

The
FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. XLVII.—No. 48

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1927

PRICE THREEPENCE.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Religion and Morals.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	753
<i>The Bible.—J. T. Lloyd</i> - - - - -	754
<i>Hail and Farewell.—Mimnermus</i> - - - - -	756
<i>Modern Science and Materialism.—W. Mann</i> - - - - -	756
<i>How I Became a Freethinker.—F. Davics</i> - - - - -	758
<i>The Freethinker.—J. W. Wood</i> - - - - -	758
<i>What We are Fighting.—Chapman Cohen</i> - - - - -	761
<i>The "Freethinker" Endowment Trust.—Chapman Cohen</i>	761
<i>Rationalism and Education.—J. Reeves</i> - - - - -	763
<i>The Amazing Achievement of Atheism.—Athos Zeno</i> -	764
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions.

Religion and Morals.

I SUGGESTED last week that, in attempting to reconcile religion and science, Professor Julian Huxley was giving definitions of the two with a view to harmonizing them, not giving an impartial review of their subject matter. A consequence of this was, as I tried to show, that science had to be defined in such a way that it left the essence of science altogether unnoticed. And very much the same result ensues when he comes to deal with religion.

The concern of a definition is with what is, says Professor Huxley, and with that I quite agree. I also agree, generally, that "primitive relations usually concern themselves very little with abstract morality, and equally little with scientific facts and principles. In place of morality they have taboo and strict ritual, in place of searching patiently for scientific truths they have invented mythologies." He is on less secure ground when he says that the "feeling of sacredness . . . is of the essence of religion," because it is clear from the context that he is beginning to use "sacredness" not in the primitive religious sense of "taboo," but in the later ethical sense of "morally admirable"; and if one begins by making a thing what one wishes it to mean, it is likely to end by being just what one wants. Having got the rabbit into the hat while no one is looking, it is easy to pull it out in full view of the audience. Thus, as thought develops, we are told, religion "begins to find goodness and virtue sacred . . . it begins to feel the sacredness of truth, and so to find in fact and the play of pure reason upon fact the intellectual basis for religious feeling and belief." So the past of religion being made to be what it never has been, and science being made to mean what it is not—the mere pursuit of truth and knowledge—the two things are brought from the realms of fairyland, and their future described thus:—

The intellect (Science) must provide a trellis on which the tender shoots of religious feeling may

grow, by which belief may be guided into action, and once we hold truth sacred, we shall come to look for science as the basis of our future theology. That will have the effect of shifting the centre of gravity of religious thought from the next world to this, and of substituting for impossible dreams of future bliss (or degrading dreams of future torment) a real appreciation of spiritual value in this life.

* * *

The Meaning of "Sacred."

That is quite an affecting picture, the only drawback is that it is so very, very, wrong. To begin with, and it is one of the commonplaces of anthropology, "sacredness" associated with religion never had, and has not now, any necessary association with either moral or intellectual values. All it means in religion is something sacred to the Gods, something which is so infected with supernatural influence that it is dangerous to approach it without ceremonial precautions. That is all it meant in early religions, and we have the same meaning with us to-day. What moral or intellectual significance is there associated with labelling a church as sacred? Or articles used in religious ceremonies? "Sacred," "unclean," "holy," all have about the same meaning in religion. They mean something that is placed under the protection of the tribal "joss," and is dangerous for the unauthorized person to meddle with. Half an hour spent searching among a volume of researches into the history of religion would have made this much plain. But then it might have prevented a reconciliation between religion and science, and we should have had two different definitions placed before us. But to define religion as what it is, is to make it scientifically impossible. I agree that the business of a definition is with what is; but why at once proceed to give us what isn't?

* * *

The Meaning of Religion.

Now, if Professor Huxley had just turned to, say, Tylor or Frazer, he would have found the former defining religion as "the belief in spiritual beings," and the latter as "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man, which are believed to control the course of nature and of human life." And these definitions really tell us something about religion, and cover religions from primitive to modern. But to define religion in this way would have made it impossible to reconcile it with science; for science will have nothing to do with spiritual beings controlling nature. Professor Huxley is quite well aware that the granting of this would make all science a glaring absurdity, and turn the intellect into a nightmare. Science can have nothing to do with spooks, whether within or above nature; and religion cannot live without them.

Civilizing the Gods.

It is quite true that, with the growth of civilization, religions are compelled to pay attention to the ethical and intellectual side of life. How could it be otherwise? After all, religions are compelled to deal with man as he is; and man as he is, is affected by the play of social and other forces whether he believes in the gods or not. If he happens to believe that the gods desire him to do something that is destructive of social life, and he does it, there is soon an end to both him and his gods; and there is no telling how many groups of people may have disappeared in the past because they persisted in doing something which their gods required. But if man is to live he must do those things that enable him to live; and if the gods are to live they must not prohibit such things entirely. Even a Chancellor of the Exchequer knows there is a point beyond which he must not tax his people if he is to preserve his revenues. And, really, this means the quite ordinary evolutionary deduction that the pressure of the social forces are all the time taming and training the nature of man, and at the same time taming and transforming religious beliefs. Social man becomes conscious of the value of truth, and knowledge, and beauty, and having become conscious of these values, the organized religions with which he is associated are compelled to adapt their teachings to his notions of value or lose him altogether. You can see it any time you wish to observe it by noting how the churches, having damned a doctrine up hill and down dale, conclude, when they see that people will have it, that it is a part of "true religion." What Professor Huxley has been observing is the pressure of the social forces on religion, and of the growth of knowledge in causing a modification of religious belief.

* * *

Why Religion?

But of this there is not a hint in Professor Huxley's article. There is only a pathetically ineffective attempt to provide some room for a "religion" in the future, so that he may bring comfort to those who mean by religion something entirely different from what he means, and thus help them to keep alive a little longer a religion in which he does not believe. For when we go on to see what it is that has given man what he knows of the world and of himself, we find that it is not religion, but science. It has, he points out, "given man a vaster, a more complex, and a more wonderful universe . . . It has changed the notions of man's origin, capacities and destiny. The sciences, biology, physiology, and psychology are teaching men how to control disease, and how to promote health. And the scientific love of knowledge and of truth has developed the intellectual powers of man." Why not, then, leave the future to science? It certainly looks as though we could get on very well without religion. But something must be found for religion to do, if it is to have a future. And to find it something to do, science is reduced to the position of a "trellis," on which "the tender shoots of religious feeling" are to be draped!

Was there ever a more banalistic conclusion than this? What, in the name of all that is sensible, are the tender shoots of religious feeling? If there is any meaning attaching to that expression, it must mean feelings associated with the objects of religious worship—spirits, gods, ghosts, etc., etc. Does Professor Huxley mean that after science has all these years been fighting the conception of natural forces being controlled by some "spiritual" or supernatural power, that it has now to content itself with playing the part of a trellis on which religion may drape it-

self? And merely so that religion may have a future. Science is far more likely to provide a gallows for religion than a trellis.

* * *

How Long?

One wonders when this game of non-Christian and non-religious scientists going out of their way to give succour to hard-pressed religion will cease. What is the reason for it? Is it because so many people still believe in religion? That is obvious, but it offers no justification whatever for a man of science inventing definitions of religion, and providing imaginary functions for it, merely to give it a longer lease of life. That is the business of a parson, and it should be the work of a sanely scientific thinker to prevent people being led astray by such specious arguments. What is the use of adding one more to the thousands of futile attempts to reconcile two things that are in their very nature utterly and essentially opposed? If Professor Huxley is correct when he says that science will help to do away with the energy-sapping belief in Providence, and will stir us up to see how we can make our own lives and those of others best worth living—not merely in comfort or money, but in the pursuit of truth and the love of true beauty, in disinterested work, in the facing and overcoming of suffering,

what, in the name of all that is sensible is there left for religion to do? We do not need, surely, after all this has been done by science, to maintain great religious organizations merely to come in at the end and to say "Amen"! There is no need to-day for men who do not believe in any of the religions of the world to spend their time and energy in providing excuses for them to continue a little longer. The greater need for such as have the ear of the public to tell them the truth about religion; to make the public realize what is known concerning the origin and nature of religion, and so end the reign of the greatest delusion that has ever oppressed the mind of man.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

The Bible.

THE Rev. R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D., is one of the best known Congregational ministers, and has been pastor of the Lyndhurst Road Church, Hampstead, since the year 1880. He was educated at Shrewsbury and New College, Oxford, and in 1879 he became fellow of New College and lecturer on history. His publications are numerous, including *Inspiration and the Bible*, *The Book of Proverbs*, and *Revelation and the Bible*. It has been his habit for many years to deliver a Monthly Lecture, which is often published in the *Christian World Pulpit*. His latest Monthly Lecture appears in the issue of that journal for November 17, and is entitled "How England Lost the Bible." In the *Christian World* of the same date, this lecture is specially advertized and characterized as "striking." Dr. Horton quotes largely from Mrs. Annie Swan and Sir Rider Haggard, both of whom call the Bible God's own Word. A prominent feature of most of the reverend gentleman's utterances is extravagance. He is so passionately fond of the superlative degree. Here is a sample:—

This great Book has become greater with every step of human inquiry and every extension of human knowledge, and the Bible as a whole is more wonderful and more valuable to-day than it ever was before, and it will be more wonderful and more valuable with each revolving cycle of time.

Apparently both Testaments are of equal value to

the minister of Lyndhurst Road Church. He says:—

It is no doubt the opinion of many people to-day that the Old Testament is out of date, but it is not. The study of comparative religion, for example, in the great works of Sir James Frazer, who finds the parallels of the stories of the Old Testament all over the world, has endued the Old Testament with a new interest.

Curiously enough the reverend gentleman does not seem to have grasped the true significance of the end achieved by the study of comparative religion, which is to show that all religions and all sacred writings are practically on a parallel. The result is that the Old Testament, or the New, cannot be treated as a thing apart, or fundamentally different from or superior to all other literature of the same class.

Has Dr. Horton forgotten his own book, *Inspiration and the Bible*, published in 1888, in which he exposed and held up to ridicule the then prevalent theory of the verbal and historical infallibility of the Scripture? Does he not still remember that in consequence of publishing that volume he had to endure severe persecution for a long time? All the circumstances of that time are as fresh as possible in the present writer's memory, as he contemplates this latest Monthly Lecture, with its bitter calumination of all who do not hold the preacher's present fanatical views on the Bible. Whilst admitting that Thomas Paine was "a very brilliant man," and wielded "a very gifted pen and wrote books which everyone could read and most people did read," yet the following is the way he depicts the man and his work:—

He began the habit which has been followed by a whole series of writers since, and is maintained to-day by the Secularist and Rationalist Press, of depreciating the Bible. It was he who in his Book, *The Age of Reason*, took the incidents of the Old Testament and exposed them to ridicule and depreciated the whole lesson and meaning of the Book. It shows no kind of disrespect to say that Thomas Paine was perfectly ignorant. He had no notion of what the Bible was, he had never read it except to pull it to pieces, he did not understand it, he did not feel its power, because he never tried to do so, and as far as we can tell, Thomas Paine, like the Rationalist writers of to-day, was a man without religious experience, without spiritual insight. This perpetual depreciation of the Book, coming from a man of great influence like Paine, penetrated our working-class. Ever since that time the mass of the people have been very ready to catch at every depreciatory remark that is made about the Bible. It is the perpetual subject of Rationalist and Secularist lectures in the open air and in their halls, to hold up to ridicule, in the spirit of Tom Paine, the matchless stories and the wonderful utterances of the Book that made their country.

We can easily imagine how very happy Dr. Horton felt while composing and delivering that vile attack upon Paine and his successors in the ministry of Free-thought. He charges the author of the *Age of Reason* with being "perfectly ignorant," though he cannot help knowing that it is a wholly lying charge. He asserts that he had no notion what the Bible really was; but the truth is that he had a much more accurate conception of what the Bible is than even Dr. Horton has. "Spiritual insight" is a vain invention of the theologians, just as "spirit" itself is. "Religious experience" is simply the outcome of holding certain supernatural beliefs, not one of which is capable of even the ghost of verification. The crime of which Free-thought writers and lecturers are guilty, according to this preacher, is that of "depreciating the Bible," or according to themselves, that of telling the truth about the Book.

Now think of some of "the matchless stories"

related in God's Book. Shall it be that of Jephthah burning his only daughter as a sacrifice unto the Lord, in token of gratitude for victory over his enemies? Here is another "matchless story" about the godly destruction of Jericho (Josh. vi. 19, 21): "And the city shall be devoted and all that is therein, to the Lord: only Raheb the harlot shall live, she and all that are with her in the house, because she hid the messengers that we sent . . . And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both men and women, both young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword." In 2 Kings xix. 35, we read: "And it came to pass that night that the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand; and when men arose early in the morning, behold they were all dead corpses." Here is one more truly "matchless story"; it is about the prophet Elisha: "And he went from thence unto Bethel, and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head. And he looked behind him and saw them, and cursed them in the name of the Lord. And there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tare forty and two children of them" (2 Kings ii. 23, 24). There are dozens of similar stories in the Bible, some of them more atrocious still. It is no present concern of ours whether they are true or false, our only point being that, in Dr. Horton's opinion, to hold them up to ridicule is to have no notion of what the Bible is. We maintain, on the contrary, that to ignore them, as preachers generally do, is to be guilty of gross hypocrisy, and of wilfully misleading their ignorant hearers.

One valuable lesson taught by Dr. Horton in this lecture is that Secularists and Rationalists have not laboured in vain during the last hundred and thirty years. On the reverend gentleman's own admission, as the direct result of their propaganda work, England has lost the Bible, and there is no immediate prospect of its finding it again. Strangely enough, despite his condemnation of the work carried on by Free-thinkers, in the early part of the lecture, later on he indulges in the following critical observation:—

Every scholar now recognizes that in the Pentateuch and in the historical books of the Old Testament in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles in the New Testament you are not to assume that the history there recorded is immune from all the liabilities to error which history always possesses. On the contrary, these histories must be treated as other histories are treated, and the truth of the history must be verified by facts from outside or by internal evidence. The historical part of the Bible is historical, and for that reason it must be treated as we treat other history, and we must find out what it means as we find out from other history what is true.

Dr. Horton is at once a sentimental pietist and a scholar. When he speaks as a sentimentalist he forgets all about scholarly criticism and gives way to mere emotionalism, as he does in most parts of the lecture now before us, but when he speaks as a critical scholar, as he does in one long paragraph in this discourse, he flings sentimentalism down the wind and talks sound sense. Free-thinkers differ from him in that they treat the Bible in precisely the same manner as they do all other literature, with the result that they read and know it much better than the majority of Christians do, and treat it with intelligent common sense.

J. T. LLOYD.

The first and last thing required of genius is the love of truth.—Goethe.

Hail and Farewell.

"To bear all naked truths
And to envisage circumstance, all calm,
That is the top of sovereignty."—Keats.

"Genius hovers with his sunshine and music close by
the darkest and deafest eras."—Emerson.

MR. GEORGE MOORE has stated that he will write no more books, and the news will be received with real regret by all those who care for the best work in contemporary literature. For Mr. Moore is not a mere minor writer. He has become a classic in his own lifetime, and has achieved this distinction by swimming against the stream of ordinary public opinion and not with it.

The wide-reading public does not fully appreciate the great debt it owes to Mr. Moore, who has helped more than any other man to remove the just reproach from contemporary English fiction that it is provincial, and that it consists chiefly of smooth tales, generally of love. When Mr. Moore began to write, over forty years ago, the art of novel-writing in this country had become conventional, even stereotyped. The genius of Dickens and Thackeray obscured this unpleasant fact so far as the reading public was concerned. Thackeray himself was, however, under no such illusion, and the preface to *Pendennis*, in which the author apologizes for his inability to present a full length portrait of a live man, is really pathetic. For the master's hand which painted the incomparable figure of "Becky Sharp" could have also limned a "Pendennis" which was other than a well-dressed automaton. No other writer in English attempted to bring the novel nearer to real life until George Moore, a young Irishman, made up his mind to effect this revolution. It was a bold project for a young man who had his spurs to win, but courage and genius accomplish so much in a conventional world.

In a few months Mr. Moore launched two books at an astonished public. The first almost frightened to death the squeamish readers of the circulating libraries, but the second was a real and unmistakable masterpiece, and with it Mr. Moore stormed the bastions of success.

This latter volume, *A Mummer's Wife*, is almost without a rival. It is not only a classic, but it is the finest realistic novel in our language. As a study of life it is extraordinarily vivid. The central idea, an elopement of a married woman is not unique. Many of the sugary novels freely selected by the circulating libraries have used this. But the heroine of *A Mummer's Wife* is middle-class, the wife of a small shopkeeper, and the author shows, with incomparable art, the development of a tragic tale. For the divorced woman marries her lover, becomes a dipsomaniac, and, step by step, loses propriety and decency, until she dies the death of a drunkard, impenitent and unloved. Had she been depicted as a lady of title, had her failings been clothed in well-chosen and decorative phrases, and much sentiment wasted thereon, then, probably, no outcry would have arisen. But Mr. Moore chose the better and more truthful way of describing life as it actually is, and in doing so he wrote himself a master in the oldest of the arts, a truly proud achievement on the part of an almost unknown writer.

Incidentally, Mr. Moore did another service to lovers of literature. At a time when novels were issued in three volumes at a guinea-and-a-half, he published his story at six shillings. This not only helped to break the boycott of the libraries, but, fortunately, introduced a great writer to the reading public at a time when literature was at the ebbtide of mediocrity and commonplace.

Since *A Mummer's Wife* startled prudish readers, and made Mr. Moore's reputation, he has added masterpiece to masterpiece. His *Esther Waters* cleverly turned the tables on his puritan detractors, and by the sheer force of genius compelled their unwilling admiration. For Mr. Moore has enjoyed the rare privilege of being one of the very few English authors who have been boycotted. It was for the sake of this audacious young Irishman, that the blameless British tradesman, the lamented Mr. Mudie, assumed the pontifical functions of the Bishop of Rome, and started an *Index Expurgatorius*, which caused wide perturbation in many a suburban drawing-room and sheltered home. But Mr. Moore had the sweetest of revenges, for with an enviable record of a shelf of masterpieces he has reached the coveted position where he can dispense with praise or blame.

The Confessions of a Young Man showed another facet of Mr. Moore's extraordinary genius. Few of the readers of his novels were prepared for this unique and brilliant work, another book without parallel in our tongue. Audacious in its criticisms it is wonderful how much truth underlies its brilliant writing and smart epigrams. Its intimate knowledge of the art of France, literary and pictorial, marked it off from other books.

To do even scant justice to Mr. Moore's rare genius would require columns of writing. Had *A Mere Accident*, *A Drama in Muslin*, and other of his books, been written by a foreigner, hundreds of altars would have flamed in worship. *The Brook Kerith* is more wonderful than Flaubert's *Solamibo*, and critics have exhausted the vocabulary of eulogy in praising the art of the French writer. Mr. Moore's freshness of treatment, and exquisite choice of language, which time cannot wither, manifests a personal force in our literature, which, to be quite candid, has mocked every imitator. Historians of English books will, one fancies, be compelled to consider the work of Mr. George Moore even more seriously than contemporary critics have done.

MIMNERMUS.

Modern Science and Materialism.

(Continued from page 741.)

THERE is a widely-spread impression, among religiously-minded people not acquainted with the history of scientific discovery, that the great scientific discoveries of the middle of the last century—like the conservation of energy, the indestructibility of matter, and the correlation of forces—was the work of atheistic philosophers, intent upon the destruction of religion. That is why believers are so pleased when they hear that these laws have been overthrown or discarded. The truth is, that the discoveries which have supplied the foundations of modern Materialism have been mainly the work of believers. The pursuit of science demands that when the scientist enters the laboratory, he must divest himself of all bias, philosophic or religious, and devote himself to a study of the facts. He leaves his religion, along with his umbrella, outside. It is true that some of them resume their religious attire when they come out, and try to expound their discoveries in conformity with their religion, or rather, their religion in conformity with their discoveries, for that is what it has come to now, but the materialist discards these fanciful trimmings and uses the facts. Of the men whose labours succeeded in establishing these fundamental concepts—Lavoisier, Rumford, Mayer, Colding, Grove and Helmholtz—only the two last-named, Grove and Helmholtz, were unbelievers in religion, and,

although they appear to have made their discoveries independently, they were preceded by the others.

Take the following sentence: "A simple elemental atom is really an immortal being, and rejoices in the power of remaining unchanged and unmoved in its being under the mightiest attacks which may be levelled against it." And this, from another author: "Although in the course of ages catastrophies have taken place, although ancient systems dissolve and new systems are built up out of their ruins, yet the molecules of which these systems consist, the foundation of the material universe, remain unbroken and uninjured." These quotations sound very materialistic, and those who did not know their authorship, would probably attribute them to Buchner or Mole-schott. They would be wrong.

The first is by Prof. Balfour Stewart, and the second by Prof. Clerk Maxwell, both distinguished scientists in the middle of the last century. Clerk Maxwell declared that science had demonstrated the fact that the ultimate atoms of matter were all exactly alike, therefore, he asserted, they bore the stamp of the "manufactured article," thus proving the existence of a God to manufacture them. The same argument was used by Balfour Stewart, who was the joint author, with Prof. Tait, of a religious work entitled *The Unseen Universe*, published in 1875. It had a large circulation, and was hailed with joy in the beleaguered Christian camp, against which the evolutionary forces liberated by Darwin and Spencer were beginning to put forth their strength. The book has long since been relegated to the top shelf, along with Paley's *Evidences*, the *Bridgewater Treatises*, and other obsolete junk.

Professor Clifford wrote an article on it for the *Fortnightly Review*, in which he said that the argument of the book might be stated as: "Because atoms are exactly alike and apparently indestructible, they must at one time have come into existence out of nothing. This can only have been effected by the agency of a conscious mind not associated with a material organism." Against which Clifford offers the following parody: "Because the sea is salt and will put out a fire, there must at one time have been a large fire lighted at the bottom of it. This can only have been effected by the agency of the whale who lives in the middle of the Sahara." It was in the same article that Clifford made his famous denunciation of Christianity as: "That awful plague which has destroyed two civilizations, and but barely failed to slay such promise of good as is now struggling to live among men." (*Lectures and Essays* (1886) p. 179).

While the religious press are chortling over the disintegration of the atom, as the deathblow to Materialism, it would be only fair if they also stated that it also gave the deathblow to the argument of Clerk Maxwell and Balfour Stewart. But the Christian's sense of fair play does not extend to "infidels;" it never did. And, in fact, this argument from the indestructible atom, was found to be a very two-edged weapon. The Materialist argued that if atoms, and therefore Matter, was indestructible, then it must always have existed, in some form or another. In that case, therefore, there was no need of a creator to create it. If, as the theologians argued, there must have been a "first cause" to create matter, then the same argument applied to God. There must have been a "first cause" to create God. If the argument was good in the one case, it was good in the other. In the meanwhile, we know nothing of God, but we do know something about matter, and this particular point about its indestructibility, which dispenses with the idea of creation, or a creator. Besides, the idea of a God at work manufacturing atoms

seemed somewhat grotesque; it was only another form of Paley's "Carpenter God," or of the picture of him presented in the Bible, as a tailor, making "coats of skins" (Genesis iii. 21) to clothe Adam and Eve.

The argument, indeed, has now been quietly discarded. In the latest apologetics now flowing from the press, it may be looked for in vain.

But, to return to the latest discoveries regarding the atom. Prof. Alfred North Whitehead, who is regarded as the new "white hope" of religion, contending against the powers of Materialism and unbelief, observes: "Until recently an atom was apparently indestructible. We know better now. But the indestructible atom has been succeeded by the apparently indestructible electron and the indestructible proton."³ Or, to quote Sir Oliver Lodge again:—

Not so long ago the question was an open one, whether electricity really possessed any inertia. Attempts were made to find out if electricity was like matter in this respect; it was a problem which many physicists in the nineteenth century desired to look into. The truth was hidden from them, but it has been revealed to us. Electricity is found to possess all the fundamental properties of matter, and some in addition. We find that matter has no properties and no constitution apart from electricity, but that electricity can exist apart from matter.⁴

We now know that the atom consists of a central nucleus, the proton, a particle of matter bearing a charge of electricity, around which revolve the electrons, consisting of negative electricity. Prof. Andrade tells us: "The atom of negative electricity is unique and indivisible."⁵ And "can have an existence independent of matter." But, "positive electricity can only exist in combination with matter." (Page 45.) And, further: "We have three totally different kinds of atoms: the atom of matter, the atom of electricity, and the atom of radiation." (Page 45.) The same authority tells us that the proton, or central part of the atom: "This nucleus is the heavy part of the atom, for in it is concentrated practically all the mass of the atom." (Page 47.)

Sometimes we can learn secrets from nature, by studying the sun and the stars, that we could not by confining our attention to the earth. For instance, the element Helium was first discovered in the sun before it was found on the earth. So we have learned something of the extraordinary hardness and density of the proton by studying the stars.

We all know the star Sirius, it is the brightest star in the sky, shining with a brilliancy thirty times greater than our sun. About eighty years ago it was discovered that Sirius was a double star. This companion is a dull white star revolving in a period of fifty years, and is of the White Dwarf type. The temperature of our sun is between 6,000 and 7,000 degrees Centigrade, but the temperature of this companion of Sirius attains the enormous intensity of 8,400 degrees! Under this terrific temperature the protons have been divested of their revolving electrons, with the result, recently discovered, that the matter of the star has been compressed until it has attained a density 2,000 times greater than platinum, our heaviest metal. As Prof. Eddington says, a ton of it would go in your waistcoat pocket! That does not look much like dissolving matter into nothing.

W. MANN.

(To be continued.)

³ Whitehead: *Science and the Modern World* (1926). Page 155.

⁴ Lodge: *Modern Scientific Ideas* (1927). Page 47.

⁵ Andrade: *The Atom*. Page 34.

Hail and Farewell.

"To bear all naked truths
And to envisage circumstance, all calm,
That is the top of sovereignty."—Keats.

"Genius hovers with his sunshine and music close by
the darkest and deafest eras."—Emerson.

MR. GEORGE MOORE has stated that he will write no more books, and the news will be received with real regret by all those who care for the best work in contemporary literature. For Mr. Moore is not a mere minor writer. He has become a classic in his own lifetime, and has achieved this distinction by swimming against the stream of ordinary public opinion and not with it.

The wide-reading public does not fully appreciate the great debt it owes to Mr. Moore, who has helped more than any other man to remove the just reproach from contemporary English fiction that it is provincial, and that it consists chiefly of smooth tales, generally of love. When Mr. Moore began to write, over forty years ago, the art of novel-writing in this country had become conventional, even stereotyped. The genius of Dickens and Thackeray obscured this unpleasant fact so far as the reading public was concerned. Thackeray himself was, however, under no such illusion, and the preface to *Pendennis*, in which the author apologizes for his inability to present a full length portrait of a live man, is really pathetic. For the master's hand which painted the incomparable figure of "Becky Sharp" could have also limned a "Pendennis" which was other than a well-dressed automaton. No other writer in English attempted to bring the novel nearer to real life until George Moore, a young Irishman, made up his mind to effect this revolution. It was a bold project for a young man who had his spurs to win, but courage and genius accomplish so much in a conventional world.

In a few months Mr. Moore launched two books at an astonished public. The first almost frightened to death the squeamish readers of the circulating libraries, but the second was a real and unmistakable masterpiece, and with it Mr. Moore stormed the bastions of success.

This latter volume, *A Mummer's Wife*, is almost without a rival. It is not only a classic, but it is the finest realistic novel in our language. As a study of life it is extraordinarily vivid. The central idea, an elopement of a married woman is not unique. Many of the sugary novels freely selected by the circulating libraries have used this. But the heroine of *A Mummer's Wife* is middle-class, the wife of a small shopkeeper, and the author shows, with incomparable art, the development of a tragic tale. For the divorced woman marries her lover, becomes a dipsomaniac, and, step by step, loses propriety and decency, until she dies the death of a drunkard, impenitent and unloved. Had she been depicted as a lady of title, had her failings been clothed in well-chosen and decorative phrases, and much sentiment wasted thereon, then, probably, no outcry would have arisen. But Mr. Moore chose the better and more truthful way of describing life as it actually is, and in doing so he wrote himself a master in the oldest of the arts, a truly proud achievement on the part of an almost unknown writer.

Incidentally, Mr. Moore did another service to lovers of literature. At a time when novels were issued in three volumes at a guinea-and-a-half, he published his story at six shillings. This not only helped to break the boycott of the libraries, but, fortunately, introduced a great writer to the reading public at a time when literature was at the ebbtide of mediocrity and commonplace.

Since *A Mummer's Wife* startled prudish readers, and made Mr. Moore's reputation, he has added masterpiece to masterpiece. His *Esther Waters* cleverly turned the tables on his puritan detractors, and by the sheer force of genius compelled their unwilling admiration. For Mr. Moore has enjoyed the rare privilege of being one of the very few English authors who have been boycotted. It was for the sake of this audacious young Irishman, that the blameless British tradesman, the lamented Mr. Mudie, assumed the pontifical functions of the Bishop of Rome, and started an *Index Expurgatorius*, which caused wide perturbation in many a suburban drawing-room and sheltered home. But Mr. Moore had the sweetest of revenges, for with an enviable record of a shelf of masterpieces he has reached the coveted position where he can dispense with praise or blame.

The Confessions of a Young Man showed another facet of Mr. Moore's extraordinary genius. Few of the readers of his novels were prepared for this unique and brilliant work, another book without parallel in our tongue. Audacious in its criticisms it is wonderful how much truth underlies its brilliant writing and smart epigrams. Its intimate knowledge of the art of France, literary and pictorial, marked it off from other books.

To do even scant justice to Mr. Moore's rare genius would require columns of writing. Had *A Mere Accident*, *A Drama in Muslin*, and other of his books, been written by a foreigner, hundreds of altars would have flamed in worship. *The Brook Kerith* is more wonderful than Flaubert's *Solamambo*, and critics have exhausted the vocabulary of eulogy in praising the art of the French writer. Mr. Moore's freshness of treatment, and exquisite choice of language, which time cannot wither, manifests a personal force in our literature, which, to be quite candid, has mocked every imitator. Historians of English books will, one fancies, be compelled to consider the work of Mr. George Moore even more seriously than contemporary critics have done.

MIMNERMUS.

Modern Science and Materialism.

(Continued from page 741.)

THERE is a widely-spread impression, among religiously-minded people not acquainted with the history of scientific discovery, that the great scientific discoveries of the middle of the last century—like the conservation of energy, the indestructibility of matter, and the correlation of forces—was the work of atheistic philosophers, intent upon the destruction of religion. That is why believers are so pleased when they hear that these laws have been overthrown or discarded. The truth is, that the discoveries which have supplied the foundations of modern Materialism have been mainly the work of believers. The pursuit of science demands that when the scientist enters the laboratory, he must divest himself of all bias, philosophic or religious, and devote himself to a study of the facts. He leaves his religion, along with his umbrella, outside. It is true that some of them resume their religious attire when they come out, and try to expound their discoveries in conformity with their religion, or rather, their religion in conformity with their discoveries, for that is what it has come to now, but the materialist discards these fanciful trimmings and uses the facts. Of the men whose labours succeeded in establishing these fundamental concepts—Lavoisier, Rumford, Mayer, Colding, Grove and Helmholtz—only the two last-named, Grove and Helmholtz, were unbelievers in religion, and,

power in public affairs it is this. It is almost an insult to children to call it childish. Imbecilic would be nearer the mark.

The *Daily News* recently had an article entitled, "The New World of Politics." We extract one gem from it—it is in the form of a letter from father to son:—

A Labour man may be a respectable God-fearing Non-conformist workman who wants something to be done for the working-class. Or he may be a roaring Atheist who wants to see a guillotine in Palace Yard, and blood running down the gutters of Piccadilly.

That is all, but if any of our readers can supply us with a finer sample of gutter-blackguardism, we should be interested to know where it can be found. None but a very Christian paper would insert it.

Some Christian watch-dogs of Cardiff's morals have been called on by the Chief Constable to apologize for not speaking the truth in alleging that Cardiff is a centre of "white slave" traffic. These Christian critics had declared that they knew of seventeen girls who had disappeared from South Wales during the past five years, as the result of this traffic. These girls, says the Chief Constable, were, with one exception, traced and found to be in domestic service. He declares that there is no evidence of their ever having been in danger of becoming victims of white slavery. We should be surprised if the apology is forthcoming. Christian critics love the product of their imagination too well to admit its falseness to fact. Still, it is good to see Christian slanderers pulled up sharp.

Of an anthology of excerpts from the writings of Sir James Frazer (author of *The Golden Bough*) a pious reviewer says:—

... that where *The Golden Bough* seems in no small degree to make necessary the destruction of certain beliefs that have for generations been bound up with the Christian faith, Sir James makes the pronouncement with such sympathy that the reader never once has the impression of an iconoclast being at work. It is written with reverence and not a tinge of arrogance.

This, of course, exactly suits the Christian. To him, fearless seeker after truth though he is, calling a spade a spade is iconoclastic arrogance. He prefers his pills to have a sugar coating, so that he doesn't quite know what he is swallowing.

It is a pleasant relief to turn to a report from Paris during a time when, at home, the church has thrust itself well forward in the limelight over armistice celebrations. Thirty thousand French ex-soldiers pledged themselves to keep faith with their dead comrades by taking an active part in working for world peace... they hereby proclaim:—

... nine years after the Armistice, that the moment has come for us to interfere in public life in moral as well as in social affairs, to collaborate in an effort for mutual understanding, to put social and economic questions before political aims, and to guarantee peace by respecting treaties.

And, in the meantime, America, with enormous resources in land and food, is afraid of being starved to death and starts building ships. She, him, or it, has nearly all the gold in the world, all the chewing gum, all the canned beef, all the lively souls of Tennessee, Niagara Falls, great stretches of land, and a Statue of Liberty; what more does she want other than a little more common sense?

Reason, says Major W. E. Elliott, must walk humbly, and take second place to instinct. A weekly paper comments: "Rubbish. If man had followed instinct instead of reason he would still be in the jungle." Seeing that fear of the unknown was the instinct which gave man the Christian religion, this comment would appear to imply that Christians are mentally still in the jungle.

Music, says a Mr. G. A. Atkinson, is Christianity's first aid in South Wales. By the look of things, what Christianity needs (in South Wales and elsewhere) is

not "first aid" but serious hospital treatment. And when it gets that it will be only a ghost of its former self hobbling around on crutches.

The hearing of the superb rhythm of the Prayer Book Sunday after Sunday, leaves its mark for life, says Mr. Baldwin. A mark and a spot are much of a muchness. Hence, the appropriate comment is Macbeth's: "Out, damned spot!"

What can the nation reasonably expect to get for its expenditure on education? The question put by the *Schoolmistress* to Mr. G. Bernard Shaw elicited the following answer:—

At present, the moral and intellectual imbecility, the illiteracy of pen and speech, that it actually does get. With a reasonable, sincere, and really available system of education, the nation might reasonably expect to become educated after a generation or two.

Mr. Shaw, we gather, doesn't approve of our educationalists producing the type of intelligence which millionaire newspaper proprietors delight to cater for.

Sir John Reith says the B.B.C. has received plenty of proof that large numbers of listeners like the Sunday wireless religious service. He also says that the B.B.C.'s practical working rule is: "Give the public something slightly better than it now thinks it likes." We presume the B.B.C. thinks that a "working rule" ought not to be made to work on the Christian Sabbath.

Of things seen—but not believed. A *Daily News* headline across a page announces: "The Craft of Fiction: Where the Churches Fail!"

A reader of a daily paper points out that in the town he happened to be in on Armistice Day, while the parsons and the people were thanking God for his help in the war, round the corner was a queue of 1,000 men signing the unemployment register. The reader doesn't put it quite like that, but it will serve. We presume that God, who brought the war to so successful a termination, is resting after his labours, and is much too weary to help the nation to overcome the evil effects of the war.

The *Tablet* has a grievance against modern Wesleyans. It appears they are questioning and minimizing the Holy Scriptures. Punishment of sin is regarded as an antiquated bugbear; hell has been damped down, raked out, and abandoned. There is now a "reasonable" way of interpreting the opening chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke. And as for the Fall, most Wesleyans know only of an unbroken Ascent of Man. As the *English Churchman* says, this is painful reading. If we may be permitted to suggest a remedy, we think a rather good idea would be to organize a special mission for converting Wesleyans to the Christian faith. That might save some of them from the eternal fry-pan.

Freedom of speech, says the *English Churchman*, is one of the great blessings we in England enjoy. Both in public and in private, men may speak their minds freely. Many people, however, says our contemporary, while claiming and using this privilege for themselves, are not willing to accord it to others. Fancy our pious friend noticing that! But surely it might have seen too that the practice is so common among Christians as to be classified as a Christian characteristic.

At a Christian conference, a Mr. Ben Williams read a paper on the right use of leisure. The following tit-bit will enable the reader to gauge the intelligence of Mr. Williams and his audience:—

Probably no one would dispute the fact that the Churches, by insisting on the sacredness of Sunday, have done more than any other institution to secure leisure for man.

The "fact" not being a fact explains why no one would dispute it.

There would have been a rough house for Dr. Barnes less than a hundred years ago, and, whilst he is thinking out to whom he owes thanks for a liberal atmosphere of a sort to-day, we give an extract from the *Daily News*, 1849:—

The Rev. Dr. McNeile thinks that the cholera is a judgment in this country for favouring "Popery"; the Rev. Mr. Toye, that it is to deter people from marrying the sisters of their deceased wives; the Rev. Mr. Gutch attributes it to electors voting for dissenters and Jews; whilst others attribute it to the omission of "Dei Gratia" from the new florin.

The careful reader will be impressed with the logic displayed in this notice, that has no existence in any other world but that of theology.

Bishop Welldon, in a style peculiar to his profession, wishes to improve the law of the land. He appeals for a higher standard of citizenship, and wishes that society would more forcibly express its indignation against bad citizens. This is delightfully muddled for an expert on the citizenship of heaven, and society ought to shake hands with itself for only having old judges to put up with, instead of a relic of medievalism. If this is Bishop Welldon's best contribution to social life, we think he justifies Dean Swift's essay, "An Argument against Abolishing Christianity." There is much food for quiet laughter in this aspiration of the Bishop; he and his brethren have seen to it that man starts with a strong dose of "original sin." If this is not a real handicap at the start for good citizenship, we should like to know what is, whilst someone is taking a census of the religious beliefs of those in our prisons.

Summonses have been issued at Darwen for church brawling, and the Rev. J. Sheppard, at Islington Chapel, was cheered on Sunday by his congregation, and he liked it, as he admitted that preaching became very monotonous. Thus it is possible to blow hot and cold in one breath.

Mr. G. Bedborough writes:—

A quotation from A. Noyes, in a recent issue of the *Freethinker*, struck me as singularly reminiscent of what Captain W. Bell McTaggart used to write in the *Agnostic Journal*—afterwards published, I believe, under the very explanatory title of *Hylō-Idealism*. Mr. Stewart Ross was not wholly free from moods in which he was capable of writing somewhat similarly himself (e.g., "the awful Eidolon filling more than conceivable space"). But in those humorous hours of his when he was at his best, "Saladin" translated one of these mystic texts of the Bible as meaning, "Once there was a deuce of a row somewhere and somebody got hurt."

But here is something that knocks spots on A. Noyes and the rest. Zona Gale, a famous authoress, and by way of being a sort of Freethinker, prefaces her book *Birth*, by the following quotation:—

"The world's greatest need is a sense of the intangible."
Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Why, yes, not even A. Noyes ever thought of that being "the world's greatest need." Perhaps the famous philosopher J. L. Jones wanted to "touch" a non-existent salary—sometimes I too have felt this to be the "greatest need."

A reader of a daily paper says:—

Can we not afford to dispense with all controversy about the mysteries of creeds and obscurities of dogmas, when "just the art of being kind is all this sad world needs"?

Oh, the artfulness of these opponents of religion with their seemingly innocent queries! What, no mysteries and obscurities, no ceremonies, no observances; no public worship and prayers? What, no priests to explain, expound, teach, and conduct them? What, no churches for expounding and teaching and conducting these things in? If all that the world needs is the art of being kind, then the world can do without all that has been, and is now, associated with the Christian religion. You see the drift? A very cunning attack, is that. We feel we ought to put the clergy on their guard against it.

Ince, a Lancashire town, thinks it has had quite enough of war and war-trophies, and has sold two large cannon, a howitzer and two field-guns to a metal merchant. Other and less enlightened towns might do worse than copy the good example of Ince.

Scottish Sabbatarian associations have been co-operating in a campaign for the prevention of other people's Sunday happiness. Protests were made against Sunday excursions to popular Scottish seaside resorts. Lord Maclay suggested that the large Labour Unions should be urged to withdraw their members from Sunday work. We fancy the Unions will show no particular eagerness to assist the parsons to safeguard their Sunday trade, since to do that means taking from working people opportunities for wholesome enjoyment.

"A Country Rector" suggests, in the *National Review*, that what elementary education is most in need of at present is a little wholesome neglect from the authorities. We suggest that what education is still more in need of is a wholesale neglect from ecclesiastics. For priests have no real interest in education, but only in the production of future customers.

An Australian critic has asserted that Thomas Hardy and George Meredith are now little more than names to the present generation. A writer in a religious weekly reminds the critic that at the present time Thomas Hardy's oldest novels are being run as serials in a popular weekly. Just so; it is the pious vilifiers, including a bishop, of the blasphemous author of *Jude the Obscure*, who are forgotten.

Prebendary Charles Harris is of opinion that the principal attacks on religion do not come from science but from philosophy and psychology. He thinks that one person should be attached to each cathedral for the study of these things. In other words, he wants outposts to give the warning before the enemy is at the gates. This is a very good suggestion, and the only fault to be found with it is, that it is one hundred years too late.

The Rev. E. A. Causton, 6 ft. 8 ins. in height, is the tallest clergyman in the Church of England. Obviously the right man for relating the "tall" stories of Holy Writ.

The Battle of the Bishops.

AN OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP BARNES

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price ONE PENNY (16 pp.)

5/- per 100, for Propagandists.

A large edition of this pamphlet has been printed, and they should be put into circulation at once.

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

What We are Fighting.

WE have said more than once that Christians pay us the compliment of their heartiest hatred. They realize that they have no deadlier enemies to fight than the Secular Society and the *Freethinker*. With neither is there any hope of compromise; with neither is there any disguise as to their real object. We do not ape the language of religion, and we do not pretend to be anything that we are not. They are powerless to either silence or defeat of our attacks, and so they adopt the cowardly policy of silence, and the contemptible one of the boycott.

A week or so ago, a circular was sent to the Secretary of the Secular Society, Limited, from Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Limited, asking for an advertisement. At the last meeting of the Board of the Society it was resolved to apply for the use of half a column. The books offered for advertisement were Draper's *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science*; Mr. Cohen's *Materialism Re-stated, Grammar of Free-thought, Determinism or Free Will?* and *God and Evolution*; Mr. Mann's *Modern Materialism*; and Mr. Whitehead's *What is Morality?* The advertisement was accepted and a cheque paid.

Two days later the cheque was returned with a note that the publishers were unable to accept the advertisement in the columns of the Journal.

Now, except from the point of view of downright bigotry, there was nothing in any of these works submitted for advertisement, to which exception could be taken. They are all attempts to seriously argue the points at issue between Christianity and Freethinkers. But the publishers of *Pitman's Journal of Commercial Education* decide that, so far as they are concerned, these arguments shall not be heard. In their opinion, the only way in which Christians can be kept true to their religion is to keep them in ignorance concerning it and its history. In this I am inclined to agree with them.

I am not worrying over this refusal. A similar thing has occurred before, but it is just as well for Freethinkers to realize what we are fighting, and perhaps they will appreciate more heartily what it has meant to keep a paper such as the *Freethinker* alive for nearly fifty years, in the face of all that Christian bigotry could do to suppress it. It will be well, too, for them to realize that the attitude of Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons is the general attitude of the whole of the Press where the *Freethinker* is concerned.

But the Press has not made us and the Press cannot break us. We are not dependent upon the "log-rolling" efforts of journalistic friends, and we are therefore quite careless whether they are pleased with what we say or not. Our contempt for the Christian is not increased by the action of Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons—that would be nearly impossible. But it is fully justified. A religion that can so distort a man's sense of justice, and give mental cowardice the quality of lofty morality, deserves the worst that can be said concerning it.

But there are many of our readers who are interested in Pitman's publications, some from a reader's, others from a business point of view. What do they think about it?

We can only alter this kind of thing by still further weakening the power of the Christian religion. And I know of no better way that this can be done than by giving a fuller a heartier support to the *Freethinker* and the National Secular Society. No other two agencies have done so much during the past fifty years to shake the citadel of Christian superstition, and they are only at the beginning of their work.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

The "Freethinker" Endowment Trust.

WE have four weeks in which to raise the balance required to secure the £1,615 promised conditionally. Those who have promised are most anxious they should be called upon to "pay up," and I do not think that Freethinkers will lose the money promised for the sake of the comparatively small sum yet to be raised. Having got so far, we ought to manage the rest—and more.

Mr. A. W. Coleman and his sister Miss D. W. Coleman, already contributors, write: "If we are to average £70 a week for the rest of the time, it appears that some of us must do a second helping," and promptly send their cheques. Mr. Sydney Gimson also contributes a further sum to the Fund.

But there are a large number who have yet to send, and the sooner they send the better. We require another £282 10s. 9d., and I could name half a dozen who could easily put an end to our wants in that direction. And then, there are the hundreds of smaller, but none the less earnest or generous ones, to come along. But they must come along. We took our coat off to the job, and we are going through with it.

We have reached the point when every pound subscribed is worth more than five. That is a point to bear in mind.

ELEVENTH LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£	s.	d.
PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLEDGED	6,020	12	9
Dr. A. W. Laing	25	0	0
Sydney A. Gimson (2nd sub.)	5	0	0
E. Pinder	1	0	0
C. S. Knight	5	0	0
J. Wearing	0	1	0
E. Ramsbotham	1	0	0
E. A. Macdonald	1	1	0
J. W. Marshall	1	0	0
F. Goodwin	0	2	6
Dr. W. English	5	0	0
A. W. Coleman (2nd sub.)	5	0	0
Dorothy Coleman (2nd sub.)	5	0	0
A. B. C.	5	0	0
D. Winterton	1	0	0
N. E. Bishop	1	0	0
J. Goulding	0	10	0
G. Wallace	1	0	0
Elizabeth Lechmere	0	10	0
A. J. Marriot	0	5	0
A. C. Williams	0	5	0
A. Aspden	0	2	6
Blue-Black	1	0	0
J. H. Thomas (Cape Town)	3	0	0
J. W. Irving	1	0	0
S. Toms (Pretoria)	0	5	0
Dinah	0	2	6
J. Thompson	0	3	6
T. S. Massey	0	5	0
Rayne Adams	0	5	0
C. F. Small (3rd sub.)	1	0	0
L. Marian	1	5	0
J. Hopkins	3	13	0
Mrs. B. Siger	0	10	0
J. Close	0	10	6
Youngmans	5	0	0

Total £6,102 9 3

Promised on condition that a further £282 10s. 9d. 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 a 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.

A. J. COOPER.—Article to hand. Shall appear.

S. B. EMANUEL.—Sorry we cannot spare space for your letter. We do not know anything of "the inventor of all things," or even that all things were invented. And as for something in the place of God, there is the whole world of nature and of human nature. If that is not enough, you must be hard to satisfy, and are merely making the cry to be provided with some new form of superstition the occasion for declaring that art, science, literature and humanity is not enough. There is not the slightest need to put something in the place of a thing that is false. It is enough to remove the falsity.

J. GOULDING.—It is not at all unlikely. Papers are not slow to borrow from the *Freethinker*, but it would never do to avow the source of their inspiration.

G. WALLACE.—All required is for each to do what he or she can. Will counts for everything here, opportunity soon follows.

BLUE-BLACK.—Thanks for compliment. Life would have been ill-spent if improvement had not taken place.

J. A. REID.—Sorry, but we can find no trace of the letter to which you refer.

H. MAY.—We are gratified to learn that *Materialism Restated* has been of so much help to you. It is a work which is not intended for those whose mental entertainment does not rise above the level of *T. P.'s Weekly*, and for that reason the ready sale of the work is the more gratifying to the author.

MRS. B. SIGER.—Thanks for good wishes. We can always rely on your doing what you can to help the cause.

J. THOMPSON.—One has to do what one's opportunities permit. It is by the use one makes of them that one should be judged.

S. PULMAN.—Thanks. Shall appear.

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

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

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

When the services of the National Secular Society in connexion with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary, Mr. F. Mann, giving as long notice as possible.

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

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

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

Letters for the Editor of the "Freethinker" should be addressed to 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

Friends who send us newspapers would enhance the favour by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.

The "Freethinker" will be forwarded direct from the publishing office at the following rates (Home and Abroad):—One year, 15s.; half year, 7s. 6d.; three months, 3s. 9d.

Sugar Plums.

To-day (November 27) Mr. Cohen will speak in the Stratford Town Hall on "The New Warfare Between Science and Religion." The hall is easy of access from all parts of London. Trams and buses stop outside the door, and on this occasion the hall should be crowded. Mr. Cohen is not holding many meetings in London this year. The lecture commences at 7 o'clock, and admission is free.

There was a fine audience at Leicester on Sunday last, to listen to Mr. Cohen, and everything went with a swing from start to finish. There were an unusually large number of questions at the close of the address, and many new faces were present. This is quite as it should be. Mr. Sidney Gimson occupied the chair, and we were delighted to see him looking so well and hearty.

The Libraries Committee of the Glasgow Corporation, says the *Glasgow Evening Times*, is in danger of making itself a laughing-stock over the way in which it bans certain notable modern books. Among these we may note that Mr. Cohen's *Theism and Atheism* and Lewis's *Elmer Gantry*, are classed as undesirable. We do not question the applicability of the expression. It entirely depends upon the class of men who consider them undesirable. And we are quite ready to grant that *Theism and Atheism* is not desirable from the point of view of every parson in Great Britain. But, then, it was not written for their pleasure, and many of them are incapable of edification.

We are glad to learn from Plymouth that Mr. Rosetti had two good meetings there on Sunday last. The hall was well filled on each occasion, and there was no mistaking the pleasure and interest with which the lectures were listened to. An excitable Roman Catholic, who rushed on the platform during discussion, was firmly and tactfully dealt with by the speaker, and profited by his lesson to the extent of returning to the evening meeting and behaving properly. The meetings should give impetus to Freethought work in Plymouth.

Mr. R. B. Kerr, M.A., LL.B., will be the lecturer at Manchester to-day (November 27). The meetings will be held in the Engineers' Hall, Rusholme Road. In the afternoon, Mr. Kerr will speak on "Is Britain Overpopulated?" and in the evening, on "Birth Control." On these subjects Mr. Kerr is an authority, and there should be a good turn out to hear him.

We are glad to say that Mr. Cohen's "Open Letter to Bishop Barnes" is selling very well, and is doing its work. It is attracting attention in many quarters, and bringing new readers for the paper, and new people into touch with the movement. This is as it should be, and we hope that our friends will go on circulating it. A package of 100 will be sent post free for 5s.

We are asked to announce that Mr. E. C. Saphiu is open for lectures dealing with the phallic and solar elements of current religious beliefs, and will be pleased to hear from Branches of the N.S.S. and other bodies who care to hear them. Each lecture is fully illustrated with lantern slides. Mr. Saphiu's address is 4, Wellesley Road, Harrow-on-the-Hill.

PROGRESS.

Now that the world has once been set in motion, and is no longer held fast under the tyranny of custom and ignorance; now that criticism has pierced the veil of tradition and the past no longer overpowers the present—the progress of civilization may be expected to be far greater and swifter than heretofore.

Even at our present rate of speed the point at which we may arrive in two or three generations is beyond the power of imagination to foresee. There are forces in the world which work, not in an arithmetical, but in a geometrical ratio of increase. Education, to use the expression of Plato, moves like a wheel with an ever-multiplying rapidity. Nor can we say how great may be its influence when it becomes universal, when it has been inherited by many generations, when it is freed from the trammels of superstition and rightly adapted to the wants and capacities of men and women.

Benjamin Jowett.

Rationalism and Education.

(By a retired school inspector, Author of the "World-Story.")

II.

FOLLOWING Pope Gregory's deprecation of the "idle vanities of secular learning," about 600 A.D., the suppression of education by the Church, other than its own, began in the Middle Ages. We learn that in 1340, Robert of Dalton, "clerk," "unmindful of his salvation, dared to teach school, to the prejudice of the liberties of the Church," and that he was ordered to desist on pain of excommunication. This fine phrase, "the liberties of the Church" (like an allied one, "the liberty of teaching") has long signified to Roman Catholics, if not to some others, ecclesiastical monopoly or domination, or, where and when these prove to be unattainable, the maximum of possible clerical influence and control.

The English statute of 1401, for the burning of heretics (*De Heretico Comburendo*), forbade "divers false and perverse people . . . to hold and exercise schools"; in 1414, justices were directed to make inquiry into cases of local heresy and heretical schools; and in spite of the fact that the Court of Common Pleas ruled that there was no legal restriction of the right to teach, it was for centuries impossible for any one to teach in a school without a licence from some church official.

The Reformation brought about no improvement in the freedom of teaching. Anglican bishops were instructed to inquire in their dioceses, whether any schoolmaster of "suspected religion," or "that is not licensed by the bishop or Ordinary," was engaged in teaching "in any public or private place"; and in 1753, Dr. Philip Doddridge stated that action had been taken in twenty cases of this kind in one diocese.

It was not until 1846 that the "sanction of punishment" for teaching without the licence was removed in this country, and not until 1869-70 that the Endowed School commissioners provided for dispensation with the licence in all the schools within the jurisdiction of that body.

Despite the enlightened efforts of a few statesmen and others, and of such bodies as the Public Schools Associations of Manchester, Birmingham and other centres (which secured the support of the more liberal-minded politicians of the time), we failed to get a secular system, though these efforts probably did much to prepare the way for the Bill of 1870. The opposition of the Church to this measure is well known. It passed, however, and the "godless Board Schools" (as many clergymen and other pious people called them during the remainder of the century) came into existence, thirty-four years after the "godless University of London" (so-called because it did not impose a theological test) was founded.

Similar hindrance has occurred in other countries. In France, under the old regime, education was controlled by the clergy. But from this domination the schools, in part and for a time, escaped, after Guizot had organized the primary system in 1833. A fall, however, took place in 1850, when it became possible for any member of a religious order to teach in a school if he could procure a "letter of obedience" from a bishop; and with a view to the reduction or elimination of the qualified lay teaching staff, an astounding measure for the suppression of the training colleges was authorized. In 1871, however, a secular system was established, and it still continues.

The course of education in Germany has been more fortunate than in some other forward countries. Though in the sixteenth century the schools were little more than an appanage of the church,

and though much of their administration long remained in clerical hands, the State system was fully established, but without the elimination of religious instruction, in 1787. Here also, about the middle of the eighteenth century, reaction set in; religious instruction became the "corner stone" of the teaching in the training colleges and the principal subject in the primary schools, the secular subjects of the curriculum being reduced to the narrowest limits. In 1851, the Minister of Religion and Education arrested the work of one of our most famous educationists by prohibiting the Froebellian schools in Prussia, on the ground that the pupils became infected with socialistic and atheistic ideas. (Froebel was of mystical religious temperament, and regarded the cultivation of "religious insight" as the chief aim of education; but he had a nephew who held socialistic views). However, recovery was made; and though religious instruction continued to occupy a prominent place in the curriculum, with conditions very similar to those existing in our own country, the German educational system again became, in many respects, a model for other forward countries.

From what has been written above, it will be clear that the references, so frequently made during the Great War, to the lack of religious instruction in Germany, had no basis in fact. Probably no forward nation, during recent times, has, on the whole, paid so much attention to this feature as the German; and with this we may associate the frequent and free, and doubtless to some people painful, references of the Kaiser to his alliance with the "Almighty," or, alternatively, "our old German God."

In New York City, the Free School Society, afterwards the Public School Society, crept in, early in the nineteenth century, as a provider of schools for those "who do not belong to, or are not provided for, by the churches," and did something to form a system of semi-public schools. As, however, the Society received some aid from public funds (which were denied to religious societies), sectarian claims and conflicts soon developed, and continued until 1842. Happily these were terminated by the establishment of the New York Board of Education, which refuses aid to any school where "religious or sectarian doctrine shall be taught, inculcated or practised."

The ecclesiastical domination of education naturally involved the universities. Following the establishment of those of Bologna and Paris, the doctrine that such institutions must obtain the permission or recognition of the Church in the form of a papal bull arose and developed; and though Oxford escaped this embargo, Bologna and Paris, and Cambridge, and other later universities, found it necessary or desirable to get the bull. We also note that of the four faculties—Arts, Theology, Law and Medicine—which were ordinarily studied, that of Civil Law was not taught at Paris, "having been forbidden by Pope Honorius III," and theology became the chief subject of instruction. For a long time the universities were practically closed to those who did not profess the religion of the dominant party, and our own existing establishments at Oxford, Cambridge and Durham, were not freed from theological tests until 1871. The German universities were the first in modern times to achieve freedom, and it is probable that their victory over obscurantism and tyranny did much to hasten educational emancipation in other countries.

J. REEVES.

We must develop the will to peace among our peoples and the habit of peace among our Governments.

Dr. Murray Butler.

The Amazing Achievement of Atheism.

(Concluded from page 747).

PERSONALLY, I much prefer the more sincere and straightforward abuse, denunciation, and attempted suppression, rather than the trimming and twisting and misrepresentation so much in evidence on the part of some of those who speak and write for positive birth-control. There always have been those who desire to run with the Christian fox, while they hunt with the Freethought hounds. I suppose there always will be such; and these "advanced believers"—with their two voices—are common in this particular conflict between religion and science, as they have been in previous struggles. Some time ago, shortly after my last short stay at home, one of the most disgraceful utterances of this kind of "backward voice" met my eye. It was in a popular weekly, with a large circulation, which contains articles of all sorts of opinion on socio-political subjects; and the writer was one from whom we might have expected something less "low-down" than that which he perpetrated. In an article entitled "Why not Birth-Control?" the "Backward Voice" wrote: "The idea of birth-control as a respectable social institution has suffered a great deal from its prior association with the practice of prostitutes and the advocacy of Atheists, although Malthus, its earliest advocate, was a clergyman." True, indeed, is it that, "His forward voice now is to speak well of his friend; his backward voice is to utter foul speeches, and to detract." Earl Russell will not arrest the advance of Atheism, nor will he help the Birth-Control Movement, by such statements as that which I have quoted; but he certainly can injure himself—in the estimate of those who count—by descending to such worse than questionable lines of "argument." It is a pity—for his own sake—that his desire to "swheedle" Christians into the practice of positive birth-control allowed his love of alliteration to lead him into such an eggful of inaccuracy and innuendo. However, "that is his funeral, not mine."

Space—or want of it—will not permit me to deal at any length with the muddled message of this "Backward Voice"; but much space is not required. First of all, note the logical fallacy. Earl Russell is concerned with spreading the principles and practice of positive birth-control among the poorer people; but he asserts that "Malthus, its first advocate, was a clergyman." This is to play down to the Christian Godist, in the "swheedling" process. Malthus was never an advocate of birth-control—much less of positive birth-control. That is why the philosophic and practical Atheists who cleared the way and laid the foundation for this great Atheistic step forward in human progress called themselves "Neo-Malthusians." Presumably, Earl Russell is aware of that. Malthus's remedy—so far as he had one at all—was late marriage. Earl Russell does not advocate that; nor does the Birth-Control Movement: yet he uses a syllogism of four terms (more than four implied)—has a swipe at Atheism—and imagines he will convert Roman Catholic official Christians to positive birth-control! Were Alexander Bain alive; he'd add that to his illustrations of fallacy.

Birth-Control means the use of positive preventions.

Malthus advocated late marriage.

Therefore, Malthus first advocated birth-control!!!

Any ordinary person using such logically extraordinary process of reasoning might fittingly be told, "Get thee to a monastery, go!"

The reference to "the practice of prostitutes" is a method of Propaganda by bad dialectic of which, I hope, Earl Russell is ashamed by now. I am a child in these matters—and was nearer to being a child then—but I have always understood that prostitutes did *not*, and would *not*, use practical preventives. They may have used Malthus's remedy of late marriage; but "that is another story." What then was the connexion—if any—between Atheism, Malthus, Birth-Control, and Prostitution? Those Atheists said that Malthus's remedy of late marriage led to other evils which were quite as bad, socially, as too-large families. They pointed out that the practice of (comparatively) late marriages among the "middle-class" was rendered possible by prohibition and induced inhibition for the young woman, combined with the use of the (generally) working-class-girl prostitute by the young man.

They urged, further, that these practices resulted in much social and individual evil. They were right, too, both in their facts and in their conclusions. Social progress has proved that. It was Malthus's remedy which tended to blight the lives of the young women, to mislead the young men, and to perpetuate the practice of prostitution. Not much of birth-control in that!

Those Atheists, therefore, as Neo-Malthusians, advocated (comparatively) early marriage, with (again comparatively) late parentage and a deliberately limited number of children. This would mean, they said, a fuller life for young man, young woman, and family, with greater health and happiness for all. That remedy—combined with a greater measure of economic independence for the woman, was their suggested method of curing the social evil of prostitution. Once more—as so often before—the Atheists were right; while the Godists were wrong. Maybe, that is why they were—and are—so much maligned.

As to the principles and practices of positive birth-control being Atheistic; nothing more need here be said. In a very mild way, I have shown, in this essay, how the progress of humankind is the progress to philosophic Atheism. Positive birth-control is the up-to-now highwater mark attained by the flood tide—the spring tide—of Atheism. Atheists can say—as a great Godist once did say politically—"The flowing tide is with us." "God," which exists only as an idea—"without body, parts, or passions" in the minds of those who believe in it, will—sooner or later—be finished in that flood. Then we shall be able finally to say of the apologists for an outworn superstition:—

"And be these juggling fiends no more believ'd,
That palter with us in a double sense;
That keep the word of promise to our ear,
And break it to our hope."

ATHOS ZENO.

Correspondence.

"THE MAN NOBODY KNOWS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. B. S. Wilcox is, of course, entitled to his opinion—he finds the book with the above title "decidedly refreshing," and "written by a man of obviously wide vision, keen perception, and much human affection." Well, I wrote a long review of *The Man Nobody Knows* for this journal soon after the book was published last year, and after reading Mr. Wilcox's article, thought I ought to have another look at such a famous work. My opinion, however, is not changed—I have rarely read such a conglomeration of rubbish in my life. The book is silly, childish, and its author is just as credulous as a Christian Evidence lecturer. Look at the presumptuous title—*The Man Nobody Knows!* There

are—I am quoting from memory—987,634 lives of Jesus in existence, 1,234,567 reviews of his teachings and miracles, 4,678,912 pamphlets have been written for and against him; every year, in all languages, are published 364,892 magazine articles, testifying to his uniqueness or his deity or humanity, or even—dare I suggest it without offending either Mr. Bruce Barton or Mr. B. S. Wilcox—to his non-existence. Moreover, every church in the world—no, I must go further than that, in the *Universe* (for, of course, they are all praying to Jesus in other inhabited planets) has one and sometimes more sermons or invocations or prayers or other things in honour of the “carpenter of Nazareth” every day, perhaps every hour; even some Rationalists and Atheistic Communists salute him as the greatest force the world has ever seen—and yet Jesus is *The Man Nobody Knows!* What tosh! As for the actual “life”—well it is written just as the dear old “dreadfuls” were written in my boyhood days. Jesus is the “hero” and most of the other people are either villains or fools. The descriptions of life at “Nazareth,” or wherever Jesus went, read like descriptions of small American towns—like those in *Main Street*, for example. Jesus was oh, just too wonderful for words. He knocked everybody silly. He was a “born leader,” he had “wonderful power” to pick out men, everything he did was “amazing!” “A lesser leader” would have done this or that, but not Jesus. For sheer clap-trap, I advise anyone to read the chapter on “His advertisements.” It would be difficult to find anything really funnier. “Take any one of the parables,” says Mr. Barton, “no matter which—you will find that it exemplifies all the principles on which advertising text books are written . . . crisp, graphic language and a message so clear that even the dullest cannot escape it.” And this after 232,897 books have been written by eminent Christian divines to explain what the parables mean! Mr. Barton actually says, “There is hardly a sentence in his teaching which a child cannot understand.” And I’ve waded, in company with millions of other folk, through countless commentaries designed specially to explain the wonderful teaching of Jesus! Need I say that Jesus was the “founder of modern business”? Or that on his “homecoming” he went up to his “room, his old room, alone”? or that his mother “patted his cheek,” and “looked at him with glistening eyes”? or that the Pharisees were “bigoted formalists” who “would awe him into line by the splendour of their presence”? or that “the young man from Nazareth watched in amazement which deepened gradually into anger”? or that “suddenly without a word of warning he (Jesus) strode forward to the table where the fat money-changer sat and hurled it violently across the court. The startled robber lurched forward, grasping at his gains, lost his balance and fell sprawling to the ground.” If this last paragraph doesn’t come straight from Old Brett’s *Boys of England*, I’ll eat my hat. That “fat money-changer” surely is a gem. But there’s a delicious quotation on each page, and I simply dare not quote further. Mr. Wilcox would not like Mr. Bruce Barton to think his article an attack on him or his work. If Mr. Barton sees this I want him to understand that, in my opinion, *The Man Nobody Knows* is beneath contempt.

H. CUTNER.

A SLOGAN FOR FREETHINKERS.

SIR,—The most wicked and nonsensical belief in the world is that anybody could derive benefit from a poor innocent man being crucified. That is my slogan, and it is worth adding that even were the belief true, no man with any respect for himself would willingly take advantage of such atrocious cruelty and injustice. Death by crucifixion, as Professor Huxley has explained with painful detail, is as lingering and agonizing a death as can be conceived. And yet, forsooth, the crucifixion of Jesus, impudently asserted to be the means planned by God to save a small minority of mankind from burning eternally in Hell (a place designed and created by himself for the purpose of inflicting never-ending torment on creatures he has himself made) is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, and for preaching and teaching, which

great numbers of black-coated images are paid liberally and held in high honour. Belief in Christianity with its grotesquely absurd and abominable doctrines, offers strong proof of man’s simian ancestry and ape-like brain. I am grateful to Sir Arthur Keith for having made Bishop Barnes confess that “Darwin’s triumph destroys the whole theological scheme.” Yet, notwithstanding the destruction of what he is so highly paid to uphold, the gentleman in gaiters sticks like a limpet to his cushy job. This is the general policy of Christianity’s paid men. As the great Lynch says, *Vive the Freethinker.*

J. E. ROOSE.

Giumbi, via Hafue,
Northern Rhodesia.

ATHEISM AND CO-OPERATION.

SIR,—“Athos Zeno,” in his article upon Atheism, in the issue of November 20, classes the Co-operative Movement among its “amazing achievements”; and speaks of its policy, “Spirit,” and aims as being Atheistic. One can only suppose, in a spirit of charity, that such a claim is made in blissful ignorance of the inner workings of the Co-operative movement. The *Freethinker* itself, only quite recently, reproduced a letter from an educational journal, where an applicant to the C.W.S. for a situation was subjected to a rigid religious catechism; and when his inquisitorial examiners learned that he was an Atheist, they treated him to a grandfatherly homily on the follies of his unbelief! Probably the successful candidate passed their religious test; at all events, the *Freethinker* did not get the situation. And to speak of a movement which invites Christian bishops to address its Conferences as Atheistic, seems to me absurd. It is, of course, true that in the earlier days a few, well-intentioned, but misguided, Atheists, professed to see in Co-operation a new path to social betterment. But Robert Owen himself looked askance at a new movement which paraded in borrowed plumes, but which had nothing whatever in common with his ideals and social experiments. And to associate his name with modern Co-operation is little short of an insult to the memory of a truly great man. One would like to see the evidence that such a nondescript movement as Co-operation has ever favoured or aided in any shape or form, Atheistic propaganda.

The Co-operative movement votes a share of its surplus funds to various objects; and I would suggest to “Athos Zeno” that he put his convictions to the test, in this way. Let him propose at some Co-operative meeting, that they vote the three hundred odd pounds to complete the “*Freethinker* Endowment Trust.” I rather think he would get a rude awakening.

Indeed, there is not a single statement in his paragraph upon Co-operation that will bear the least examination.

JOSEPH BRYCE.

Society News.

GLASGOW BRANCH.

MR GEORGE WHITEHEAD’S presence attracted two fine audiences on Sunday last, the evening audience being extra good. In the morning “Physiological Remedies for Human Defects” was well stated, but somehow did not evoke much criticism. In the evening, “Psychological Remedies” was the subject, and this time a halt had to be called to the questions in order to leave time for the opposition. Most of the questions were relevant, but what a speaker is to say to “If Couism is any good, why did Dr. Coue die?” passeth comprehension.

Sunday November 27, Mr. Wilson, a newcomer to our platform is to speak on “Are Secularists Puritans?” We hope there will be a good turn out.—T. R.

MANCHESTER BRANCH.

“Is Religion a Bar to Progress?” was the subject matter of a debate at the Pavilion of the Castner-Kellner Recreation Club, Runcorn, on Wednesday last, November 16.

The affirmative case was presented by Mr. Sam Cohen,

of the Manchester Branch, and the negative case by Mrs. E. M. Lavender, M.A., I.L.A., of the Theosophical Society.

Mr. Cohen defined religion as belief in the supernatural, and then went on to show how historically religion had stood in the way of reform, and that instead of giving a lead it had always lagged behind. With the growth of knowledge and the advance of science, man had to civilize his religion. The belief in hell, the attitude towards slavery, and the woman question, were instanced by Mr. Cohen as proofs of his case.

Mrs. Lavender did not follow the case put by Mr. Cohen, but talked about the law of God, and defined religion as that which binds man back to his source, he was part of the divine to which he seeks to be related. Instead of material standards, development must be on spiritual lines. Our old friends the "Something behind phenomena," and the "Great Creative Mind" were mentioned. Life itself was the quest—it was something different to the material channels through which it manifested. The One indwelling Life and social subconsciousness were also phrases which, like the peace of God, pass all understanding.

The Members of the Club were afforded an opportunity of questions and comments, and then Mr. Cohen and Mrs. Lavender replied. Altogether the Freethought position was well sustained, and will undoubtedly benefit as a result of the encounter.—M.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH.

THOUGH sparsely attended on account of exceptionally bad weather, last Sunday's address by Mr. Rex Roberts was one of the most interesting we have listened to this season. The subject, "National Needs," was too wide to be thoroughly covered in the discussion, but one or two outstanding points were seized upon and dealt with by Mr. Ebury, Mr. Loubadi, Mr. George Saville and others in the audience. We were glad to hear and see our old friend, Mr. Collette-Jones, again, also. The outcome of the lecture, which we look forward to with great pleasure is a debate between Mr. Rex Roberts and Mr. George Saville during our Spring Session.

To-night, Mrs. Ivy Elstob addresses us for the first time. From what we know of Mrs. Elstob's views, her subject "The Future of Marriage," will stimulate an even better discussion than usual. We expect a really good audience.—K. B. K.

Obituary.

MR. W. WILSON.

FREETHINKERS in the North of England will learn with regret of the sudden death of Mr. W. Wilson, of Liverpool. Mr. Wilson, who had been a Secularist for over fifty years, had a severe heart attack on Tuesday, November 15, and died the following day. According to his wish, Mr. Wilson was cremated and his ashes scattered. A Secular Burial Service was conducted by Dr. Carmichael in the presence of a large number of local Freethinkers, who assembled to pay the last tribute to one of their most esteemed members.—F. M.

THE "FREETHINKER."

THE *Freethinker* may be ordered from any newsagent in the United Kingdom, and is supplied by all the wholesale agents. It will be sent direct from the publishing office, post free, to any part of the world on the following terms:—

One Year, 15s.; Six Months, 7s. 6d.

Three Months, 3s. 9d.

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

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, Mrs. Ivy Elstob—"The Future of Marriage."

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (30 Brixton Road, S.W., near Oval Station): 7.15, Mr. W. Sandford—"Is Modern Science Materialistic?"

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7.0, R. Dimsdale Stocker—"Ethical Aspects of 'Behaviourism.'"

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (The London Institution Theatre, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11.0, S. K. Ratcliffe—"Fresh News from the North."

STRATFORD TOWN HALL.—Chapman Cohen will deliver an address on: "The New Warfare Between Science and Religion." Chair at 7 p.m. (See advt. on page 768).

THE METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (34, George Street, Manchester Square, W.1): 7.30, Lecture on "My Pilgrimage from Christianity to Secularism." Thursday, December 1, at 7.45 p.m. Debate on: "Should Capital Punishment be Abolished?" (Mr. Lombardi and Mr. Reynolds).

OUTDOOR.

FREETHOUGHT MEETING (corner of North End Road, Fulham, near Walham Green Church): Saturday 7.30, Speakers—F. Bryant, A. J. Mathie. Local Freethinkers' attendance invited.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common): 11.30, Mr. L. Ebury, Wednesday, November 30 (Clapham Old Town): 8 p.m., Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 3.0, Messrs. Hyatt and E. C. Saphin. At 6.0, Messrs. Campbell-Everden, Le Maine, and Darby. (Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith): 3.0, W. P. Campbell-Everden—A Lecture. Freethought meetings 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. Jno. Welsh—"Embryology." Chair will be taken by Mr. T. Birtley.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY, Branch of the N.S.S. (No 2 Room, City Hall, Albion Street): 6.30, Mr. W. D. Wilson—"Are Secularists Puritans?"

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Engineers Hall, 120 Rusholme Road): R. B. Kerr, M.A., I.L.B. (London). Subjects: 3.0 p.m., "Is Britain Overpopulated?"; 6.30 p.m., "Birth Control." Questions and discussion cordially invited. Admission free. Silver collection.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (18 Colquitt Street off Bold Street): 7.30, Dr. Carmichael—"Materialism Re-stated." Admission free. Discussion.

OUTDOOR.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N.S.S.—Meetings held in the Bull Ring on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, at 7 p.m.

The Egyptian Origin of Christianity.

THE HISTORICAL, JESUS AND MYTHICAL CHRIST.

By GERALD MASSEY.

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

Price 6d., postage 1d.

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

UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

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

CONVICTIONS' COURAGE

enables us to take the bold step of severing ourselves from all other interests and devoting our whole time and energies to the service of Freethinkers. We are convinced that fellow Freethinkers have feelings like our own; that kinship of ideals and aspirations engenders a desire to associate, an inclination to help, and a longing to trust. We are convinced that Freethinkers will entrust us with enough commands to keep us fully employed. We are convinced that our experience and skill, backed by the powerful incentive to do the very best for Freethinkers, make it more than worth while for every Freethinker to buy clothes from us only. We are sure you will write at once for one or other of the following:—

Gents' A to D Patterns, Suits from 59/-;
Gents' E Patterns, Suits all at 72/6;
Gents' F to H Patterns, Suits from 81/-;
Gents' I to M Patterns, Suits from 106/-;
Gents' Overcoat Patterns, prices from 52/6;
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

**MANCHESTER,
 BIRMINGHAM
 AND
 LONDON**

FREETHINKERS are asked to communicate at once with Mr. Macconnell, who is organizing shopping weeks in these cities in the order named. The idea is that parties of Freethinkers will be conducted on tours of the wholesale warehouses, where they will see larger displays of every sort of goods than in even the biggest retail shops. They will be at liberty to examine and purchase anything they require, thus buying in their own city, and still supporting a Freethought concern advertising in the *Freethinker*.

Freethinkers in general are asked to note that from henceforward they will have two clear-cut alternatives when buying clothes and household requirements of every nature—it will be either funds for Freethought, or cash for Christianity. Nothing which energy and ingenuity can contrive will be left undone to make the first of these alternatives not merely a slogan but a ruling principle. We shall in fact strive to make it even easier and more convenient for you to buy from us than in the way you have hitherto done.

This half-page in the FREETHINKER has been taken permanently. It will take some paying for, and your support is both asked and expected. Bear in mind, such support will be paid for. You have only to test our service; gain practical knowledge of the values we consistently offer, to realize that it truly pays to buy from us. Make funds for Freethought your slogan.

MACCONNELL & MABE,
 New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

The Crisis in the Church

Those who wish to understand the dispute now raging in the Established Church concerning the Sacrament should read:

GOD EATING

A Study in Christianity and Cannibalism
 By J. T. LLOYD

PRICE 3d. By Post 4d.

This pamphlet deals with the subject from the historical, doctrinal and anthropological points of view. It is just the kind of work to place in the hands of an enquiring Christian.

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

**Materialism
 Re-stated**

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

A CLEAR and concise statement of one of the most important issues in the history of science and philosophy. In view of the mis-statements and misrepresentations of Materialism, and the current controversy on the bearings of scientific teaching on religious doctrines, there is great need for a work of this description. It bids fair to take its place with the same author's *Determinism or Free Will?*

Contains Chapters on:

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

Cloth bound, price 2/6. Postage 2½d.

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

LITTLE BLUE BOOKS

By JOSEPH McCABE

Send stamp for list to:

Dept. A., 82 ERIDGE ROAD, THORNTON HEATH, SURREY.

YOU WANT ONE.



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

More Bargains in Books!!

The Rise, Decline and Fall of the Roman Religion

A treatise on the phallic worship
and phallic symbolism enshrined
in the Christian religion.

By J. B. HANNAY

Privately printed by the Religious Evolution Research
Society.

With numerous plates of phallic symbols, etc., etc.

Published in 1925
at 15/-

PRICE 4/6
Postage 6d.

Within the Atom

A popular outline of our present
knowledge of physics.

By JOHN MILLS

Published at
6/- net.

PRICE 3/-
Postage 4½d.

The Psychology of Social Life

A Materialistic study. An impor-
tant and suggestive treatise.

BY

CHARLES PLATT, M.D., Ph.D.

Published at
12/6 net.

PRICE 4/6
Postage 5½d.

Our Fear Complexes

An important psychological study.

BY

E. H. WILLIAMS & E. B. HOAG

Published at
7/6 net.

PRICE 3/-
Postage 4½d.

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.

STRATFORD TOWN HALL

Sunday, November 27th, 1927

CHAPMAN COHEN

(President National Secular Society)

WILL DELIVER AN ADDRESS ON

"The New Warfare Between Science and Religion"

Doors open
at 6.30

Chair taken
at 7.0

ADMISSION FREE
COLLECTION

Questions and discussion cordially
invited

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.