course of a dinner. I bade them all goodbye, tucked my unopened brown paper parcel under my arm and made a way for some food. What on earth had possessed me to be mauled in such a manner? Romance, that brazen baggage had cheated me of sleep, of immunity from vermin, of inner calm. In a looking-glass I beheld a face with bloodshot eyes, keen black spikes sticking out of my chin, and over my skin a green pallor made me look like something brought up from the deep. Stretched full length on a railway carriage seat on my return home, the wheels seemed to be mocking me... "People born to be hanged"... "People born to be hanged." The little devils who had danced with glee in giving me elementary lessons on the cat were now silent. Father Neptune might be singing about his romance. I had just missed going out in a trawler for a fortnight in the North Sea, and the fact that ice was taken with them conveyed to me the idea that they did not return tomorrow. I will raise my hat to a fisherman or a plaice, but to Romance—never. Things are not what they seem.

WILLIAM REPTON.

American Notes.

MOTHER INDIA.  
One of the most impressive of recent books is *Mother India*, written by a famous American woman. I believe there is an English edition, published by Cape's, London. Unlike most foreign criticisms of British administration in India, this book tells its story fairly, and with obvious sincerity. Miss Katherine Mayo's object is to get at the real obstacles to progress and happiness in India. She makes due allowance for all that can be said against successive British administrations. But when all the other causes of India's misery have been weighed, she comes to the conclusion that religion, and nothing but religion, drags India down, and will continue to degrade its peoples below the level of civilization until the religions of India are civilized. The book is sickening in its descriptions and photographs of the brutalities, the disgusting customs, the

vile habits of rich and poor Hindus. Miss Mayo deserves the thanks of us all for her courage in writing frankly of very disgusting facts.

The theosophists, like Tagore and other romancers, have merely tried to deceive us as to what Hinduism really is.

Miss Mayo, with acute judgment, sums up the help and guidance obtainable from British and other missionaries:—

Searching missionaries' reports for light out of their long experience, one finds neat rows of dots, marking the silent tombs of the indecorous. For the missionary is thinking first of the doves at home, whence his money comes, and second, of the super-sensitive Indians on whose sufferance he depends.

The author points to the population of India, which has increased by 54,000,000 during the past fifty years and is now "controlled" indeed... but "controlled by disease and disease only." And half the population of British India consists of illiterates—kept illiterate, in spite of Governmental provision and wish, solely because the religions of India steadfastly oppose education, not only of 28½ million "untouchables," but of 121 million Indian women.

Here then is a sacred trio indeed. Religion, and illiteracy; then disease as the only form of birth-control.

U.S.A. BEAUTY CONTESTS.

Beauty contests and bathing contests were denounced by the National Council of Catholic Women at its recent Congress at Washington. The President of the Catholic Big-Sisters Society shed pathetic tears over the terrible immodesty of bobbed hair and jazz bands. The Vice-President of the National Council of Catholic Women, after shocking her hearers by telling awful tales of girls who swim, made nuns and priests blush by claiming that the parents are most to blame for these terrible crimes.

MORE "K.K.K." RELIGION.

Now that the ex-Mayor of Indianapolis is in jail for his misdeeds, in subordinating municipal efficiency to the necessity of giving well-paid jobs to the Klu Klux Klan members, he is making all arrangements for his wife, Mrs. Duval, to succeed him in the Mayoral chair, which he will not be allowed to hold for some years to come.

Meanwhile, a church organization called the "Hustling Hundred," members of which mostly belong to the denomination called "Disciples of Christ," has rallied all the lawless gang who supported Duval, to make a further bid for "85 per cent. of the paid offices," which the K.K.K. forced Duval to promise them.

The Attorney-General has had to warn the same citizens, if any are left:—

To take care lest forces parading under the guise of religious fervour undo all that has been done in the recent political renaissance.

THE MAN NOBODY KNOWS WHAT HE SAID.

So much has recently appeared in American papers, copied, no doubt, into English ones, about "The Man," and "The Book" nobody knows that I have been investigating both again for the nth time.

Modern Bible students, of all schools, have abandoned the old theory of inspiration, and "everybody knows" that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, whoever they were, were not present when the Man Nobody Knows was alone. Nobody knows, therefore, how the authors of the gospels knew what the Man Nobody Knows thought and said when Nobody was present to hear and report these things. Under the old theories of inspiration this difficulty did not arise. But on any theory of inspiration accepted or acceptable to modernist minds, how on earth can we know that Jesus *thought* certain things, that he had secret reasons for certain acts, and that events that happened while he was alone are fully and no doubt accurately reported.

EVOLUTION PATRONIZED BY RELIGION.

Does anybody know "Professor James Simpson, of New College, Edinburgh"? He is described as the

author of several books, telling the world how easy it is to combine science and religion.

This gentleman has come all the way from Scotland to preach at the Chicago Orchestra Hall, and is announced with a great flourish of trumpets (and his photograph) as the author of the wonderful discovery that "Evolution is God's Way to Develop the World."

The following is not part of a report of his Chicago sermon, but is given publicity as the marvellous originality and profundity of Professor Simpson's "thought." The Chicago public will be sure to flock to hear this philosopher, with these new and convincing ideas.

Science describes and religion interprets. Both are necessary to an understanding of the world as a whole. Science yields increasing data as to the story of the slow ascent of man, but science can offer no interpretation of the fact of man's existence. Nevertheless science offers no contradiction to the meaning of life and man's destiny which have been revealed to us by religion.

#### THE "REV." CAPTAIN KIDD.

Christ Church, Middletown, New Jersey, celebrated its 259th anniversary recently. Christ Church is said to have been founded by the "celebrated" buccaneer Captain Kidd and his pirate crew. So far from repudiating their "pious founder," the anniversary celebrators showed that the present clergyman, Rev. Ernest Mandeville, is proud of the murderous ruffian whose ill-gotten gains endowed the church wherein he worshipped. A monument has also been erected in the church grounds to William Leeds, one of Kidd's henchmen, who left property to the same fortunate and appreciative House of God. The present pastor and congregation took part in the festivities which included a "treasure-hunt," and a "pirate ball." The congregation all dressed up as pirates, down to the appropriate sea-boots and kerchief.

Perhaps the Rev. Ernest Mandeville preached a sermon from the fitting text—Job xii. 6: "The tabernacles of robbers prosper." GEORGE BEDBOROUGH.

## Correspondence.

### OUR RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—In the estimation of Freethinkers, all the discussion about Transubstantiation and the Unrealities of the Sacrament would appear to be about as sensible as a discussion of the unrealities of Father Christmas. It is difficult to understand why prelates, who hasten to explain that they are not ignorant men, should spend their time in upholding doctrines which others who can make no pretence of learning, not only cannot accept, but utterly repudiate as repugnant to common sense, except that these prelates have their vested interests at stake.

They are whining over the susceptibilities of pious Christians being disturbed, but forget that their beloved Church has murdered and imprisoned those who fought to rid intolerance: who suffered both physically and mentally for freedom of thought, and for the dissemination of truth and righteousness.

By their intolerance they perpetuate that characteristic English hypocrisy of which we read in the trashy Sunday journals, which likewise have vested interests at stake. "'Tis for money that the parson says his prayers." CINE SERE.

### Society News.

#### NORTH LONDON BRANCH.

We were glad to find a better audience at the Reform Club last Sunday, when Mr. Cutner's address on "The Failure of Socialism" evoked a lively and interesting discussion, in which Mr. Palmer, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Lombardi, Mr. Judge, and others took part. Next session we hope to arrange a debate between Mr. Cutner and Mr. Ebury. To-night, Mr. Fred Mann is addressing us on "Can a Lawyer be Honest." We hope for a good audience.—K. B. K.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

Notices of Lectures, etc., must reach us by the 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.): 7.30, Mr. Fred Mann—"Can a Lawyer be Honest?"

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7.0, Eustace Miles—"SELF—Health."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (The London Institution Theatre, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11.30, John A. Hobson, M.A.—"The Population Problem."

THE METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (34, George Street, Manchester Square, W.1): 7.30, "Is Secularism Sound?" (A reply to Mr. Robert Harding.) Thursday, November 3, at 7.30, at 101, Tottenham Court Road, a Social and Dance, 18. Tuesday, November 1, at 7.30, Captain Vincent—"Solantropy."

GRAND CO-OPERATIVE CARNIVAL DANCE.—(Organized by the Metropolitan Secular Society), will be held at Slater's Oak Restaurant, 18-24 Kensington High Street, W.8., on Thursday, November 10, 1927, 7.30 to 11.30 p.m. The Gold Star Dance Band. Tickets 2s., from Mr. Jones, 9, Victoria Grove, W. 8.

#### OUTDOOR.

FREETHOUGHT MEETINGS.—(Corner of North End Road, Fulham—near Walham Green Church): Tuesdays and Saturdays, 7.30. Speakers—F. Bryant and F. Moister, Local Freethinkers' attendance invited.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common): 11.30, Mr. F. P. Corrigan. Wednesday, November 2, at 8 p.m. (Clapham Old Town): Mr. L. Ebury.

THE METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Hyde Park): 11.30 and 3.0, Speakers—Messrs. Botting, Baker, Parton and Hanson.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 3.0, Messrs. A. Hyatt, B. A. Le Maine; 6.0, Messrs. Campbell-Everden, Carter and Jackson. (Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith, W.): 3.0, Mr. Campbell-Everden, A Lecture. Freethought lectures every Wednesday and Friday in Hyde Park at 7.30. Various Lecturers.

### COUNTRY.

#### INDOOR.

CHESTER-LE-STREET BRANCH N.S.S. (Assembly Rooms, Front Street) 7.15, Mr. T. Brown—"Study of Man from Rocks." Chairman: Mr. Jas. Davidson, Junr.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY, Branch of the N.S.S. (Saloon Hall, City Hall, enter by Candleriggs): Chapman Cohen—Subjects: (11.30 a.m.) "The Priest and the Child"; (6.30 p.m.)—"The New Warfare between Religion and Science."

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (18 Colquitt Street, off Bold Street): 7.30, Mr. E. Egerton Stafford—A Lecture. Admission free. Discussion.

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Chorlton Town Hall, All Saints, Manchester): The Hon. J. M. Robertson (3.0)—"Fifty Years of Modern Thought"; (6.30) "The Present Posture of Christianity." Teas provided.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE BRANCH N.S.S. (Socialist Club, Pilgrim Street Arcade): 3.0, Members' Meeting.

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N.S.S. (Plymouth Chambers, Co-operative Buildings, Drake's Circus): Meeting on November 3, at 8.0 p.m. All members are requested to attend.

SWANSEA AND DISTRICT BRANCH N.S.S. (1a Sloan Street): 6.30, Members' Meeting.

#### OUTDOOR.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N.S.S. Meetings held in the Bull Ring, Monday, Wednesday and Friday, at 7 p.m.

## 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.)

# Religion and Sex

A Study of Religious Belief, and of the play of Suppressed Sexualism in Religious Manifestations.

BY  
**CHAPMAN COHEN**

Price - SIX SHILLINGS

Postage 6d.

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

## FOUR GREAT FREETHINKERS:

GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE

By JOSEPH McCABE.

The Life and Work of one of the Pioneers of the Secular and Co-operative movements in Great Britain. With four plates. In Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 2s. 6d. (postage 3d.).

CHARLES BRADLAUGH

By THE RIGHT HON. J. M. ROBERTSON.

An Authoritative Life of one of the greatest Reformers of the Nineteenth Century, and the only one now obtainable. With four portraits. Cloth Bound, 2s. 6d. (postage 3d.).

VOLTAIRE

By THE RIGHT HON. J. M. ROBERTSON.

In Paper Covers 1s. 6d. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 2s. 6d. (postage 3d.).

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL

By C. T. GORHAM.

A Biographical Sketch of America's greatest Free-thought Advocate. With four plates. In Paper Covers, 1s. 6d. (postage 2d.). Cloth Bound, 2s. 6d. (postage 3d.).

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

## PIONEER LEAFLETS

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

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

PECULIAR CHRISTIANS. By CHAPMAN COHEN.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By A. D. McLAREN.

DOES GOD CARE? By W. MANN.

DO YOU WANT THE TRUTH?

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

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

Publications issued by

## THE SECULAR SOCIETY, Ltd.

A GRAMMAR OF FREETHOUGHT. By CHAPMAN COHEN. A Statement of the Case for Freethought, including a Criticism of Fundamental Religious Doctrines. Cloth bound, 5s., postage 3½d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK. By G. W. FOOTB and W. P. BALL. For Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians. Fifth Edition. 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

MISTAKES OF MOSES. By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL. 2d., postage ¼d.

WHAT IS IT WORTH? By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL. A Study of the Bible. 1d., postage ¼d.

GOD-EATING. By J. T. LLOYD. A Study in Christianity and Cannibalism. 3d., postage ¼d.

MODERN MATERIALISM. By W. MANN. A Candid Examination. 1s. 6d., postage 2d.

A FIGHT FOR RIGHT. A Verbatim Report of the Decision in the House of Lords *in re* Bowman and Others *v.* The Secular Society, Limited. With Introduction by Chapman Cohen. 6d., postage 1d.

GOD AND EVOLUTION. By CHAPMAN COHEN. A Straightforward Essay on the Question. 6d., postage 1d.

WHAT IS MORALITY? By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. A Careful Examination of the Basis of Morals from the Standpoint of Evolution. 4d., postage 1d.

THE RELIGION OF FAMOUS MEN. (Second Edition.) By WALTER MANN. Price 1d., postage ¼d.

DEITY AND DESIGN. By CHAPMAN COHEN. An Examination of the Famous Argument of Design in Nature. 1d., postage ¼d.

Can be ordered through

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

## "MAN TO MAN"

the world o'er shall brithers be for a' that." If it be not the purpose of Rationalists and Freethinkers to level the barriers between race and race and man and man, then they have no aim at all. And this exalted cause does it not weld Freethinkers and Rationalists in a closer-knit brotherhood than that of clan or country? Is this not the magnetic force which draws us to each other; makes Rationalists and Freethinkers trust each other, support each other, and strengthen each other by that sense of solidarity without which a cause never advances? We know this is the power behind nearly all the welcome business we secure. Think, too, how unnatural it is for brother to betray brother, and you will be very sure we never make a claim we cannot substantiate, nor an assertion we cannot prove. Most certainly we can do your tailoring satisfactorily, and do it all by post. You should write at once for any of the following:—

- Gents' A to D Patterns, Suits from 55/-;
- Gents' E Patterns, Suits all at 67/6;
- Gents' F to H Patterns, Suits from 75/-;
- Gents' I to M Patterns, Suits from 98/-;
- Gents' Overcoat Patterns, prices from 48/6;
- or Ladies' Fashion & Pattern Sets, Costumes from 58/-; Coats from 44/-

All Pattern Sets accompanied by Price List, Measurement Form, Measuring Tape, Style Book, and stamped addresses for their return. Samples cannot be sent abroad except upon your promise to faithfully return them.

**MACCONNELL & MABE**

(David Macconnell, Proprietor),

New Street,  
Bakewell,  
Derbyshire

# Materialism Re-stated

BY

## CHAPMAN COHEN

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

JUDGING from the reception given to this work, it is one for which many Freethinkers and others were waiting. Materialism has suffered so much at the hands of both its friends and its enemies that restatement of the whole position from the historical, scientific, and philosophic points of view had become highly necessary. An attempt is here made to supply that need. Materialism is expounded in simple language, free from the technical jargon of both the scientist and the philosopher. The work stands alone in both the method of exposition and the nature of the defence against hostile criticism. It is a book that should certainly be in the hands of all who take pleasure in clear thinking and simple exposition.

### Contents:

A QUESTION OF PREJUDICE—SOME CRITICS OF MATERIALISM—  
MATERIALISM IN HISTORY—WHAT IS MATERIALISM?—SCIENCE AND  
PSEUDO-SCIENCE—THE MARCH OF MATERIALISM—ON CAUSE AND  
EFFECT—THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY.

Cloth bound, price 2/6. Postage 2½d.

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

## Concerning Man's Origin

BY

### Sir ARTHUR KEITH

Being the Presidential Address before the British Association with essays on Further Evidence and some Unsolved Problems, Capital as a Factor in Evolution, etc., etc.

In Cloth : ONE SHILLING  
Postage 1½d.

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

A Seasonable Book . . .

## HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE

BY

### Prof. J. W. DRAPER.

THIS is an unabridged edition of Draper's great work, of which the standard price is 7s. 6d. The Secular Society, Limited, has broken all records in issuing this work at what is to-day no more than the price of a good-sized pamphlet. There is no other work that covers quite the same ground, and it should be in the possession of every Freethinker.

### Two Shillings

Cloth Bound. 396 Pages.

Price 2/- Postage 4½d.

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