

A JOURNALISTIC FIASCO.

The

FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

VOL. XLVIII.—No. 30

SUNDAY, JULY 22, 1928

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>A Journalistic Fiasco.—The Editor</i> - - -	465
<i>The Silent Revolution.—Mimmermus</i> - - -	467
<i>The Resurrection—According to Mark.—J. Sim</i> - - -	468
<i>Our Clerical Guides.—Alpha</i> - - -	469
<i>Body and Mind.—Keridon</i> - - -	474
<i>Mr. Chesterton Replies.—H. Cutner</i> - - -	475
<i>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus in the Talmud.—C. Clayton Dove</i> - - -	477

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

Views and Opinions.

(Continued from page 450.)

A Journalistic Fiasco.

IN dealing with the articles with which the *Daily News* beguiled its readers during the discussion on "Where are the dead?" one is curious as to why certain people were asked to contribute at all. The most striking illustration is the article by Mr. Lloyd George. No one, either friend or enemy, has, so far as I am aware, ever accused the ex-Prime Minister of being either a thinker or a reader. His knowledge of either science or philosophy is, one would imagine, about as near a minus quantity as could well be. It may be admitted that he knows as much of another life as anyone else, but on that count a parade of Salvationists would be equally effective as an argument. And, wonder of wonders, he writes an article which, with the single exception of the sentence, "There is a striking revival of interest in all that concerns the Founder of Christianity and the mysteries of the hereafter," never once mentions the subject of the dead or a future life. But to be just to Mr. Lloyd George, the article does not appear to have been written for the *Daily News* discussion at all, but as one of a series of articles written for a syndicate, and which the *Daily News* seems to have purchased for inclusion in its columns. Doubtless it thought that the name of an ex-Prime Minister in a symposium on the existence of a future life would be impressive, whether he said anything about the subject or not. In the game of "spoofing the mugs," every little helps.

Lord Gorell lengthens the discussion by telling us some of the beliefs he has about a future life, which is interesting enough if it happened to be what Lord Gorell believes that was under discussion, but is of no earthly interest to anyone otherwise. What Lord Gorell believes is of no greater intrinsic importance than what any Methodist local preacher believes. It is not what Lord Gorell believes, but the reasons he has for believing that are of interest. And the quotations he gives from various authors—all the quotations are in the one direction—have no value other than as a possible contribution some

anthology of a future life. His sapient conclusion is that "We are forced, since our questions lead nowhere, to the belief that there are things which we cannot understand, things not to be measured or proved by our earth-bound, earth-born minds and means." So meanwhile we will go on believing things we cannot understand, and ask questions that we know cannot be answered. But apart from these two, a very great deal of what most of the other champions of the belief in immortality had to say might well come under the same head. What they did say was often enough irrelevant, and often enough quite worthless when said—not much more above the intellectual level of the average sermon, from which one may suppose they had borrowed many of their sentiments.

* * *

Save Us from Our Friends.

I pointed out last week, that of the twenty-four contributors of articles there were only three who could be counted as at all representing the opposition. Of these three, Sir Arthur Keith had to be invited because the writers were all more or less concerned with what he said. I purpose examining what these three said first of all, and seeing how far they can be said to present the case against future existence as put by a Freethinker who knows the case and is not afraid to state it.

Of these three articles, the one by Sir Arthur Keith is far and away the best, and keeps closest to the subject. He handles his subject strictly from the point of view of the working scientist, with just such reflections as the common sense of any medical man would suggest. Needless to say, none of the believers attempt to deal with his arguments. What they do is to throw conundrums at him, and then take his inability to answer these to their satisfaction as proof of their own knowledge. As usual, it never strikes these religious ladies and gentlemen that the ignorance of A is not quite the equivalent of the knowledge of B. Both may be ignorant—in that case I should not be surprised to find men like Lord Gorell and some of the others arguing that if both are ignorant then both ought to be religious. There is great historical support for this claim.

Of the other two, it may be said that their contributions strongly remind me of a dictum of one of my favourite authors, Sir Thomas Browne, that it is not given to everyone to act worthily as a champion of truth, and many injure truth by their ill-considered striving. Mr. Arnold Bennett opens his essay with the warning that we should be careful to avoid wounding anyone's religious susceptibilities, and must bear in mind that no answer to the question can be final. That is not a very promising beginning, but the end is well suited to it. He is convinced that we shall never know what death signifies or is; but human ignorance is more than

bliss, it is an ordnance of the divine wisdom. This, be it remembered, is one of the three whom the Editor of the *Daily News*, in his child-like simplicity, selected as fitly representing Freethought. I am not sure that we may never know what death is, science seems well on its way to knowing all about it sooner or later. Nor do I know why it would be any worse to know that man will live beyond the grave—if it be a fact—than it is to know that any baby may probably live to be eighty. If I may venture on an analysis of Mr. Bennett's mental state, I would suggest that he is confusing a fore-knowledge of every event in a man's life, with a knowledge of the general duration of human existence. The former would rob life of much of its interest. It is round the corner that makes the road attractive. But the latter kind of knowledge is already given us in actuarial tables without it making us at all miserable.

* * *

How Not to Do It.

We have the Editor's assurance that Mr. Bennett "has the sanity, clarity, and lack of sentimentality which always win the ears of those who prize common sense." An excellent testimonial, but one is left regretting that the example furnished in the present article is not of a more convincing character. For example, he believes that matter and spirit are indivisible—an expression that is certain to lead to confusion in others, even if it does not indicate it on the part of the writer. He is of opinion that when the body loses its "organized vitality," and when the soul loses its organized vitality, both are resolved into their original atoms. Mr. Bennett does not seem to have grasped the fact that the question at issue is whether the "soul" is the name of a thing or a term used to cover a number of mental phenomena. And after that, one is not altogether surprised to find the following:—

But atoms are indestructibly alive; they are the most alive things we know; they probably comprise the potentialities of all intelligence and all progress, according to the manner in which they combine and recombine. Nothing can be destroyed—no quality of mind, no beauty, no kindliness. The elements of that which we have loved will in some new and probably finer form reappear to us or to our descendants. Everything is from everlasting to everlasting. And in the ordinary sense of the word there are no dead.

It is really too bad of the Editor to so give Mr. Bennett away as to describe him as having the sanity, clarity, and lack of sentimentality which always win the ears of those who prize common sense, in the same issue of his paper in which the article appears. For the article is certainly not clear, and it is riddled with sentimentality. For example, the only ground on which Mr. Bennett is justified in saying that the atoms are indestructibly alive is that they are in motion, and are indestructible—the latter statement being open to question, if the most recent researches are to be trusted. And while life may be a form of motion, it is not by any means the case that every form of motion is life. That is equal to the blunder of "All fiddlers are men, therefore all men are fiddlers." I know that scientists exercise a certain poetic license and say that all atoms are alive, but they would be the first to disown the belief that they were alive in the sense that the organism is alive. And if they were reprimanded for using this language they would probably reply that it is intolerable not to be permitted to give those who listen to their statements credit for a minimum of sanity and common sense. If life means vital phenomena, then

there is nothing more certain than that the atoms are *not* alive.

As for a lack of sentimentality, I would beg anyone to observe the sugary foolishness of the "Nothing can be destroyed—no quality of mind, no beauty, no kindliness." People who sip that kind of thing with pleasure are not likely to notice that the things which cannot be destroyed—beauty, kindliness—are all of a pleasing nature. But if no quality of mind can be destroyed it must apply to all qualities, and how different the passage would read, and what a different effect it would have on the readers, perhaps on even Mr. Bennett himself, if it read:—

No quality of mind can be destroyed, no hatred, no brutality, no ugliness, no greed, all is from everlasting to everlasting.

In that case I have no doubt that the Editor would think twice before again inviting Mr. Bennett to give his thoughts on immortality.

It must also be comforting to those who are always whining that the universe is an imposture unless they are able to meet somewhere or the other someone whom they have loved, to be told that "The elements of that which we have loved will in some new and probably finer form reappear to us or to our descendants." That is cheering, although just a trifle dangerous, for there is the possibility that some religious reader may have a cerebral spasm, which will lead him to reflect that it is not the *elements* of the beloved thing that he is bothering about, but the special combination of elements which makes "that which we have loved." One might as well give to a man who is craving a glass of beer the ingredients of beer done up in packages, and assure him that if he swallows them he will be drinking Bass or Burton. Nor can I imagine one of these sentimentalists feeling satisfied with the knowledge that he will meet "that which we have loved" in some other form. I cannot for the life of me think that Mr. Robert Blatchford, whose belief in a future life appears to be largely motivated by his affection for his wife and his desire to meet her in some future life, being quite satisfied on coming across a spiritualized cabbage as the then existing form of the one of whom he is in search. Mr. Bennett might have reflected that if a thing is transformed into something else, then it is not the same thing, and that if a man is "yearning" to meet some *one* then *any* one will hardly fill the bill. I really think that Mr. Bennett may sleep easy. He cannot have disturbed the faith of anyone, and he cannot have wounded the susceptibilities of even a Billy Sunday. On the other hand, he may have done something to convince the unthinking that they are philosophers, and that the cerebral excitation of a sucking curate reaches a deeper basis of "Reality" (blessed word!) than does the mental activity of a Spinoza. And I am sure he will always be welcome in the columns of the *Daily News* whenever religion is on the carpet.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

(To be continued.)

Birds of Paradise.

BOTH Leda's swan, and Mary's dove
Were sent as messengers of love.
From heaven to earth they quickly flew
Carrying the Royal *billet-doux*,
For in those days Jove and the Ghost
Were partial to the feathered post,
Alas! in our prosaic days,
We can't employ romantic ways,
But still the lover's flattering tale
Oft travels by the Royal Mail.

S. SODDY.

The Silent Revolution.

If I am not level with the lowest, I am nothing."

Edward Carpenter.

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

THOMAS CARLYLE'S affectionate tribute to Walter Savage Landor, "the unsubduable, old Roman," comes to mind on reading in the newspapers that Lord Sydenham, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, has been expressing his views of men and affairs. This veteran has seen so much of life in its various phases that his experiences lend additional weight to his utterance. A man who has seen so much of the world has enjoyed unusual scope for observation. During his working life he has been engineer, soldier, administrator, scientist, traveller, and artist. Hear what this man of affairs has to say:—

"I have seen in my eighty years of life no improvement in the world of art, statesmanship, or ideas—indeed there has been none since the Romans; but I see people daily becoming relatively more and more ignorant, which must, of course, continue to be the case. There is, you see, so much more to know and only the same human brain to assimilate it. It cannot be done. I shall probably not live to see it, but this modern race of invention and development will result in a terrible crash."

Wisdom is too often conceded to those who have lived a long time, but it is quite safe to assume that a comprehensive and philosophical survey of the world is only the result of experience. To John Ruskin, for example, our so-called progress was largely an illusion. Lord Sydenham is as emphatic as Ruskin in his denunciation of the hurry-scurry and haste of modern life. He is, however, on less safe ground when he regards "a terrible crash" as being probable in the future. Every generation has had a very plentiful supply of Jeremiahs who prophesy startling events, usually for a cash consideration.

Lord Sydenham speaks as a man of the world, and he is greatly impressed by the present-day industrialism, and our complex civilization. Only super-men can deal with such vast matters, and there are so few super-men. It is just as well. There is no need to sigh for the time when one man could compile an encyclopædia, and assure the innocent reader that the book contained all that there was to know. As for super-men, even Napoleon outlived his usefulness as an actor-manager, and lagged superfluous on the stage of life.

There is something more, however, in those eighty years of Lord Sydenham than the life of one individual. There is the summary of the biggest change that has ever come over the life of mankind during the lifetime of one man. Lord Sydenham looks back regretfully to the classical days of the old Romans, but he has missed a momentous silent revolution which has taken place in his own time. The greatest change during the past eighty years is due to the undoubted fact that Supernaturalism is played out, and men's minds are broadening. Men and women are no longer able to accept upon mere trust the religious, social, and theological ideas that satisfied their remote ancestors. Over the pulpits of the fast-emptying churches is inscribed: "To the glory of God." That is the voice of the past. Secularism sounds the triumphant note of the future, "To the service of Man." Based on fables, supported by dead men's money, trading on ignorance, the clergy now find the conscience of the race in revolt against their outworn Oriental ideas. Theology has long enough darkened the earth, and separated man from

man. A new impulse is at hand to make men join hands and hearts. This impulse is Secularism, which embraces the whole world in one great fellowship.

Freethought is a far nobler and wider evangel than a purely political one. It has its roots in intellectual necessity, and, deeper still, in ethical right. It is based on the psychological law of human development. Reaffirmed from generation to generation from the days of Voltaire and Thomas Paine to those of to-day, it is now changing the character and direction of the ideas of the civilized world.

Although Lord Sydenham insists that there has been no improvement in basic ideas since the far-off days of Ancient Rome, there has been this great silent revolution which makes the contrast between the old and new seem so startling. The British to-day are the kindest people on the earth. A few generations ago Christian priests were roasting their fellow Christians in full view of the populace, and our penal code was Chinese in its ferocity. In the history of evolution a few generations are nothing. There is no reason to suppose that in so short a space the species has undergone perceptible change. We regard such horrors as being barbaric, not because we are a different species, but because our minds have been broadened.

Because some of us wear shiny silk hats and spats we are apt to regard ourselves as radically different from and superior to our ancestors. Because we have gramophones and motor-cars we are not superior to Plato and Socrates. The best brains of the ancient and modern world could meet to-day without loss of dignity on either side. The real advance has been made, not with regard to a dozen superior persons scattered throughout the world; but with regard to the enormous rise in general intelligence. There is less widespread ignorance, and the tendency to be superstitious is being lessened day by day. The importance attached to mascots and charms shows that there is still a residuum, a bed-rock of ignorance. Indeed, there are numbers of people who have nothing to learn in the matter of fetishes from the savages of Africa and New Guinea. This is the class from which Priestcraft derives its support.

Yet the last word will be with the humanitarians. Their ideals are, far and away, the noblest. If they are ahead of the times in which they live, they have real faith in the future of humanity. They believe that when idleness and vicious luxury on the one hand, and oppressive labour and the dread of starvation on the other, are alike unknown, when the standard of opinion is set by the best and wisest among us, then Democracy will come into its heritage. Tradition means giving votes to the most obscure of all classes, our remote ancestors. It is unsuited for the living, for it is the democracy of the cemeteries.

Lord Sydenham's valedictory remarks have caused me to eulogise other things than "the glory that was Greece, and the grandeur that was Rome." I cannot agree that the composite human mind must break down under the enormous task it has set itself. As Emerson points out, the world is a good swimmer. There may never be a crisis, and there is no need for undue excitement. A passenger on a ship was aroused by a fellow-passenger. "Wake up!" shouted the traveller, "the boat is sinking!" "Well," replied the man in the bunk, "what does it matter? It doesn't belong to me."

MIMNERMUS.

The renunciation of war is not enough.

Lord Grey of Fallodon.

The Resurrection—According to Mark.

LONG before the time of Jesus Christ, Buddha, Krishna, Adonis, and a host of other gods had died for humanity and had risen again. This is a formality that is expected of gods. It is what they are for. Unless they rise to the occasion, quite properly, they are not recognized as gods.

It is remarkable how these ancient deities anticipated our Western object of worship. Buddha selected December 25 for his birthday. His mother was the Virgin Maya. He disputed and taught in the temple when twelve years old. He rose from the dead, and some day he is coming back to our weary, wicked world, so that we may all live happily ever afterwards. Krishna was born in a cave, of a virgin. He worked miracles, was crucified, descended into hell, rose again, and ascended into heaven. All men saw him go! Adonis was a virgin-born god, suffered death, and of him M. Loisy says: "It is by no mere chance that the resurrection of Christ on the third day after his death coincides with the ritual of the Feast of Adonis." In our time, in our part of the world, all these stories of gods rising again after death are quietly but firmly ruled out—with only one exception. Men, mostly with spectacles, and often with an array of imposing ecclesiastical titles in front, or with impressive letters representing theological distinctions tacked on to their names, still treat seriously the stories of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Why this exception? Is there satisfactory evidence in the case of Jesus Christ which is wanting in the others? The answer is in the negative.

In the four gospels there are four conflicting contradictory accounts given of this alleged happening. Select any one of these four as a true and accurate narrative of fact, and you at once cancel the other three accounts, as no two are in any sort of agreement. These gospels are anonymous productions. No one knows when, where, or by whom they were written. It is even disputed in which language or languages they first appeared. It is only certain that neither of them can claim to belong to the generation of, nor to the generation immediately succeeding that of the time of Jesus.

It is not claimed that Mark ever heard Jesus Christ, but because Mark shows less of the miraculous (he makes no mention of the miraculous virgin birth for example) and because it is believed—on very slender evidence—to be the work of a companion of Peter, and because it is reckoned to date earlier than the others, Mark's Gospel is claimed by Christian apologists to be worthy of special consideration. It is a damning confession of the weakness of their case, when they are fain to cling to an "authority" who admittedly never saw Christ, but who was reputed to have got his information from the same Peter, who anticipated the Pickwickian opportunist, and "went back" on his leader at a critical time, when the tide of popularity had turned against him. There is a vague tradition that Peter took it as a personal reflection when the bad little boys of Jerusalem used to put their fingers to their noses and imitate the *cock-a-doodle-do* of a rooster.

Mark's account of the resurrection trenches but little on the miraculous—it only hints at the supernatural. To trace the growth of the resurrection snowball is most illuminating. Mark's story simply is that three ladies, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, early on Sunday morning visited the tomb or cave where Jesus had been interred, bringing spices. They had anticipated

trouble in getting the stone closing the cave removed, but they found it already rolled away. Entering, they found a young man sitting on the right side, who politely told them not to be frightened, and that Jesus "is risen . . . behold the place where they laid him. Go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see him as he said unto you." Nothing supernatural so far. The unknown young man's statement was not necessarily the whole truth; obviously, he could make any statement he pleased, and commit no one but himself. Mark's story then ends with these words: "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed; neither said they anything to any man; for they were afraid."

"Oh lame and impotent conclusion!" Surely for a "miracle" that is supposed to affect the whole human race, a less adequate account can hardly be conceived. And the cream of the joke is that Matthew, Luke, and John disagree with every particular here given. Another gentleman of the pen recognized the inadequacy of Mark's deficiencies in a practical manner by adding an artistic finish to Mark's gospel. Verse 9 to the end of the 16th chapter of Mark is admitted by all competent investigators, Christian or otherwise, to be a spurious addition to the real "Mark." This fraudulent Mark has no squeamishness about bringing in the supernatural. He deals out the marvellous with a liberal hand. He postulates that all true Christians can cast out devils, can speak with new tongues, can handle serpents or drink poison without hurt and so on. He enumerates three appearances of Jesus Christ after resurrection, and incidentally adds: "He was received up into heaven."

Does not the inclusion of these spurious verses with Mark's Gospel totally condemn, not only the resurrection story, but also the Christian leaders who knowingly circulate Bibles containing this admitted forgery? This brazen fabrication is passed off by learned Christians as being the veritable "Word of God," and it has been, and is now, accepted by ignorant Christians in untold multitudes, as being part of the very "Word of God."

There is nowhere in the Bible, nor outside of it, one witness for the resurrection that would be admitted in a British Court of Justice. Just think that it is not even pretended that the actual resurrection—the only worth while miracle in the whole of the world's history—was witnessed by any human eye. The stories told of the resurrection are by men who never saw Christ either alive or dead. Such tales are useless in support of alleged miracle.

If there is a *miracle* in connexion with the resurrection, it lies in the fact that man—with his vaunted intelligence—should be caught in such numbers with such poor samples of theological chaff.

J. SIM.

Colney Hatch.

I WILL put Truth in a box because
They say Truth's dynamite,
Then I will sap and mine Earth's walls
And set the fuse alight.

Then I will run away and hide,
Stopping my ears with wool . . .
And when th' explosion's over, come
And build Earth beautiful.

JOHN H. HEWITT.

Our Clerical Guides.

AN unconscious revelation of the attitude of the public mind with reference to the clergy may be seen by the manner in which it receives the news when a clergyman lapses into what we may call ordinary common sense. Among even moderately educated men and women disbelief in miracles, the infallibility of the Bible, and the like is common—so common that its expression has ceased to call for comment and rouses no surprise. But let a clergyman say during the course of a sermon or an article, that he does not believe in these things, or that he has grave doubts about them, and he is sure of staring headlines in the newspapers, while the man in the street opens his eyes in surprise.

How are we to account for this? What mental attitude does it indicate? The man who will take as a matter of course disbelief in certain religious doctrines when the doubt is expressed by laymen, nay, who will be surprised if his brother layman believes them, is very much surprised when he finds a parson expressing doubts about the same things. It would seem that the explanation of this curious position must be that he is not expecting a clergyman to either know enough about these things to detect their falsity, or he is astonished that, knowing the truth, he should so far forget himself as to express it.

This frame of mind is indicated in another way. A layman may have grave doubts about particular religious doctrines. His doubts may amount to positive disbelief. But in the presence of a clergyman he will remain silent. Pressed for a reason for his reticence he will often reply that one does not like to hurt a parson's feelings by telling him that these things are not true. He behaves to him much as an adult to a child who believes in fairy tales. It is quite natural, even amusing, for the undeveloped mentality of a child to accept such stories as true, and he thinks it wrong to disturb the enjoyment the child is getting out of the stories. So, apparently, he treats the parson as one who cannot be expected to know the truth about religion; or, if he does know it, cannot reasonably be expected to tell it. And when either thing happens, he buttonholes his friends to express his astonishment that a mere parson should betray such unusual candour or possess so much knowledge, while the newspapers have an eruption of headlines and exclamation marks at the phenomenon. If I were a parson, I think I should strongly resent this assumption on the part of the layman that I was a mentally undeveloped or irresponsible individual.

Should anyone think I am overstating the case, let them take the following from the *Daily Express* of July 12. At the Congregational Conference held at Oxford, on July 11, the Rev. John Bevan, of Balham, said:—

There would be no great harm done if many parts of the Old Testament were lost to the sight of men and preserved only in museums or for the delectation of students. Their religious value is negligible; in fact, they have never been of the least help to true religion.

The Old Testament is not a children's book, and should not be put into a child's hands. The child is not able to grasp the religious significance of it, and the result is that it just bores him stiff because it deals with a world he knows nothing about.

We should tell our congregations quite frankly that the history in the Bible has no more bearing on religious truth than any other history.

The *Express* calls this an "astonishing attack." But, clearly, the only reason that can exist for regarding this as "astonishing" is that it comes from

a clergyman. It would not be astonishing if a layman said it. It would cause no greater comment than a man saying that the next election would see a change of government, or that hardly anyone believes nowadays in a flat earth. It can only be surprising because a parson is not really expected to know so much about the real Bible, or to be so ready to tell the truth about it. One day some enterprising newspaper will print such a report with something like the following headlines:—

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BIBLE BY A CLERGYMAN!

ASTONISHING INCIDENT AT A CHURCH GATHERING.

Prominent Laymen surprised that a minister should tell the truth about his creed.

Of course, that is on the assumption that both the newspapers and the clergy are overtaken, at the same time, with an attack of mental straightforwardness.

Consider. *The Age of Reason* has been in existence for 135 years. It has been circulated by hundreds of thousands. It has been the most attacked and the most blackguarded book ever issued in the war between Religion and Freethought. Scores of men and women have been sent to prison for publishing it and selling it. Its teachings have been popularized on thousands of platforms, and there are very few biblical scholars to-day who would question its fundamental statements. And after 135 years it creates a sensation to find a parson has discovered some of the truth about the Bible! Either that or the surprise is that he should have the straightforwardness to tell it. It is not for me to say which is the more correct. But I should like to see some parson explain which is the more correct assumption of the two.

I like the advice: "We should tell our congregations quite frankly that the history in the Bible has no more bearing on religious truth than any other history." The advice is far more interesting in what it reveals than it is in what it actually says. We ought to tell our congregations the truth! What have they been doing? We ought to tell them quite frankly! What have they been doing? Did ever men who set themselves up as moral instructors give themselves away so completely? And the advice to the other clergymen present is given only when a deal of truth about the Bible is—thanks to Freethought propaganda—so widely known that if the clergy do not admit some of the truth they stand a good chance of losing their congregations altogether. Really, if he is more stupid, there is something better about the parson who says: "I have been brought up to preach these fables; I promised to preach these fables; I am paid to preach these fables, and I will go on preaching them."

Even now the advice to be a little more honest than they have been halts. It stops at the Old Testament. But what of the New? What substantial difference is there in the two collections? Every scholar knows that the objections against the one hold good about the other. Each is no more than a chapter in the history of mythology. Scholarship has riddled both volumes. But the clergy have managed to keep the people more ignorant about the one than the other. When Freethought has done for the New what it has admittedly done for the Old Testament, then we may expect to find some parson explaining that it is time they spoke the truth about that also.

ALPHA.

Acid Drops.

We see that the *Daily News*, satisfied with the results of its imposture of a "Debate" on "Where are the Dead?" is commencing another discussion on "If Christ Came to London." We shall unquestionably see the same elaborate humbug staged. Writers who can be safely trusted to say nothing that will hurt Christianity will be invited to contribute, all others being carefully excluded. Parsons will be told that if they mention the discussion, their sermons may be reported. Letters from Christian cranks of all kinds will be published, and a few very mild ones from outsiders, drastic communications being promptly consigned to the W.P.B., and at the end the *Daily News* will triumphantly proclaim that the huge volume of letters received, and the general tone of all the articles shows that Jesus is still dear to the hearts of the people, and that there is a general agreement that salvation is to be found in his teaching only. Which is really surprising, considering that it is only believers in his teaching who will be allowed a say in the matter.

We suggest the following guide for letter writers and others who wish their communications to appear in the *Daily News*. (1) Begin by saying that the name of Jesus is the greatest name on earth, but refrain from saying that this is only the case in Christian countries, and then only when considering those who profess to believe in Christianity. Otherwise it will look like saying that to those who believe the name of Jesus is the greatest on earth, the name of Jesus is the greatest on earth, which may strike even *Daily News* readers as peculiar. (2) Do not hint at the fact of Jesus preaching a gospel of other-worldliness, of his demonstrated ignorance, of his subscribing to all the superstitions of the day, of his belief in a flat earth, demonism, possession, etc. (3) Do not hint that the whole importance of the figure of Jesus to the Christian Church and to the Christian world is, not that Jesus is a good man, but that he was an incarnate God. (4) Do not hint that every one of the characteristics of the gospel is to be found in connexion with others of the world's saviour gods. That might have the effect of disturbing the faith of some of the readers of the *Daily News*. (5) When running short of ideas, pile on the "sob stuff" about the joy the hope in Jesus has brought to weary souls, the infinite sympathy with all sorts of suffering, his boundless love for the poor, the weary hearts that have crawled to the cross for help and strength, and so forth, and so forth. It is impossible to write too much of this kind of thing. The greater its silliness the more welcome it will be, the surer evidence of strong spiritual insight. If these rules are followed, writers will be sure of a place in the *Daily News*.

Though regretting the continued decrease in Sunday school scholars, the report of the Young People's Department of the United Methodist Conference expresses the view that "it is due to causes we could do little to alter, such as a small child population in the country, the growth of Sunday games, the coming of the motor-bus, and the decay of parental control." The report might have included another cause—the parents' lack of belief and interest in the Christian religion, despite the well-meant efforts of the daily papers and the B.B.C. We fancy that is the chief cause of all, and we wonder how the Conference could have overlooked it.

If anyone wishes to know what is a "vested interest," he can get an inkling from the following facts. The General Chapel Committee of the Wesleyan Church announces that the total income is £1,255,827, and the total expenditure is £1,331,765. This income and expenditure concerns only one Christian denomination, and relates merely to repairing and building activities. From this it will not be difficult to understand why ministers and their hangers-on, and also ecclesiastical builders and architects, view with alarm the widespread indifference to the Christian religion. If Christ "came

again," we fancy he would be vastly interested in the wonderful industry carried on in the name of God & Company. We commend this notion to the *Daily News*.

Lord Cecil, of Chelwood, at the Albert Hall last week, expressed his regret that the League of Nations is a secular organization. Its great defect, he thought, was that it had no direct connexion with Christianity or organized religion; but he did not see how it could have such a connexion, for, obviously, there were non-Christian countries represented there. Considering the kind of mess Christians have made of affairs, it is just as well.

The Rev. Samuel Chadwick, of Cliff College, says: "If you can prove to me that he (Jesus) said he believed Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days, then I believe it too." We feel sure Mr. Chadwick has no need to wait for proof before believing. With his infinite capacity for swallowing Biblical tall stories, he would have no difficulty in believing that Jonah swallowed the whale, if the Bible said so.

A pious reporter of missions and conventions doesn't like a well-known preacher's trick of praying in public with his hands in his pocket. Maybe the preacher has a reason. He may have heard that towels and soap disappear from a certain Wesleyan church, and he fears for the contents of his pockets.

Lord Desborough, in moving the second reading of the Easter Bill, said:—

A fixed Easter would do more for the drapery trade even than a revision of income tax. I understand the spring fashions come out at Easter, and the different dates of Easter are a great hindrance to the trade.

After centuries of drama for the poor over this date, it would seem that trade has the winning vote, and as far as we can see, it is as sensible a suggestion as any for the yearly dose of dirge to be fixed at a regular time each year. The Fall was over a woman, and necessitated redemption, and as a sign that common sense does make a little headway, the most prosaic reason of trade is advanced—with woman again in the background.

A new tract of the Sunday Alliance is headed "Sunday, the Day of Freedom and Fraternity." We know what the bigots' notion is of "freedom and fraternity" on the Sabbath. And no one wants to rob them of it nor prevent them from acting according to it. What we object to is their attempts to force the general public to conform to this narrow notion. The average man outside the churches claims the right to choose what he will do on Sunday, and how he will fraternize. A peculiar thing about the Christian religion is that it breeds busybodies impertinently anxious to interfere with other people's freedom of choice.

Mr. Basil Mathews, author of *Roads to the City of God*, is preparing a *Life of Christ for Boys*. We would advise Mr. Mathews to keep Christ's pacifist instruction about turning the other cheek to the smiter discreetly in the background. Otherwise, modern youth may not be willing to include Jesus in his gallery of heroes, which consists mainly of soldiers, sailors, explorers, and cinema gallants, not to mention the latest speed-king of the motor-track.

Some years ago, says the Editor of the *Sunday School Chronicle*, it seemed as though Japan would rapidly become Christian. But young Japanese came to the universities and the great industries of the West, and what they saw shook their confidence in Christianity. The Editor implies that this confidence was shaken by the inconsistency between Christian belief and precept and Christian practice. That is an easy explanation, but we don't think it is the true one. We believe that what happened is that the young Japanese became acquainted with modern discoveries in the various sciences, and with sceptical criticism of religion.

A recent Fleet Street story is to the effect that a certain eminent person was requested by a publishing firm to write his autobiography. He was offered a considerable sum of money if he would do so. He replied that he thought the story of his career would not be likely to interest the public, but that he desired to write a Life of Christ, and would be glad to arrange with this firm for publication of it. His suggestion was courteously welcomed, but he was reminded that such a book could not, of course, be expected to command so high a fee!

The *Christian World* complained in its last issue that three eminent scientists who pleaded for trained anthropologists to deal with native races showed no appreciation of missionary work. It pointed out that missionaries have added much to our knowledge of the customs of native races. This may be true, but the complaint is a very fine example of the art of mixing things. For missionaries do not go abroad to add to our knowledge of native customs, but to carry "the glorious gospel to the heathen." Of course, they do, in the course of their work, observe something that is useful to others, but it is in no sense part of their work, and they have to be judged in the light of the purpose for which they go among natives.

When that is said, we think that, first, most scientific observers would say that, on the whole, missionaries are not good observers at all. They are, in the vast majority of cases, narrow-minded, ignorant men and women; they have no sympathy with native beliefs; they woefully misunderstand them, and many anthropologists who have relied on missionary reports find themselves sadly at sea. Secondly, missionaries are responsible for almost as much trouble as traders. In China, a great deal of the unrest and the dislike of Europeans may be traced to the ignorance and the intolerance of missionaries, who, where the "heathen" is concerned, show no consideration for native rights or for native customs. The same is true of India and elsewhere. These three scientists had good grounds for leaving missionaries out. Of course, that did not suit the *Christian World*. Had the scientists mentioned them, it would have been dishonestly cited as scientific testimony to the value of missionary work.

A Yarmouth man, aged 104, would appear to be not worrying over much about "immortality." Life is sweet, says he. With Omar Khayyam, he is content to "take the Cash and let the Credit go." To disturb his serenity with Christian fears should be a punishable offence.

The secret of England's greatness, says Mr. James Douglas, is not her laughter but her seriousness. On the other hand, we suggest that one secret of her greatness is her refusal to be serious over certain matters alleged to be serious. That indicates her possession of some sense of proportion.

Discussing the case of Mr. A. J. Cook, the miner's Secretary, who broke into tears during an address, and had to be led from the platform, the *Daily News* says that the incident explains the man, and why he will say a sensible thing to-day and a foolish one to-morrow. He is, it says, "Admirably fitted to open a revivalist meeting anywhere." We are not concerned as to whether this is a correct description of Mr. Cook; we cite it as an example that even the *Daily News* cannot help sometimes dropping into the truth about religion. We hope it will remember when the next revival comes along.

The high tone of Sunday newspapers, and it will be remembered that there are no atheistical Sunday newspapers, is being maintained by an exclusive article from Mrs. Pace, whom we trust has had sufficient sense to name a high price to the newspaper for her article. It is no doubt what the newspapers think the public wants; what the public thinks of what the newspapers think

the public wants, may be gauged by an examination of the parks, commons, and countryside on a Monday morning.

At Sunderland, George Liddle was sent to prison for one month for stealing money from a flag-day collection. The probation officer said that Liddle, who was only seventeen years old, frequented billiard halls on weekdays, and on Sunday went to Church and spoke at open-air religious meetings. This kind of person has to commence somewhere, and if Liddle had been left alone he might have advanced far enough to start a mission of some kind, and have made much more than he could hope to do by "pinching" money from collecting boxes. The magistrate has probably nipped a promising religious career in the bud. Now all that is left for Liddle to do when he comes out is to play the "converted" card. Still, many have done very well in that direction.

If any of our readers have any religious difficulties, there is one man who seems able to remove them. This is the Archdeacon of London. Preaching at St. Mary's, Islington, this servant of the Lord recently dealt with the question of prayer. God, he said, had three ways of replying to prayers. Sometimes he said yes, sometimes he said no, sometimes he said, wait. Now we do not see how any unbeliever is to get over this argument. If, for example, we pray for rain and it rains at once, that is an answer. If it does not rain at once, God is saying, wait, and in time, if we wait, rain will come. If we ask for health, and we get it, it is "yes." If we get it after a time, it is "wait." If we do not get it at all, then "the all seeing power had perceived that an affirmative answer would be bad for them or bad for others." Now that is a complete answer to the sceptic, and we do not see how to get round it. Particularly as the question of how the deuce the Archdeacon knows that God ever answers prayers at all, or if there is a God to listen to them would be ruled out as irrelevant. We should say the Archdeacon earns his salary. Such mentality is not found in high places—save in the Church.

The Rev. J. P. Arendzen, D.D., D.Ph., M.A., had a letter in the *Daily News* on July 6, and it contained a statement that makes one wonder if his distinctions have any relationship with ordinary thinking. He writes: "We can prove that God said it, and a man ought to accept what God said." We had no idea that the Fundamentalists of America had such good representatives in this country, but the statement at its face value indicates that there are plenty of caterers left for fifth-rate minds.

The art of suppressing the truth or suggesting a falsehood are well known methods in controversy, particularly in religious controversy. Here is a sample of both from an article by Dr. T. R. Glover, the gentleman who writes the Saturday religious article in the *Daily News*. Dr. Glover's object is to prove the ethical superiority of Jesus, and he does it in this way. A negro porter, he says, was rude to him in New York. An American would have advised him not to hit the negro, in view of New York law. The Buddhist would say that both the negro and his gold teeth were illusion. The Christian would take higher ground—higher ground unnamed. But it is almost impossible to imagine that Dr. Glover knows so little of Buddhism as to imagine that in the face of a question of conduct a Buddhist would say anything of the kind. Conduct, and the effect of conduct on character, was anything but illusion. It was one of the most important aspects of life. But Dr. Glover writes for the Christian readers of the *Daily News* and knows where he is safe.

The attitude of a Buddhist is well illustrated by Mr. Fielding Hall in his *Soul of a People*. In Rangoon, he saw a number of British soldiers enter a Buddhist temple and misbehave themselves. In any Brahmin temple, or in any English Church, the conduct of the

soldiers would have been forcibly resented. The Buddhist priests went on calmly with their duties without paying attention. Mr. Fielding Hall expressed his surprise at the calmness of the priests. But, said the priest, these men are not hurting us, they cannot hurt us; it is they who are the injured parties, and must bear the consequence of their own actions. Now that, as Dr. Glover must know, is the genuine Buddhist attitude. There is nothing of the "Jesus will save," "Though your sins be as scarlet they shall become as snow" attitude about Buddhism. It teaches that when a man has done something, there is nothing on earth, or elsewhere, that can prevent his reaping the consequences of his action, good or bad. And to the Buddhist conduct is everything. Criminals are not saved at the last moment by an act of faith, and the Buddhist who was being executed for murder would smile at the notion of being jerked from the gallows to the arms of Buddha, or Jesus, merely because he had received special attention from a Christian medicine-man. Once more, we ask, can a Christian ever be completely honest when he is dealing with religion?

The Broadstairs Urban District Council has decided that the morals of the district are in a sufficiently healthy condition to permit of tennis being played on a Sunday afternoon. In this respect the inhabitants are to be congratulated, not so much on the tennis as on their moral health, for we have it on the authority of a large number of parsons in other districts, that the people in their charge are so morally shaky, that if they were permitted to play tennis on a Sunday it would be a prelude to the wildest dissipation. But some people are never content, and Mr. H. E. Latimer Voight writes to the *East Kent Times* saying he is not satisfied, and wants it to be permitted *all day* on Sunday. This thankless person calls members of the Council "kill-joys," when all they wish to do is to stop the spread of immorality in the district. We should not be at all surprised at finding Mr. Voight to be one of those dissipated persons who would play catch-ball in the garden on Sunday with his children.

The Editor of the paper does not agree with Mr. Voight in calling the members of the Council "kill-joys," but quite agrees with him that if tennis is right on Sunday afternoon, there is no reason why it should not be played on Sunday morning. We decline to believe that the Editor is quite so guileless as he appears. He must be aware that if people are permitted to play tennis on Sunday morning, they will not come to church at all. There are a large number of people in Broadstairs and round about whose living depends upon closing rival shows when their doors are open, and trade is bad enough without our doing anything that would add to the number of the unemployed. The Council is simply doing what it can to see that one of the oldest professions in the world is protected from competition. The power of the Lord is great, and his gospel is all conquering, but how can these be expected to stand against open competition by tennis courts?

Viscount Castlerosse states, in the *Daily Express*, that "Faith is only achieved by kicking yourself—not by an elaborate mental process." Which is another way of saying that the more ignorant people are, the better the churches like them.

His Lordship also lets another cat out of the bag; he writes:—

To-day I should say that it is, in all reverence, a better business to be a Roman Catholic.

There is a man in the City whom I know, who has made at least £250,000 simply by capitalizing his creed. Equally, if you are a diplomat it is becoming important to be a Catholic.

This may be news for the *Daily Express* readers, and we suppose the statement is acceptable to the Catholic Church as it is made "in all reverence." There are some things that one cannot joke about, and this is one of them, in all reverence.

Readers of these "Acid Drops" may remember the scene in one of Rider Haggard's stories where the savages kneel in superstitious terror at the approach of an eclipse of the sun. On Sunday, July 15, a dark coloured circle of cloud, through the centre of which the blue sky could be seen, hung over Wellingborough. Rumour spread that it presaged the end of the world, and numbers of men and women knelt in the market place praying for mercy. In the novel, the people were savages. In actuality, the people were "civilized." A reward of books to the value of £1 will be given to any Christian who can point to any substantial difference in the mentality of the two bodies of people.

His Satanic Majesty has been busy among the twentieth-century primitives assembled in convention at Keswick. For fifty years the convention has preserved its fundamentalist character; but this year trouble has arisen. Doubts have been cast upon the faith of some of the leaders. The Evil One, you will observe, has taken advantage of the fact that Jesus' command of King's English was inadequate to express exactly what was to be the one interpretation of his fundamentals. That inadequacy is regrettable. For there can be no world-wide brotherhood of Christians until the one interpretation is forthcoming.

Mr. Shoran S. Singha points out, in a religious weekly, that Hinduism is entering on a new phase. In the past, proselytizing was not a part of the Hindu faith; one had to be born in the faith. Christian missionaries have not hitherto had much to fear from aggressive opposition. But to-day a certain section of educated Hindus are determined not only to shield their own faith, but to carry on aggressive propaganda to convert "outcastes" and "untouchables" to the Vedic religion. Christian missionaries, says Mr. Singha, will therefore have to reconsider their whole programme in the light of this new movement. The missionaries will be pleased to learn that!

Mr. Singha also says that the Hindu Missionary Movement is supported by the Maharajah of Indore and his American bride. Centres of Hindu culture are to be established in the various capitals of Europe, and a regular school of instruction at Geneva. Arrangements are being made to build a great Hindu temple in London, dedicated to the goddess of learning, where lectures on various aspects of Hinduism will be delivered, and a general programme of propaganda be carried on. He mentions also that a Buddhist temple in England is being planned; and that funds are being raised for a new Moslem mosque in London, from which more vigorous propaganda of the Mohammedan faith can be organized. We daresay these other religions will make converts. To the religiously-minded there is a no great difficulty in swapping one superstition for another.

The Rev. William Adolphus Penyston left £64,692; the Rev. William Mordaunt Furneaux left £38,373; the gospel of poverty no doubt has attractions, but it would appear that in these two cases the gospel of "safety first" was not overlooked.

WHERE ARE THE DEAD?

The discussion of this topic offers a first-rate opportunity of bringing the "Freethinker" to the notice of likely subscribers. Why not make a point of doing so?

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.

FREETHINKER ENDOWMENT TRUST.—C. R. Boyd-Freeman, From sales of Author's books, £2 13s.; Mr. Hawkridge 2s. 6d.; W. J. Taber, 2s. 6d.

GENERAL FUND.—Mr. F. Mann acknowledges: A. Duncan, 10s.

E. GRAVES.—We are glad to see Hull Freethinkers busy with the correspondence columns of the Press. That is always to the good. Sorry, but Mr. Cohen's time is already too well filled to permit of further incursions in the direction you suggest. Our trouble is that there is only twenty-four hours to a day.

W. SKEATE.—Obviously, your letter was too good and too direct for the editor of the *Dail News* to publish. It is by suppression and misrepresentation that Christianity manages to impose on so many to-day, and the *Daily News* is simply "playing the game."

W. BIRKS.—The *Morning Post* is very much like the other London newspapers where Christianity is concerned. They all take care that nothing which puts the truth about religion shall appear in their columns.

A. G. GUTHRIE.—Received and shall appear.

J. GODULINS.—If Freethinkers do so much by their advocacy to establish the truth of the Bible, Christians are peculiarly ungrateful to them for so effectively helping the "Cause of Christ." May we suggest that a very practical way of corroborating your belief would be to take a bundle of specimen copies and circulate them.

T. RAWLINGSON.—We do not see any need for an elaborate theory concerning the "experiences" which parsons tell in the pulpit to decorate their sermons. They are simple and deliberate lies. The tellers know they are fiction, but it is part of the clerical training that lies of this kind do not matter.

H. WALTERS.—Pleased to have your appreciation of last week's "Views and Opinions." *The Other Side of Death* contains a quite full treatment of the subject. You will find the subject of "Desire" dealt with in a special chapter.

H. BUTT.—There is no class of the kind you require at present in existence, but something of the kind might be attempted during the winter. We will bear your offer of help in mind.

HEWSON (Cowen).—The fact of the action of the *Daily News* having roused a keener sense of the need for fighting Christian influence, is something to the good.

P. SHERWIN.—Very pleased to learn of the success of the success of the open-air meetings held by the Liverpool Branch.

A. L. BRAINE.—As you say, the picture of a parson getting off a platform to punch a man who had offended him, is a good sample of the practice of turning one cheek when the other is smitten. The newspaper reports of the incident we saw discreetly suppressed the actual punching part of the programme.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums.

We printed a larger number than usual of last week's issue, and we are glad to say that our appeal for help in getting these distributed met with a ready response from our readers. Many took extra copies, one gentleman has ordered twenty copies weekly, and others smaller numbers, and some have helped by sending on names and addresses with postage. But we want a much larger measure of help for the next few weeks. The *Daily News* has opened a way for us by its articles, and by the way in which it managed the "Discussion," and we ought to take all the advantage of it we can. The articles will run over about eight numbers, and those who wish the whole series sent to a friend may get this done post free by sending a postal order for two shillings. As usual, Mr. Cohen is not mincing matters when dealing with the *Daily News*. As he is not controlled by any newspaper, there is no reason why he should. And, we say it far more in sorrow than with pride, the *Freethinker* is the only paper in the country in which these articles and their writers can be treated as they deserve. And we must make the most of every opportunity offered us.

From a correspondent, after reading last week's "Views and Opinions":—

THE GREAT IMPOSTURE.

(Dedicated to the "Daily News")

"Now, don't, sir! Don't expose me! Just this once! This was the first and only time, I swear."

Robert Browning (Mr. Sludge, "The Medium.")

Now that the report of the Committee set up to inquire into the Savidge case has been issued, we sincerely hope that the matter will not be allowed to rest where it is. When it was known that the police had "invited" Miss Savidge to Scotland Yard, and had there subjected her to an examination extending over several hours, there was loud expressions of indignation, and surprise that such things could be. Quite properly it was said that the police were indulging in "third degree" methods, a charge not to be dismissed by proving that the method adopted was not so brutal as that attributed to the United States police. For the essence of the "Third Degree" is not that witnesses are bullied and ill-treated, but that the police should turn themselves into a compound of French examining magistrates and prosecuting counsel. The situation is not made better by being told that the police acted in the usual way. The plain fact is that it ought not to be the usual way. If it is, the sooner it is stopped the better. It is also to be hoped that too much will not be made of there being no policewoman present. That will serve only the purpose of a red herring drawn across the path. If half a dozen policewomen had been there, they would still have been police officers. And in a case where the police are on trial, it is only human nature for the police to stick together.

In English justice, when a prisoner is brought into court he is under the protection of the Judge, and it is part of the Judge's duty to see that no unfair advantage is taken of him. By the procedure adopted in the Savidge case, which we learn is now the usual procedure, it is the witness, often the person about to be accused, versus the police. No one else is there. A signed statement in such circumstances is worthless, and judges would act up to the traditions of British justice if they treated it as such. The answers are written down, not in the exact words of the witness, but so as to give their meaning. And in what condition is anyone, after being subjected to a badgering for several hours by two or three police officers, to be sure that the whole of a lengthy statement is just what they said, and conveys exactly what they meant? More, in the Savidge case, the police were the accused parties. But we wonder what the police would have said had Sir Leo Money, before his case came before the magistrate, called upon one of the policemen at his private address and asked him to come with him to

some hotel and then had put him through an examination, and afterwards requested him to sign it. Any policeman who agreed to doing this would probably have been discharged the Force. In our opinion, it does not matter whether the police were acting under instructions or not. The practice is a bad one. The police have no right to play that part. Judges should set themselves against it, and they would have a good public opinion behind them if they did so. Legitimate police enquiry is one thing. This method of subjecting people to lengthy examinations, particularly where the police themselves are concerned, is another—and a very bad another.

One more point. In the Hyde Park case, plain clothes constables were set to play the part of spies—sent to the Park, not to prevent certain things being done, but to catch people after they were done. Such a policy inevitably leads to the making of cases. An officer detailed for such a duty is valued according to the cases he brings. Set a man on that work, and if he brings nothing forward he is far more likely to rouse complaints of his inefficiency than for his superiors to conclude that there is little or nothing to discover. In any case, the work of a spy under such conditions is bad and degrading. We do not hesitate to say that such work carried on in civil life will either degrade the men who are put to it, or attract a type of character to the work that the police force would be better without. No citizen has the right to object to being arrested by the police, but every citizen has the right to object to being judged and condemned or ruled by them. If it is necessary for people to be examined in the way in which the police have examined Miss Savidge and others, let proper tribunals be set up, in which it will be seen that the elementary rights of a British citizen are respected and preserved. And let it be made quite clear that the police have no power whatever to demand such statements. The courts only can do that.

Finally, we have every reason for saying that a large body of the police object to these methods as much as we do. But of late years the police force has been militarized to an extent the ordinary citizen knows little of. And with that there has come into force the habit of looking upon citizens in much the same light as the ordinary military officer looks upon the men under him—as beings to be ruled, not as citizens to be served. The police are the servants of the public, not its masters.

In connexion with the B.B.C. and its resolve to turn itself into a Branch of the Christian Evidence Society, we said last week that it set us wondering whether mental honesty and Christianity could possibly exist under the same hat. Here is another instance to hand, which gives point to the question. Recently, one of our readers, Mr. A. W. Coleman, wrote the Corporation enclosing a copy of the *Freethinker*, in which we dealt with the subject and said:—

It is now some months since it was announced that the ban on controversial subjects was to be raised, yet your Corporation do not realize—and evidently do not intend to admit—the essentially controversial nature of the whole subject of religion. It is evident that the raising of the ban on controversial matter is the veriest cant.

To this the B.B.C. replied:—

In reply to your letter of July 2nd, religion is not treated by us in the spirit of controversy, and we have no intention of including in our programmes matter of an anti-Christian or anti-religious nature.

Now the officials of the B.B.C. are certainly not brainless, and we can only conclude that the humbug of the reply is deliberate. First, the complaint that if religious topics are broadcast, in fairness to all, the other side should be permitted a hearing, is met with the reply that their licence does permit the broadcasting of controversial subjects. When the ban on controversial subjects is withdrawn, the plea is entered that religion is not treated in a spirit of controversy. Which leads us to enquire, since when has a controversial subject become a non-controversial subject by preventing the other

side a hearing? We present the suggestion to the Government, and when it next brings in, say a measure of Protection, it labels it a non-controversial measure, by not permitting anyone to speak against it. We repeat we cannot believe that the B.B.C. is quite so idiotic as to believe this. It is simply a sample—a very fine one—of whether religious humbug, or a confession that as the Corporation think it necessary to keep the goodwill of the Churches, any kind of a reason will satisfy Christians.—Anyway, we hope that Freethinkers will continue to let the B.B.C. know they are alive. Reading the replies will help us one day to compile a guide for all who wish to follow the profitable path of Humbugging the Pious.

The Secular Society, Limited has just issued a booklet by Mr. George Whitehead on the subject of *Gods, Devils, and Men*. The work extends to 80 pages, and is replete with useful information for both Freethinkers and Christians—particularly the latter. The price of the book is ninepence; post free, tenpence.

Body and Mind.

LAST week I received from a subscriber of this journal a copy of *Outline* for June 30, containing an article by the Hon. Bertrand Russell, on "Mind—Body—Soul," and inviting me to comment on it. As the article is evasive to a degree, I consider it my duty to comply.

At first our hopes are raised high, for Mr. Russell starts off in his characteristic style of delectable lucidity by positing three certitudes, which he says can stand no theoretical view that is subversive of them. Briefly epitomized these are: (1) That our nervous system is an actuality. (2) That our inner life of consciousness is a reality. And (3) That these two are interdependent. Nothing could be more accurately expressed or clearly stated. But the discussion that follows is very disappointing. How Mr. Russell, the scientist differs from Mr. Russell, the metaphysician! Donning the mantle of the latter, he makes discursive allusions to the various guesses with which metaphysics has intensified the mystery which shrouds the nature of mind and existence. He first of all cites a choice bit from Haldane's *Quintessence*. The excerpt forcibly reminded one of how the Dons of Lilliput, by picking out words haphazardly from a dictionary, and juxtaposing them, composed books!

The Lilliputians must have been "pure metaphysicians" of the first water.

Mr. Russell concludes his remarks on the mechanistic theory with the words "to which philosophy gives no support."

To my mind no better fact could be adduced as proof-presumptive of its essential soundness. I know no theory through being backed by "philosophy" to eventuate as an established truth.

But his evasive treatment of his third certitude—the interdependence between the inner life of consciousness and our nervous system—was the gravest disappointment, the bitterness of which is mainly due to the fact that no one is better qualified to speak on the problem or better able to do so.

I was astounded to find no mention of the two basic facts upon which this interdependence rests. These two facts may be expressed thus: The absolute concomitance between the racial mind and organization; and the like concomitance between the individual mind and cerebration.

As it requires no erudition or expert knowledge to learn the lesson which these fundamental facts teach, I propose to illustrate them very briefly.

It is not merely the organized complexity of the brain that forces me to the conclusion that mind is a

function of the cerebral system, but the absolute concomitance between the capacity of mind (using the term in its most comprehensive sense) and the degree of organization. Had man a brain no bigger or more highly organized than that of the ape, and still had man's present capacity for ideation and thought; or if the mind of a child developed into that of an adult, while its brain remained stationary, then there would be a real tangible fact—a solid ground—for assuming the human mind to be some self-existent entity independent of the brain. But Nature has not a single example of such divorce. On the contrary, the difference in mind capacity strictly corresponds to the difference in cerebral structure and size.

Besides, is not the infinite variations in mental capacity of human beings palpably due to the difference in the organization and size of their brains? The unsophisticated masses unwittingly acknowledge this fact in their terms of reproach, "blockhead," "brainless," etc.

Indeed the concomitance between mind and the nervous system runs throughout the entire animal kingdom, from the lowest to the highest—from the amoeba to man.

The other concomitance is revealed as this inherited brain with its particular structure functions.

Mind is not only different in different persons, but is most variable in one and the same individual. From the press effusions one could fancy that mind is a "constant"—something that never varies! What assumption could be more absolutely false? Both as intellect and as the seat of feelings and emotions, the fluctuations of the individual mind are not only daily but hourly—some periodical, some aberrant depending upon states of health, nutrition, oxygenation, fatigue, or need of rest or sleep! The evening and morning minds are usually very different. But apart from these periodical vicissitudes of which everyone is aware, but seldom reflect upon, the phenomenon of intoxication is surely an aberrancy sufficiently arresting to convince anyone of the contingency of mind upon brain. The mind of a drunken individual is obviously a very different mind from that of the same individual when sober. And can anyone but a metaphysician or a bedlamite dispute the fact that the difference is due to the imbibed alcohol? I mean *causally due*. It is as palpably a case of causal sequence as when the molecular energy of a hot body reappears as it cools in a radiant form. It is this strictly causal relation between mental and physical phenomena, a sequence in which the law of the conservation of energy vanishes, that compels me to believe that ultimate substance is both physical and mental in essence.

Thus, the individual mind at any instant is the particular resultant of just one of the infinite number of permutations of the two basic variables—structure and cerebration. And we had a right to expect from Mr. Russell an explicit statement of this fact in vindication of his third certitude.

I am not, however, oblivious of the fact that such a pronouncement would have quite vitiated his article for publication in *Outline*. KERIDON.

TRUTH IS DIFFICULT.

I am content to tell my simple story, without trying to make things seem better than they are; dreading nothing but falsehood, which, in spite of one's best efforts, there is reason to dread. Falsehood is so easy, truth so difficult. . . . Examine your words well, and you will find that, even when you have no motive to be false, it is a very hard thing to say the exact truth, even about your own immediate feelings. . . . much harder than to say something fine about them which is not the exact truth.—George Eliot.

Mr. Chesterton Replies.

READERS of this journal will, perhaps, remember a recent article of mine dealing with the Popery menace. I hoped that it would draw the enemy to respond, and I am glad indeed to report that in the *Universe* of June 29, Mr. Chesterton brings all his heavy guns to bear to blow me into smithereens. Unluckily for him, however, he forgot the powder.

I have always, I admit quite frankly, wished for a tussle with Mr. Chesterton. First of all he is a convert to Roman Catholicism, and therefore *plus royalist que le roi*. Then I remember far back in the old days his attempts to reply to Mr. Blatchford in the *Daily News*. My religious friends—though not always agreeing with him—used to smile confidently at the hammering Agnosticism was getting, but in my blindness, I suppose, I never could see it. Later, Mr. Chesterton replied to Mr. McCabe, and here again, he was supposed to have won a magnificent victory, and again I could not see how the flood of words which surged from the doughty Churchman, darkening the issue with inky paradoxes, could win anything.

Now this power of writing round a subject and never dealing with it in any serious sense is not only a magnificent asset for various Christian apologists, but is one of Mr. Chesterton's greatest gifts. How many books, for example, have been written to prove the "uniqueness" of Jesus? They must run into thousands, and mean nothing more than wordy froth. You can prove the "uniqueness" of Mr. Pickwick or any fictional character quite as easily, and you can prove Jesus to be far more unique from one of the apocryphal gospels than from the canonical ones—in some things. But the endless stream of books proving the "uniqueness" of "Our Lord" will never cease so long as people with Mr. Chesterton's gifts are alive. And I for one can never hope to emulate them. Let us get back to our muttons.

Mr. Chesterton doesn't understand part of this passage of mine:—

Mr. Chesterton, who can bray with the loudest in his own articles, quietens down to very small fry when face to face with real issues *in front of his own followers*. He comforts himself, however, with the knowledge that very few of the latter ever see the *Freethinker*, and that the replies by Canon this Dean that, simply dare not show unbelief in any shape or form—which is why the dear editor permits them to appear against the doughty Catholic champion.

Now the obvious misprint in the above is *Conon this Dean that*, for which substitute *Canon this or Dean that*. My corrected proof possibly did not reach the Editor in time. I simply meant that no editor would permit a reply to Mr. Chesterton unless it were a perfectly orthodox one. For the rest, I do claim my meaning is quite clear.

Mr. Chesterton, who confesses he has read the *Freethinker* in his "first Fleet Street days," of course never, like his followers, reads it now. Therefore he is *quite sure* that "this sort of Freethought is no longer in touch with existing realities, and is living on a tradition and even a routine."

The dear man! Of course, we poor ignorant scribes, writing for dupes, never dream of reading the bang right up-to-date stuff with which the *Universe* and Mr. Chesterton deluge their readers. We know nothing about the latest Biblical discoveries, the latest textual criticism, the wholesale conversion of educated men and scientists to popery, the wonders of psychology, all of which prove beyond a doubt the Divine Truth of the Mass!

The strange thing is that one would never suspect

Mr. Chesterton, from his writings, had ever read a single anti-Christian work in his life. He will tell you, in columns full of words, that he has, but it requires as much faith to believe it as to believe a Lourdes miracle. Will someone tell me where, in any of his books, I can find a single clear reply to a genuine Freethought argument? I have never seen one. Never.

For example, I said that the Roman Catholic Church is merely "a rehash of old Pagan and sun-myth stories." That delightful word "sun-myth" is pounced upon by Mr. Chesterton as a veritable treasure. He could not jump on me with more glee than he does for introducing it. Mr. Chesterton knew all about it—I mean the word—when he was sixteen. Nobody has ever talked about it since. The "best sceptical society are no longer concentrated on the sun-myth." They now deal with the corn-myth, and later on no doubt will deal with the mud-myth. And this is the kind of reply I claim we get always from the great Catholic champion when "face to face with real issues." I doubt if it would be possible to prove more convincingly my contention about the "small fry." There is not a single Catholic living or who has ever lived who could reply to the great work of *Depuis ou sun worship*. The mass of learning in that masterpiece smashed the Church into atoms among most intelligent men. But there are always some, and there have always been some, who believe anything without investigation and even psychology cannot explain why Mr. Chesterton will believe Catholic claims any more than why Sir A. Conan Doyle believes in fairies or Theosophists in occult nonsense.

But Mr. Chesterton claims we are out of date, and in singling my phrase out for castigation, he carefully—must I say cunningly?—misses out half in reply. I said "Pagan and sun-myth stories." Does Mr. Chesterton deny the Pagan stories? Of course "sun-myth" covers everything for his reply in the *Universe*, but I am not a Catholic. If I were, I could believe that the dreadful and old-fashioned infidel has been effectively disposed of. Why did Mr. Chesterton drop the word "Pagan" in his reply? Does he not know that in this year of grace 1928, Mr. Arthur Weigall, who is a good Christian, has actually written a work entitled *The Paganism in our Christianity*? Mr. Weigall shows and proves that the Holy Catholic Church is permeated with Paganism from end to end. Mr. Chesterton will now be able to say that if the "best sceptical society" are no longer dealing with the sun-myth, Christians are dealing with Paganism in their own heaven-sent religion. And all Mr. Weigall does is to repeat what Freethinkers have known for hundreds of years.

Our own paper, the *Freethinker*, may be ignored. It may even be boycotted as Mr. Chesterton has boycotted it for so many years. But its ideas permeate that society—sceptical or not—where truth is held in reverence, and where plain speech is championed. We are not and never have been afraid of mentioning the *Universe*. But the *Universe* and Mr. Chesterton have been afraid of mentioning us. And in this fight of the intellect and for truth our champions throw the gage down as we have always done. Dare any Catholic take it up or do they prefer the dear old world of boycott?

And, by the way, who comprise "the best sceptical society"? If Mr. Chesterton does nothing else, will he answer that? Who no longer concentrate on the sun myth and prefer the mud-myth or is this one of Mr. Chesterton's pleasant ways of facing the issue? Those wretched infidels, don't you know, have really no sense of humour.

There is another meaning to the italicized phrase

I have quoted above. Representative Freethinkers are always ready to meet Catholics in debate, but I want them to meet not in one of *our* halls, but in one of *theirs*. Our speakers want a Catholic audience to hear what we have to say about their religion. They never get a chance otherwise—or very few of them do. Most of us know Catholic apologetics inside out. I think I could put the case for the Church better than many Catholics I know. But *they* know nothing whatever—like Mr. Chesterton—of our case. They hug themselves with the rich delusion that we "are living on a tradition," and, my God, on "even a routine"! It would be useless to tell Mr. Chesterton and his kind that in the office of the *Freethinker* will be found the latest and most expensive works on science and psychology. Most Catholics would be bewildered, and people like Mr. Chesterton would not even understand. Thus, I claim, when writing for the *Universe*, Mr. Chesterton dodges the issue or sings very small when he has a real Freethought argument to deal with. Replying to a taunt about the Inquisition or even the Massacre of St. Bartholomew is no answer to *us*. When we mention these things it is only a very small part in our general indictment. But whether Mr. Chesterton writes round them one of his most brilliant articles or whether Mr. Belloc devotes a fat volume to them does not disprove them as *facts*, and they are as ghastly facts as have ever disgraced history. Catholic crimes cannot be excused by pointing to the crimes committed by Protestants. We attack both, and apologists like Mr. Chesterton dodge the issue every time.

Mr. Chesterton also says that we are "not allowed to think," and we "are not free"—this, mark you, from a member of a religion which has put some of the greatest works in literature on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*! This kind of bunk gets over with Catholics, but, seriously, how can one deal with it here? Am I supposed to reply to it, point by point? Not allowed to think, forsooth! Mr. Chesterton is not permitted to read great books; he has to get permission to read God's Holy Word in its entirety; he believes in myths and miracles, in ghosts and goblins, in devils and demons, in relics and rags, in all the medieval mush that credulous Christian monks have invented, and then says it is *we* who are not free! And Catholics call him a champion!

I made a simple remark in dealing with the fact that many Catholics are more or less eminent men. I wanted to show that it was not always the peasant mind which could swallow wholesale Catholic claims and I said, after all "Mr. Chesterton does not exactly belong to the ignorant peasant class." Mr. Chesterton likes the peasant mind. In fact, if I understand his last wordy half-column, he and the ignorant but receiving mind of the peasant have one thing in common, the religion which gives "exactly the same profound satisfaction of the soul." I do not deny it. Indeed I am certain of the fact. I share a profound satisfaction myself with the most ignorant people in many things. Why not? And what has that got to do with my argument? It was the ignorant peasantry of Ireland, of Italy, of Spain, that perpetuated the crudest myths and legends which have ever dominated and which constitute Popery.

Lucretius and Lucian laughed at the superstitions of their countrymen. Heretics have done so throughout the ages. Once they were nearly exterminated by Mr. Chesterton's brothers in Christ. They are now an ever increasing body all over the world. We can't stop eminent men believing in fairies or armulets or transubstantiation, but fewer do so in proportion to the growth of population. It has always been a long process to free the minds, a process

rigorously prohibited by the Roman Catholic Church, but we do not despair. Catholicism is making headway, but we are growing faster.

Mr. Chesterton hugs another delusion. If we both, he says, have picked up some rather desultory knowledge of the history of religions, his own knowledge is a little more up to date than mine. But why is it one can never gather so from his articles? I thought he believed in the history of the one true, holy, apostolic religion of 2000 years ago, lock, stock and barrel. It is not exactly up to date, is it?

Finally, I was rather disappointed about one thing. Mr. Chesterton holds me, every line of him, when he writes about Charles Dickens—and indeed about many other things. But why did he not attempt to answer my charge—that on religion, he, like his friend Mr. Belloc, is simply an awful bore?

H. CUTNER.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus in the Talmud.

(Continued from page 459.)

AGAIN, during financial straits, such as Marcus is known to have experienced at the beginning of the Germanic wars, the emperor sent to "Rabbi" for advice. Taking the messenger into the garden, "Rabbi" pulled up certain plants, and put others in their stead, thus indicating that a change of fiscal administrators was necessary.¹⁶ Artaban *alias* Vologesus, unsuccessfully attempted by the costliest presents to draw away "Rabbi" from his allegiance to Rome. Dr. Bodek says that this was during the Cassian insurrection, and that the Jews then remained loyal to the emperor. But Dio affirms that "Cassius soon ranged all the peoples inside the Taurus under his authority";¹⁷ and it seems passing strange that Vologesus should favour the imperial designs of Cassius after the terrible injuries done to his empire by that implacable conqueror. With diffidence I would suggest that the attempt of "Artaban" to bribe "Rabbi," if it be historical, occurred during the Parthian War. In any case Dr. Bodek is justified in supposing that the object of such an attempt would be to cause disaffection among the Jewish communities in other parts of the empire; even more than to corrupt the Jews of Palestine.¹⁸ On his visit to the holy land "Antoninus" exhibits the same simplicity and benevolence that Marcus exhibited on his eastern journey. He enriched the Synagogue at Sepphoris, and committed to "Rabbi" a large stretch of land,¹⁹ probably for the support of the High School, or its attendants, as "Rabbi" himself needed nothing, being very wealthy.²⁰ The emperor frequently met the patriarch, and he was entertained by him at banquets distinguished for their princely splendour. This again agrees with Marcus, who, as Victor and Eutropius declare, liked to see his friends and subjects make such displays on festive occasions.²¹ In their more private conversations, "Rabbi" and his illustrious friend discoursed on profound themes. Once, the emperor thinking apparently of the fixed hours of worship established among the Jews, asked if one could not address God at every hour? "Rabbi" said that men would lose their reverence for God if they communed with him in an irregular and arbitrary fashion. This the

emperor could not admit. To bring it home to him, "Rabbi" came very early one morning with his felicitations; and repeated them hour by hour several times, till at last the emperor, tired out, exclaimed, "Is that thy way of saluting thy ruler?" Whereupon, Rabbi answered, "Seest thou, if an earthly king in order not to be burdened the whole day long, will only be greeted at certain hours, how much more God, the King of Kings."²² On another occasion the two were discussing the question of responsibility. The emperor said that at death the body might accuse the soul and the soul accuse the body, and that in this way both could escape punishment. "Rabbi" encountered this objection by relating a story which has since become famous, that of the blind man and the lame man, who, in their desire to rob an orchard overcame the hinderance of their respective infirmities by agreeing that the lame one should get on the shoulders of the blind one and gather the fruit; after which, when they were captured and accused, each of them apart pleaded his own disability, but in vain, for they were put together again and condemned as one man. This, said "Rabbi," is what God will do with the soul and the body at the judgment.²³

They also discussed the question whether life is first attributable to a human being from birth, or whilst it is still in the womb. "Rabbi" took the former view, but "Antoninus" convinced him of its impossibility.²⁴ Another point debated between them was, at what period does the germ of consciousness and will appear in man? "Rabbi" put this at the genesis of physical life, and therefore before birth. "Antoninus," on the contrary, put it at birth, because he thought that a being with independent desires and impulses could not exist inside another being without hindering and endangering it. In this case also, "Rabbi" came over to the opinion of the emperor.²⁵ Dr. Bodek contends that Marcus believed the soul to come into the body at birth; but the passage which he instances from the *Meditations* as supporting his contention, seems to me against it:—

Consider what every being is from the seed to the time of its receiving a soul, and from the reception of a soul to its giving back the same. (xii. 24.)

Surely if Marcus had thought that the soul is introduced into the body at birth, he would not have omitted to say so in this passage. During his stay in Palestine, "Antoninus" probably gave attention to jurisprudence, which was a subject that Marcus Aurelius profoundly studied.²⁶ He cherished the design of elevating Tiberias, as the seat of a Jewish high school, to the rank of a Roman Colony, which would have given it many privileges, including that of freedom from taxes.²⁷ Alas, a difficulty that we should never have expected to hear of, thwarted this plan. For, "Antoninus" is reported to have said: "I would gladly have my son on my place as Cæsar, and I would also gladly have made Tiberias a free city; but they will at most grant me one, not both." Thereupon, "Rabbi" advised him to get his son named Cæsar, adding that if this were accomplished the son would be in a position to do something for Tiberias.²⁸ Here it is plainly a question of the emperor's abdicating in favour of his son. Dr. Bodek, who ignores this point, says that the original seems to show that this son was not Commodus, but

¹⁶ Midr. Rabba i. 67. B. p. 137.

¹⁷ lxxi. 23.

¹⁸ B. pp. 137-138.

¹⁹ j. Schebûth vi. B. p. 139.

²⁰ b. Chullin, 7a. B. p. 139.

²¹ B. p. 139.

²² Midr. Tanchuma Parascha. B. p. 140.

²³ b. Sanhedrin. 91a Midr. Rabba iii. 7. B. 141

²⁴ b. Sanh. 91b. B. p. 141.

²⁵ Midr. Rabba, i. 34. B. p. 142.

²⁶ B. 143.

²⁷ b. Abodah zara. 10a.

²⁸ Ib. B. pp. 144-145.

a younger one named Severus, of whom nothing further is known. He says also that the "they" who could not be expected to grant the emperor both his wishes, were the members of the senate, a body to which Marcus restored their proper powers. Indeed in his answer to "Rabbi," the emperor complains that "the nobles of Rome" gave him much trouble.²⁹ Besides these discussions relating to philosophical and public matters, "Antoninus" and "Rabbi" spoke of the former's private affairs. The Talmud reports a striking example of this kind which occurred after the friends were separated. A daughter of "Antoninus" had deeply fallen, and her grief-stricken father sought the advice of "Rabbi" about the case. At first he recommended severity, but in the end he favoured mercy. Dr. Bodek observes that the form of correspondence used on the present occasion is remarkable. In proof of this he cites the Hebrew original, and then adds that the fashion of corresponding by the interchange of symbolical herbs and flowers came from Persia. The name of the erring woman, it appears, was Gera, which Dr. Bodek regards as an orthographical modification of Galera, or Galeria. Thus if she were the child of Marcus, or at any rate of his wife Faustina, she was called after her mother's mother, Galeria Faustina, spouse of Titus Antoninus.³⁰

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

(To be concluded.)

Correspondence.

THE DYING AGNOSTIC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—The letter of H. L. S., in the 8th issue, under the above heading has many implications, and deals with a hard fact. There is not the least doubt that all religious bodies realize the importance of fastening on to children when very young, and the weakness of the child is the strength of the Church. As children ourselves, some of us realize the injustice done to us when we were helpless, and although we would now rather explain than hate Christianity, we envy your own happy and good fortune in missing what we have gone through and grown out of more or less completely. The groaning and moaning of a church organ now gives me a pain inside, and H. L. S. is one of many saturated with ritual that has left its mark. Even Thomas Hardy retained—perhaps unconsciously—much of his early Church influence, which eventually came out in old age—an opportunity not to be missed by those who execrated him in his prime and strength. The conclusion to be drawn from your correspondent's letter is obvious; religious faith dies hard, but as it has little to commend itself, may you long be spared to hasten its end.

C. G.

Society News.

MR. J. CLAYTON'S MEETINGS.

MR. J. CLAYTON, who is delivering open-air lectures in the Lancashire Towns, held his first meeting at Higham on Wednesday, July 11, and the experiment was an unqualified success. On Friday, Mr. Clayton lectured at Rawtenstall. A fair crowd gathered, and many questions were asked, a local churchwarden providing opposition. Mr. Clayton was at Burnley Market Ground on Sunday afternoon, and on Sunday night at Accrington, where he spoke on Spiritualism, receiving a number of questions and some mild abuse from Spiritualists. But there was no platform opposition. A list of Mr. Clayton's forthcoming lectures will be found in "Lecture Notices."

²⁹ Ib. B. p. 146.

³⁰ b. Aboda. zara i. ob. Kerem. Chemed iv. p. 218. B. pp. 148-149.

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.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (The London Institution Theatre, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2) : 11.0, C. Delisle Burns, M.A., D.Lit.—"Escape from Home."

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand) : 3.15, Mr. R. H. Rosetti—A Lecture.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA BRANCH N.S.S. (corner of Shorrols Road, North End Road, Walham Green) : Every Saturday at 8 p.m. Speakers—Messrs. Campbell-Everden, Bryant, Mathie and others.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Regent's Park, near the Fountain) : 6.0, Mr. F. Mann—"Historic Christianity."

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common) : 11.30, Mr. F. Mann—"The Making of Christianity" (Brockwell Park) : 6.0, Mr. L. Ebury. Wednesday—(Clapham Old Town) : 8.0, Mr. F. P. Corrigan. Thursday—(Cooks Road, Kennington) : 8.0, Mr. F. Mann—"More Nonsense from the Universe."

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Outside Municipal College, Romford Road, Stratford, E.) : 7.0, Mr. H. C. White—A Lecture.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park) : 12 noon, Mr. James Hart—A Lecture. 3.30 p.m., Messrs. Hyatt and B. A. Le Maine. 6.30 p.m., Messrs. Campbell-Everden and Maurice Maubrey. Freethought meetings every Wednesday and Friday, at 7.30 p.m. Lecturers—Messrs. Campbell-Everden, Hart, Darby, Le Maine and others.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith) : 3.0, Mr. B. A. Le Maine.

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

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

BOLTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Wigan Market Ground) : July 21, at 7.30, Mr. G. Whitehead; July 22, at 3.0 and 7.30, Mr. G. Whitehead. Mr. Whitehead will lecture from the Bolton Town Hall steps every evening at 7.30 for a fortnight, commencing July 23.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S.—Every Monday, at Islington Square—Mr. P. Sherwin; every Tuesday at Beaumont Street—Messrs. Shortt and Sherwin; every Thursday, at High Park Street—Mr. J. V. Shortt; and at Edge Hill Lamp—Mr. P. Sherwin. All meetings at 8 p.m.

MR. CLAYTON'S LECTURES : July 20, Rawtenstall (Bacup Road) : 8 p.m.; July 21, Todmorden (Centre) 8 p.m.; July 22, Accrington Market, 7 p.m.; July 25, Nelson (Chapel Street) : 7.45 p.m.; July 29, Debate at Nelson I.L.P., at 11 a.m.

YOU WANT ONE.



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

UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

For an Illustrated Descriptive List (68 pages) of Birth Control Requisites and Books, send a 1½d. stamp to:—

J. R. HOLMES, East Hanney, Wantage, Berks.
(Established nearly Forty Years.)



BAKEWELL CARNIVAL

THE event takes place on the last Saturday of August, and we intend entering for the procession two decorated motor-cycle combinations. We are not highly skilled in this form of advertising, but our basic idea will be the displaying of the hundreds of testimonials we have received from all quarters of the earth. It has occurred to us that some of our fellow Freethinkers may be so far interested in our venture, and in our attempt at showing what the enterprise of Freethinkers can achieve as to be both willing and eager to offer us suggestions and possibly materials in particular for the costumes of the two drivers.

Those who have yet to learn the class of workmanship, the attentive service, and the surpassing value which have earned for us golden opinions throughout the world are once more invited to write to us for patterns, which will come to them accompanied by all needful information.

Send a postcard to-day for any of the following patterns:

- B to E, suits from 57/-
- F to H, suits from 79/-
- I to M, suits from 105/-
- EBORAC One-quality, suits from 69/-
- B Serges, suits 63/- to 100/-

LADIES' Book, costumes from 62/-, frocks from 45/-

Patterns are sent out on the understanding that they will be returned to us. We pay postages both ways to all inland and North Irish addresses.

MACCONNELL & MABE, Ltd., New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire.

Publications issued by
THE SECULAR SOCIETY, Ltd.

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

SOME PIONEER PRESS PUBLICATIONS :

- AN ESSAY ON SUICIDE. By DAVID HUMR. With an Historical and Critical Introduction by G. W. Foote. 1d., postage ½d.
- THE FOURTH AGE. By W. REPTON. A Psychological Study of the Great Civil War, 1914—1918. 1s., postage 1d.
- DETERMINISM OR FREE-WILL? By CHAPMAN COHEN. An Exposition of the Subject in the Light of the Doctrines of Evolution. Second Edition. Half-Cloth, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.; Paper, 1s. 9d., postage 2d.
- CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION. By Prof. J. W. Draper. A Chapter from *The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*. 2d., postage ½d.
- COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIANISM. By Rt. Rev. W. M. BROWN. Analysed and Contrasted from the Standpoint of Darwinism and Marxism. With Portraits. 1s., post free. (Paper.) Cloth 4s.
- THE CASE AGAINST THEISM. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. A Reasonable View of God. Cloth Bound, 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.
- THE MARTYRDOM OF HYPATHIA. By M. M. MANGASARIAN. 1d., postage ½d.
- SEXUAL HEALTH AND BIRTH CONTROL. By ETTIE A. ROUT. Two Lectures on the application of Freethought to the problems of Sexual Health and Birth Control. 1s., postage 1d.
- CHRISTIANITY IN CHINA. By W. MANN. An Exposure of Foreign Missions. Price 6d., postage 1d.
- WHAT IS MORALITY? By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. A Careful Examination of the Basis of Morals from the Standpoint of Evolution. 4d., postage 1d.

The Question of the Day—
DO THE DEAD LIVE?

For a full and careful examination of the whole subject, read—

**THE OTHER SIDE
OF DEATH**

By CHAPMAN COHEN

Cloth Bound 3/6. Postage 2d.

**Does Man Survive
Death?**

Verbatim Report of a public debate between

Mr. HORACE LEAF

AND

CHAPMAN COHEN

Price 4d. Postage halfpenny.

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

Just Published . . .

**GODS, DEVILS,
and MEN**

BY

George Whitehead

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Contains Chapters on: The Primitive Theory of Lunacy and Disease—Religion and Madness—Religion and Crime—The Suggestibility of the Mind—Religious Epidemics—The Pathology of Religious Leaders—Jesus.

PRICE NINEPENCE

POSTAGE 1d.

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

Just Published . . .

RELIGION AND WOMAN

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

By George Whitehead

A psycho-analytic study of the influence of religious beliefs on the position of woman.

Price Sixpence. Postage 1d.

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

Essays in Freethinking

(Second Series)

BY CHAPMAN COHEN.

Contains Chapters on: A Martyr of Science—Religion and Sex—The Happy Atheist—Vulgar Freethinkers—Religion and the Stage—The Clergy and Parliament—On Finding God—Vice and Virtue—The Gospel of Pain—War and War Memorials—Christian Pessimism—Why We Laugh, Etc., Etc.

CLOTH GILT, 2/6 POSTAGE 2½d.

Vols. I and II of *Essays in Freethinking* will be sent post free for 5/-.

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

220 pages of Wit and Wisdom

BIBLE ROMANCES

By G. W. Foote

The *Bible Romances* is an illustration of G. W. Foote at his best. It is profound without being dull, witty without being shallow; and is as indispensable to the Freethinker as is the *Bible Handbook*.

Price 2/6 Postage 3d.

Well printed and well bound.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 Farringdon 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.

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 Farringdon Street, E.C.4.