

The
FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. XLIX.—No. 17

SUNDAY, APRIL 28, 1929

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Religion and the Elections.—The Editor</i> - - -	257
<i>Baa, Baa, Black Sheep.—Mimnermus</i> - - -	258
<i>The Goddesses and Women of Old Rome.—T. F. Palmer</i>	259
<i>Father McNab on the Resurrection.—Alan Tyndal</i> -	261
<i>The Egoism of Belief.—Arthur W. Gayton</i> - - -	264
<i>The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Obedience.—C. R. Boyd-Freeman</i> - - -	266
<i>Secular Education at the Teachers' Congress</i> - - -	268
<i>Buddha, the Atheist</i> - - - - -	268
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions.

Religion and the Elections.

One way and another, it looks as though religion is likely to play a larger part in deciding the issue of the forthcoming general election than has been the case for some time. There is the Sunday issue; a general move by the massed forces of Sabbatarianism is threatened here; there is the temperance question, and although the Temperance Movement began apart from religion, it has now got well mixed up with religious organizations—so much so that it is presented as though it were a distinctly religious issue. On that head I venture to commend to all readers—for use during the election, and after—G. W. Foote's *Bible and Beer*, a new edition of which has just been issued. It is written in his best style, and is as thorough-going as his work usually was. There is also the Secular Education issue, and it is certain that the Churches will see to it that as many candidates as is possible are pledged, privately or publicly—or privately and publicly—to give support to an "agreed" measure that will secure a larger measure of definite religious instruction at the expense of the State. And, finally, there will be the usual readiness of most political adventurers to promise support to Christian interests in general, without regard to the fact that they should go to Parliament to represent citizens, and not this or that Christian sect, or all of them collectively.

* * *

The Blasphemy Laws.

There is yet another thing that might be made an issue during the election, but is not likely to become one. This is the question of the blasphemy laws. That can be raised by Freethinkers who think more of the prevalence of Freedom and Justice than they do of party gains, but Freethinkers are the only ones who will do so. I hope they will all take the opportunity of questioning candidates *in public*, first, be-

cause a private undertaking usually means nothing at all, and secondly, because questions will be enlightening to those present, including the candidates, most of whom are deplorably ignorant on this topic. It is a standing disgrace that a country which professes to base its legislation on religious freedom, and which does legally admit men to every office in the State without reference to opinions on religion, should still maintain laws which have no other reason for their existence, save the intention to suppress that freedom of criticism of religious ideas that is permitted with regard to every other question. These laws were created and are maintained in the interests of a sect only. It is true that under prevailing conditions they are not frequently put into action against Freethinkers; it is also true that so long as they exist they are a menace to liberty of expression and publication, and a slight turn in the political wheel, a more assured political position for the Roman Church, and a growth of the Joynson-Hicks type of mind in politics, might well find in them convenient implements ready to hand, without any new legislation. It is "blasphemy" to-day only if one attacks the Christian religion—other religions manage to get on without a policeman to guard them—in such a way that the feelings of Christians are hurt. And as Christians are ultimately those who decide whether their feelings are outraged or not, it only needs the occasion for blasphemy cases to become quite common. At any rate the position is simple. If these laws are not maintained as likely instruments when the occasion offers itself for their use, there is no reason why they should not be swept away and *all* opinions be made subject to the same privileges and regulations. If they are maintained for the purpose named, then it behoves all lovers of free speech to get them abolished so soon as is possible.

* * *

Sabbatarianism.

So far as the Sunday question is concerned that is, like most religious questions in these times, cloaked by a mass of hypocrisy. Religiously the Sabbath is a "taboo" day. The abstention from work on the Sabbath has, fundamentally, nothing whatever to do with the need for a day of rest, and it was never presented as such until purely religious ideas began to lose their force. There is a very extensive literature on the Sunday question, and those who care to hunt up the productions of a little more than a century ago, will find scarce a mention of the day of rest, and no mention of the economic argument, but entirely that of the "Taboo." The Taboo is, of course, much older than Christianity, which derived it from Judaism, which in turn derived it from other sources which took the day of Saturn, on account of the supposedly malignant influence of that planet, as an unlucky day on which to do anything. All that tunity of questioning candidates *in public*; first, be-

Saturday to the Sunday, although it was not until Puritan days that the full gloominess of the day of Saturn was achieved. Then the religious nature of the day was the sole reason for the avoidance of anything but religious exercises. Only with the growth of disbelief in the nineteenth century was a change of argument effected, when Sabbatarianism, who have never shown any particular concern about labour during six days out of the week, became peculiarly and suspiciously anxious that labour should not be over-taxed on the seventh. But those who care to read the literature put forth by the Lord's Day Observance Society will realize that even to-day it has to appeal to the believers in the "taboo," for its financial support, and not to those who are concerned with securing for the working man a measure of rest from actual toil.

The humbug of the whole thing is shown in the fact that games in the public parks, the opening of museums and art galleries, meet with exactly the same opposition as do any other departure from the Puritanical Sunday. It is quite certain that games in the parks necessitate no more labour than does the opening of churches and chapels, and it is also certain that the opportunities of games on Sunday does far more to maintain the health and morality of the younger people than church attendance has ever done. Even cinemas, on the authority of the police all over the country, have had a beneficial effect of the conduct of the youth of both sexes. None of these considerations weigh with the people who profess to be so seriously concerned with the "higher life." Politically, the dangerous thing is that so far as Chapels can combine on this question, they represent a block vote, which will affect all politicians who are more concerned with getting votes than with anything else.

* * *

Secularising the Clergy.

It is a very curious thing that with the steady weakening of religious belief, and the rapid thinning of Church and Chapel attendances, there should be going on this growing intrusion of religion into the sphere of politics. Curious, but not very difficult to understand. While religion was able to dominate life, it was enough for the clergy to exercise a power over the people from the pulpit. Their function, too, was very largely that of, to use a favourite expression of their own, keeping the people in order. The growth of democracy, with the weakening of religious conviction, put a sharp limit to this kind of influence. The same influence that led to the secularizing of life led also to the secularizing of the clergy. They could no longer hold people in check by "spiritual" means. The very religion they preached could no longer completely control men so long as the main appeal was to the fear or love of God and to a future state. The loss of influence in one direction had to be secured by increase of influence in another—at least the attempt had to be made. So it happened that more and more, sometimes without knowing why, at other times as part of a deliberate policy, the clergy began to preach a religion of *social* salvation, and themselves to pose as social saviours. Before, the priest in politics was a corporate movement. It was the Church to which he belonged that claimed to dictate to the Secular power on many aspects of life. For some time now it is not the Church that boldly attempts to dictate to the State. It is the clergyman as an individual who now strives to exert power by other methods. He makes his appeal as a citizen; but his aim is still that of the Church. The Ethiopian does not change his skin nor the leopard his spots. The policy is different, the aim is the same.

The Priest in Politics.

The Church in politics is one of the most fatal things that can overtake a country at any time; the history of every country in the world proves it. The Church interfering in political life in Spain brought that country to the verge of ruin, and left behind it some of its most disgraceful features of to-day. The worst aspects of Czarism in Russia was largely due to the same institution regulating the lives of the people. In this country the hatred of Protestantism for Roman Catholicism very materially contributed to the misgovernment of Ireland; it prevented a measure of justice to Roman Catholics, both in Ireland, and at home, and did much to aggravate the relations between the two countries. It also threw the Irish people more completely into the arms of the Roman Church. And there is the broad lesson that never yet has any State been able for long to permit a branch of the Christian State to dominate the secular life of the people without, in self-defence, having to step in and check its greed and its activities.

Now I suggest to all Freethinkers that these are considerations that might well be borne in mind for the next five or six weeks at least. It is not likely that anywhere Freethinkers themselves are sufficiently organized to materially affect the totality of votes cast. But there are other ways of serving the best interests of the community than that of helping to decide whether Mr. Tweedledum or Mr. Tweedledee shall put M.P. at the end of his name. And those who will advocate the claims of Freethinkers to the same justice as is served out to other people, who will agitate for the State schools to be kept free from either the priest or his deputy, and who will do what he or she can to rationalize and humanize the "Day of Rest," may be serving the higher interests of the nation better than placing immediate political interests above any other consideration. Many of us have lived long enough to realize that there is no danger of the immediate ruin of the country whatever political party is returned at the head of affairs. And it is just possible that if a man were to fall asleep and wake up six months hence, there would not be anything so startlingly different in the state of affairs as to lead him to the conclusion that a new government must have been elected. There is a chance for all Freethinkers doing something for Free thought in the immediate future. I strongly invite them to do it.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Baa, Baa, Black Sheep!

"To be ruled by busybodies is more than human nature can bear."—*Macaulay*.

"Clear your mind of cant."—*Sam Johnson*.

"The Bible is a nose of wax, and can be twisted as you please."—*Martin Luther*.

ENGLISHMEN are often astonished at the strong anti-clericalism displayed by Democrats on the Continent. And foreigners are as much surprised to find that Englishmen underestimate the hostility of the clergy to all forms of Democracy. Throughout Europe Democrats regard the Black Army of priests as the enemy of enemies. Here, in England, the Democratic Movement is in danger of being strangled by the machinations of Priestcraft, and the average citizen appears to be almost entirely oblivious of the danger.

To plain Mr. John Citizen, a priest is a man who dresses in a petticoat, and belongs to the Romish Church. The tens of thousands of clergy who wear "dog collars" are, to him, quite harmless persons, who have a perfect right to fulfil their quaint calling

in a free country. There are not enough Romish priests to fill the Albert Hall, so, why worry? Nevertheless, Clericalism is as real an enemy in England as on the Continent, had Englishmen but the wit to see it.

Owing to the machinations of the clergy, and their catspaws, the position of the clerical caste in this country is now actually stronger than it was in the "seventies" of the last century. At that time the Radical programme included, among other things, the disestablishment and disendowment of the English State Church, and the secularization of education. At that period, too, there was a definite Republican Party, and it was even hoped that John Bright might be the first President of a British Republic. How things have changed! Little is now heard of secular education, or disestablishment. Present-day Labour leaders are the veriest flunkeys flaunting in Court dress at Royal functions. And the best-selling line in side-street shops is the picture-postcard of a monarch in a wheel-chair.

This shelving of anti-clerical measures has been going on a long time. It happens in the Labour Party, and also at Trades Union Congresses, and at meetings of the National Union of Teachers. So the game goes merrily along, until the whole Democratic movement becomes as innocuous to the vested interests of the clergy as the Primrose League itself. In nobbling Democracy the clerical catspaws receive help from a number of Nonconformist ex-clergymen, who have turned to politics in pursuit of the loaves and fishes. These may always be trusted to support the party of reaction, and to snuffle platitudes when vigorous action is required.

It is high time that Mr. John Citizen was reminded that priests are priests, whether they wear dog-collars, gaiters, or petticoats. They are the hereditary enemies of progress. The State Church clergy are no better and no worse than the others, so listen to the apologia of one of them. Dean Hoskyns, writing on "The Plain Man and His Church," in a London newspaper, explains in no uncertain terms the reactionary position of the priestly caste.

At the outset Dean Hoskyns says that the function of his church, which is the State Church, is "to produce in each generation a god-fearing laity." "Here's richness for you," as Wackford Squeers puts it. "God-fearing" means, in practice, simple priest-respecting, for the alleged deity is never seen, and the priests are his representatives. The Dean goes on to add—

The Church is the one sure bulwark against the cranks and the highbrows and the theorists.

This is not the cocksure utterance of a green, young curate, but the considered statement of one of the higher ecclesiastics. Now, notice the cautious remarks concerning the attitude of the "god-fearing laity" to the clergy:—

The relationship (between the priest and the laity) is exceedingly delicate, since the clergy possess an authority; and, unless they abdicate, they must be sufficiently courageous to act as though they possessed it; and as a rider to this the layman must be prepared to submit to some form of strictly limited clerical authority.

The prosperity of any Church depends upon the laymen, and the word covers both sexes. The aim of the State Church priests is, of course, to "rope in" the entire population of this country. That being impossible, they get as many worshippers as they can, and, in matters affecting the priestly caste as a whole, make temporary alliances with their priestly rivals. Here is Dean Hoskyn's plea for the tyranny of the clerical caste:—

The layman is not half a parson, just as the parson must not endeavour to be taken for three

quarters of a layman; nor does the layman possess a more intimate knowledge of theology than he who is by vocation and by training a theologian.

"Intimate knowledge of theology," indeed! Mr. John Citizen can at least read *The Book of Common Prayer*, and note its antediluvian opinions on matters of real moment. The keynote throughout is "fear god and honour the king," which, being translated, means in plain English, paying your pew-rents regularly, and singing "Rule Britannia." The whole thing is enough to turn the raven hair of a Democrat white, and curl it afterwards. As a fact, *The Book of Common Prayer* is more snobbish, more sycophantic, more lickspittle than Burke's *Peerage*, or *Debrett*, which is the stud-book of the aristocracy. In the "Peerages," due regard is given to rank, however lowly, and the latest titled money-lender, or provision-merchant, gets his appointed, if modest, place in the exhibition. But in the official Prayer Book of the Church of England, it is a case of "Eclipse first, and the rest nowhere." Prayers are offered for individual members of the Royal Family, and the other fifty millions of English people are lumped together as "miserable sinners." Indeed, it is only a few years since this prayer book contained a service commemorating "King Charles the Martyr." This was not deleted from lack of affection for Royalty, but because it was realized that such a melancholy event tended to make martyrdom, and the State Church, ridiculous.

To turn for a moment from the ridiculous to the sublime, Dean Hoskyns informs us of the signs that distinguish a really Christian home from the abode of the naughty Nothingarian, or the still more awful Atheist. Here are the Dean's own words:—

Hot-cross buns on Good Friday, lamb and mint sauce on Easter Day, gooseberry tart on Whit-Sunday, goose on Michaelmas Day, in addition to turkey and plum pudding on Christmas Day, and pancakes on Shrove Tuesday.

And, lest we forget, fish on Fridays. It is a perfect gastronomic calendar, reminiscent of the eighteenth century, when even the dons of Cambridge were "sunk in prejudice and port," to adopt Gibbon's sarcastic comment. Reactionary in so many respects, it is not unexpected that the Christian should be advised by his pastor and master to keep to the flesh-pots of old Egypt. Fed on such a diet, if he survives indigestion, he should be ever ready to "do his duty in that state of life into which it shall please God to call him." But, as the million and a half unemployed people cannot, by any means, adopt this alluring menu, it appears as if the distinctive signs of a Christian home will be lacking in their particularly sad cases. Indeed, so many things in the Christian Religion are ill-adapted to the times in which we are now living. In the days when the working class could neither read nor write the Christian Church was a tyrant, and an impostor. To-day it is, first and last, a nuisance, and should be treated accordingly, and the sooner the better.

MIMNERMUS.

The Goddesses and Women of Old Rome.

THE antique Roman matron remains an imposing figure. Was not Cornelia the mother of the Gracchi? Again, the splendid picture of Portia, the wife of Brutus in the tragedy of *Julius Caesar*, was inspired by the pages of Plutarch. What a contrast between the fulminations of the Christian Fathers against weak and wicked woman, who first enabled sin to enter the world, and the ideal Roman wife portrayed by the mighty Elizabethan poet!

Ancient Etruria, in Italy, was apparently the parent of many of the social and religious institutions of Rome. In Etruria, the recovered tombs and frescoes clearly testify to the honour and glory in which women were held. The early history of Etruria provides close correspondence to the evidences revealed in the ruins of ancient Crete. Two of the three leading divinities of Etruria were goddesses, while the twelve minor deities consisted of six of each sex. Fate was personified by the goddess Lasa, and the Etruscan kings assembled in solemn council at the shrine of the goddess Voltumna. The children were named after both parents. In wall paintings of banquets, women appear by their husband's side. Men and women officiated together at the sacrificial ceremonies. Even the stone memorials of the dead appear more elaborate in the case of women than of men.

Etruscan women of the upper classes were cultured and accomplished. Livy and Pliny both refer to the famous Tanaquil, who was not merely a stately and industrious matron, but, like Hypatia in a later and decadent age, was renowned as a mathematician.

It is surmised that the festival of the Matronalia was established to commemorate the rape of the Sabine women who, after their submission to their forced marriage, persuaded their infuriated fathers to forego reprisals for the abduction of their daughters. They implored their parents and husbands not to render them fatherless and widows. Thus, they prevented war. And this was the received explanation of the custom observed at the feast of Matronalia, when wives were presented with gifts from their husbands, and maidens made gifts by their lovers. This story has been cited to prove woman's instinctive horror of war.

Valeria and Volturnia, the wife and mother of Coriolanus, successfully appealed to the hero's clemency when he was prepared to make war on the Romans. Coriolanus tells them:—

“Ladies, you deserve
To have a temple built you: all the swords
In Italy, and her confederate arms,
Could not have made this peace.”

The homestead was from the earliest times the social and religious centre. There, the ancient cult of ancestor worship was observed. The chief divinity of family life was Vesta, the goddess of fire. She symbolized female supremacy in the home. Peering into the shadowy past we dimly discern the sacred flame aglow in the settlement which was kindled by the sons, and tended by the daughters of the ruler. This became in historic times a complex and important affair of State. The Flamens and Vestal Virgins had been evolved from simple beginnings. On March 1st, the New Year's Day of the old Roman calendar, the six Vestals solemnly renewed Vesta's sacred flame. At the Summer solstice in June, they purified the Penus Vestae—a development of the primitive granary and barn—and it was thus prepared for the reception of the first fruits of the agricultural year.

The Vestals possessed magical powers, and many special functions were theirs. In the middle of May, a procession, in which the pontifices and magistrates took part, proceeded to the banks of the Tiber, and twenty-seven straw images were cast into the stream by the priestesses of the State. Some detect in this a simple rain-charm, while others with greater justice regard it as a relic of an earlier human sacrifice to the spirit of the river.

Another goddess of high descent was Juno. The noble temple on the Capitol, which became the centre of Roman religion, was dedicated to Jupiter, Juno,

and Minerva. At a later date, temples devoted to Juno worship were erected, and the goddess became the marriage divinity. To her, the seasons were sacred, and her aid was sought in times of trouble. Juno's cult was popular with women, who were encouraged in their worship, as this kept them in subjection to the policy of the State.

Minerva also developed into an independent deity. The goddess of wisdom, her advancement coincides with the growth of industrial life. Her temple on the Aventine became the headquarters of the handicrafts. She smiled on good craftsmanship and blessed all forms of labour. To her, students proffered prayers for name and fame in the republic of letters.

As an earth goddess, Ceres, the corn-mother, presided over the reproductive powers of Nature. Her ceremonial season was April, but offerings were made to her as the harvest-time drew near. To her care were committed the bodies of the dead, and the soil was saluted when her divine name was spoken.

Diana, the divine huntress, and other female deities were widely worshipped by women. In ancient, as in modern times, May Day was sacred to seasonal celebrations. This anniversary was that of the mighty Bona Dea whose temple was preserved, and whose ceremonies were celebrated by women alone. There was a solemn sacrifice to the same goddess in December, which was attended by the Vestal Virgins, and this became an important part of the national religion. It was an offence, punishable by death, for any man to violate these sacred mysteries with his presence, so invaluable were they deemed to the welfare of the State.

Religious prostitution prevails in Indian temples to-day. Male and female prostitution was prevalent in the religion of ancient Judea, and many other lands. So in ancient Rome a day was dedicated to the honour of women who served, in terms of religious thought, to stimulate the flagging reproductive powers of Nature.

The sexual excesses said to have been associated with the worship and love of Dionysus, particularly during the nocturnal gatherings of the faithful, were denounced by the austerer type of Roman, and were interdicted by the State. Reading between the lines, and allowing for all overstatements—and the late Dr. Donaldson, an eminent authority, contended that the immorality was enormously exaggerated—there appears to have arisen a powerful wave of religious hysteria in connexion with this cult.

Stern old Cato expressed very decided opinions about the proper place of women. But for these frail creatures, he said, the immortal gods would still have been dwelling with men upon earth. Many of his complaints possess a very modern air. They are strikingly reminiscent of the views so popular in certain circles in the now distant days of the female-suffrage agitation. But then, as now, proud man parted with his brief authority, and was compelled to bow to the spirit of the age.

Cornelia, Scipio's famous daughter, was the ideal Roman woman. When she was left a widow, many sought her hand in marriage, but she determined to devote her life to the education of her boys, her “jewels.” She inspired them, with some success, to do the State some service.

In early centuries divorce was rare in Rome. But as the Republic neared its end, freedom of divorce was established. Divorce was now granted if both parties consented to the dissolution of the marriage, except in cases where crime or adultery was involved. Most marriages, however, were regarded as life partnerships. As Dr. Ritchie remarks in his *Natural Rights*: “Monogamy has come to us as a

Roman, not as a distinctively Christian institution."

Wedlock between a patrician and plebian had been legal from early Roman times. The offspring of plebian women who wedded patricians assumed the rank of their father. Moreover, the children of freed women were likewise free. And illegitimate offspring were in no way debarred in obtaining office or emolument in civic life.

In the Augustan Age the marriage tie had become slack. Romans of both sexes disliked the yoke imposed by the sacerdotal form of marriage, and it became customary with the opulent orders to marry *sine manu*. This form of matrimony enabled the wife to wed without passing into the *manu* or power of her lord, while she still remained subject to her father or guardian. This contrivance admitted much liberty of action to the wife, because her father's *potestas* was bound to decrease when she abandoned her father's house for her husband's home. The artful Augustus, as Gibbon termed him, to some extent increased the stringency of the marriage code, as he desired to increase that section of the population most useful to the State. Then to crown all, a tax on bachelors, known as the *uxorium*, was restored and increased.

T. F. PALMER.

Father McNabb on the Resurrection.

In his Five-Minute Sermon in the *Sunday Graphic*, recently, Father Vincent McNabb plumps, naturally, in favour of the Resurrection. In five minutes he proves, conclusively, a dogma that has worried many good people for years.

He has a ready "way wid him," this Father, in advancing his arguments. He brushes aside, "abstract scientific facts, like the chemical formula for sulphuric acid," or "a mechanical formula for the expansion of steel under heat." By so doing, he imparts a scientific flavour to his findings before blurting out his facts. As much as to say, "I know a thing or two about astronomical observation, therefore, what I am about to say about the Resurrection must be true.

Two "facts" suffice for Father McNabb; and really, if he can legitimately substantiate these facts, there's nothing more to be said. The battle's won. It is all over but the shouting. We must join the Church.

"Fact No. 1.—A man named Jesus of Nazareth was put to death in Jerusalem by command of the Roman Governor, Pontius Pilate."

"Fact No. 2.—The man Jesus was seen alive after his death."

There we have it. How beautifully simple. To prove the truth of the Resurrection is as easy as counting peas. First, you must make sure the victim is dead. Then all that remains is to ascertain that five persons saw the deceased afterwards—in good health, little the worse for his unpleasant experience.

Then we have to remember that Matthew and John were both eyewitnesses and earwitnesses. What these worthies saw and heard must have happened. It must be true as gospel. And even if these were disposed to be credulous, or if their reports happened to be "edited," well, there's Dr. Luke. You cannot hoodwink a Doctor. Oh no. Doctors are scientific gentlemen, and always speak the truth. You cannot bamboozle a medico. What never? Well, hardly ever!

But the "fact" of the Resurrection is not merely dependent upon the sworn statement of these unprejudiced witnesses. There's Paul. Paul was a whole-hogger when it came to verifying facts. After his attack of sunstroke, if the facts didn't suit his particular theories, the facts could be altered. Lying for the glory of God, is a principle that can overwhelm any amount of "facts."

Of course there were other reliable witnesses, but Father McNabb, in five minutes, has no time to call them. There were the ladies, who could always be relied upon to spin a yarn, and who, generally, can turn a

bald and unconvincing narrative into plausible history. The Father has no use for Mary. Mary can just go 'long

Here is a sample of the argument, which our five-minute mentor puts into the mouth of the objector: "On the one hand, I tell the believers that they cannot hold that Christ *has* risen, though the fact is witnessed by five historical documents. Yet, on the other hand, I accept the fact that Christ has *not* risen though the fact is witnessed by no documents. How, then, can I say that to have documents is no proof—and to have no documents is a proof? Is this history?"

I suppose this is the kind of verbal manipulation that will appeal to the faithful in all Churches, but especially to those who have a reputation for keeping hell-fire up to a certain temperature. This five-minute preacher evidently expects a negative to be substantiated. He wants proof that Christ has not risen. He wants the fact demonstrated that Jack never climbed the beanstalk. He would like to be assured that Mrs. Hubbard never had a cupboard, or a dog, or even a bone. Some rev. Fathers, when they reach the age of seventy, are hard to please.

ALAN TYNDAL.

Acid Drops.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks says that he has spent more time in prison than any other Home Secretary has ever spent. And yet some people find fault! They do not like him spending part of his time there. They will never be satisfied till he makes it a whole-time job.

Sir William also says that our prisons ought to be educational and reformatory establishments rather than places of punishment and detention. Well, the same thing was taught by the Atheist Beccaria, about one hundred and eighty years ago, and has been advertised as one of the objects of the National Secular Society for very many years. These Christian reformers generally follow us sooner or later, the pity is that they do not do it sooner.

Oh, these journalists! This is the way the Science Correspondent"—probably an office boy with nothing to do, leads off an article on inventions:—

For sheer inventive ability Great Britain is probably ahead of any other country in the world. There is scarcely a street without a potential inventor.

We should be surprised to learn that the last statement is not true of every human being in any part of the world. For sheer raucous vacuity the statement is worthy of "Jimmy" Douglas himself. When newspaper readers can be brought to imagine that thought undelies this kind of emptiness, one almost ceases to wonder at many things that happen in the world.

Archbishop Temple is gravely concerned about the position of Church of England schools. He says that the value of the Church school is not in any special religious syllabus, but in the fact of its definite association with the Church, and in the opportunity given to the clergy to visit the school frequently, not only to preach, but to show interest in the children and become friendly with them, and thus set us in the children's minds the idea of the union of the school and the Church. Put in another way the Church values the schools not for the education they supply nor their ability to remove ignorance, but as client-catching agencies. We have said this before, but we never dreamed that an Archbishop would tacitly admit the truth of it. The Archbishop and many of his clergy are interested in the Worker's Education Association. Is his and their motive similar to that which prompts the Church's interest in schools?

The Director of Education for Worcestershire asks: "Is it possible to have a common religious education for all children who are not connected with any par-

ticular Church? Would not such a school religion do a great deal to promote the re-union of the Churches?" Just the one thing needed! The more attenuated and more hazy the common religious education in schools, the less likely would the children be to squabble over it. No child would be sure about anything. That might favour peace and brotherhood and re-union. For, at present, it is each sectarian's certainty and conviction as to the truth of the doctrines taught by his Church that incites enmity, squabbling and division.

Cardinal Bourne says that while unemployment is a very serious question, to Catholics the chief thing is that of the attitude of candidates towards education. That is not a quite honest way of putting it. What he means is, will candidates support the Catholics getting their religion taught at the expense of the general rate-payer. That is quite a different proposition.

By the way, we see that, according to the Labour paper, *The Sunday Worker*, Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell's reason for not standing again for Paisley is that on account of the opposition to him from Roman Catholics, following his attitude on the Prayer Book, he fears that he will not be re-elected. Catholics form a large part of the electorate in Paisley, and as the Catholic vote is the most sheep-like in the country, the fears of Mr. Mitchell may be well founded. All the same, this intrusion of organized religion into the political field indicates one of the gravest dangers the internal life of this country has to face. Nor is it likely that either of the big political parties will speak out against it. They are far more likely to pander to it.

Apropos of the Roman Catholic celebration of the centenary of the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act, the *Methodist Recorder* says:—

The political disabilities which the Act of 1829 removed were not so different from those from which the Protestant Dissenters, as Nonconformists, were then called, had been relieved a year earlier by the repeal of the iniquitous Test Corporation Acts.

This should remind our Christian friends that the Brotherhood of man introduced by the Churches is a weird and wonderful thing, and doesn't seem to have been particularly helpful to the cause of equity and justice and freedom amongst men.

Our contemporary asks the rejoicing Catholics why their Church still does not do as they have been done by, and accord to Protestants in Catholic countries the liberty they themselves claim and enjoy under Protestant rule. The answer we suggest is that their religion won't let them, just in the same way the religion of Protestants and Catholics will not let them accord full liberty to Freethinkers in some Protestant and Catholic countries.

Mr. Henry T. Hodgkin says, in a recent book of his, that one task of religious education is to see how "the death of Jesus may be so presented to this generation as to give it a chance of producing results at least as profound as those produced in previous generations." And this, he thinks, will not be done by reviving old theories or clinging to outworn forms of expression. The task, we agree, is a pretty tough one. The trouble is that as soon as the theologians have devised the right presentation to suit the present-day intelligence and knowledge of to-morrow. In the circumstances, even a Salvation Army theologian might be pardoned for seeking consolation in booze.

Judging by the popular newspapers, the Rev. Dr. W. R. Mathews, Dean of King's College, London, thinks there is an almost unexampled interest in religion. But on the other hand, he notes that people of to-day are less

willing to take religion for granted, to take it pre-digested from the Churches. Like that, then, the alleged interest is of small use to the Churches. If people don't take in religion from a God-inspired source, what will become of the priests? The present outlook for them is poor indeed. The majority of the people cannot be got interested in religion, and a large number of the religious-minded tend to make of religion anything they fancy. Poor priests! their occupation is gradually fading away from them. No wonder they are beginning to get interested in the unemployment problem!

Gipsy Smith is home again, with the latest child story from America. In his own words we tell it:—

One of my friends has a little girl who said, "I dreamt I went to heaven. I saw God, and I said, 'There's ever so many questions I want to ask you. But God said, 'I've no time now to answer questions. Just go and sit in the moon for a while, and I'll give you a star to play with.'" I said to the parents, "You watch that child, she is going to be something great."

Maybe, a leading doctor of divinity.

From the *Schoolmistress* we learn that:—

A children's corner is to be formed in St. James' Church, Barrow. There will be a prayer-desk, chairs, pictures, books and magazines. Flags for Scouts and Guides will be deposited. The object is to encourage children's organizations.

An "object" with the usual ecclesiastical motive—kidnapping. We don't think dear Jesus would quite approve of these wily tactics. He never troubled about catching "kids." He applied his energies to fishing for men. Though, it must be admitted, his chief successes were in catching adults of the mental age of children. For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Professor Conway, at Manchester:—

People talk proudly of the victories of England being won on the playing fields of Eton, and they vote next day for the erection of an elementary school in a crowded district, where there is not an inch of ground.

Probably, people who vote as the Professor says, fancy that the victories of England were really won in the incubators of the Church—the Sunday schools. In which case, the kind of day schools the nation has does not matter much, so long as the Sunday schools are in working order and well fitted.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc, in *Radio Times*, relates as solemn fact, various ancient myths about Joan of Arc, as evidence for her being divinely inspired. The "logic" Mr. Belloc builds around these reveals Mr. Belloc as a true Catholic humourist. "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us to see oursel's as others see us!"

The following is taken from the *Rational Journal* for March, the organ of the Rational Association Friendly Society, Manchester:—

There was much activity in the formation of Friendly Societies and Mutual Associations about 1830, and the spread of these societies raised much opposition. Pulpit and Press rang with denunciations. A member of a Friendly Society was being buried at Woodhouse, near Huddersfield, and after the Church of England service was finished the officiating clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Bywater, of St. Paul's Huddersfield, addressed the numerous brethren assembled to pay homage to a respected and well-beloved brother, in the following language:—

"Now, my brethren, as you stand here, I have a few words to say to you. You may think, because I have interred this man, I have done my duty, but as a minister of Christ I cannot allow this occasion to pass without saying something to you. I intend to give you a short lecture and then to turn my back on you for ever. I care not for you—I dare tell you so. What do you mean by coming here with your badges, collecting a multitude of people, breaking the Sabbath and keeping

thousands from a place of worship? Is it not abominable? I care not for your badges—they are emblems of wickedness—and you are worse than devils or infidels; and if you do not forsake your badges you will not only go down to the grave as this man has done but you will sink down to hell eternal. I dare say that when I am gone some one of you will put on a surplice; but let me tell you yours will be an abomination, while mine is an emblem of holiness. You are a disgrace to society, a scandal to the country you live in! Go to the heathen and he will teach you a lesson! Ever since I have known anything of you this has been my opinion and shall ever remain so."

That is how the clergy helped.

"Summer Time" is again in operation. It has one serious drawback, which appears to have escaped the notice of our parsons. It compels the staff of the prayer-receiving bureau in heaven to get to work an hour sooner. For the same reason, it must be a nuisance also to the Recording Angel, who books people's sins. This suggests a grave philosophic problem. It is ethically right for the Churches to support, or not to oppose, a scheme which compels heaven to conform its economy to suit the convenience of man? The Churches' intellectual giants really ought to get the point settled before next April, lest uninstructed Christians get worried over it.

One of the features of a certain Wesleyan Girls' League rally was a missionary exhibition of curios, costumes, models, etc., brought from other lands and collected by the girls. The collection was pretty complete, for it included the full-dress war-paint of a Christian missionary—with a parson inside it.

The *Methodist Recorder* discourses at large on "Youth and Age in Church and State." We are told that the main contribution which youth has to offer is driving power and the spirit of adventure. Quite true; but what is troubling the Churches to-day is the unwelcome fact that so large a number of youthful people will give the Churches no chance to misdirect youthful driving power and spirit of adventure into ecclesiastically useful channels. The loss is the Churches'; the gain is the Nation's.

The Scout Movement comes of age this year. Having reached adulthood, it might now, we suggest, pay some attention to fostering in youth more interest in intellectual matters, and damp down the glorification of the purely animal and primitive. There is a mental side to real manhood as well as a physical. The Scout Movement hasn't yet realized the truth of that.

A religious weekly says gravely: "As we have repeatedly urged, on moral and religious, no less than on social and economic grounds, unemployment must be cured." One would fancy that on "religious grounds" unemployment might be an advantage. It enables the Churches to dole out charity and thus excite gratitude, and to carry the blessed consolidation of religion to the workless and their dependants. It also furnishes earnest Christians with opportunities for doing something to please God and dear Jesus.

Dr. Stanley Jones, a missionary from India, says that Christians cannot believe in any national religion; what is not universal is not true. This seems to rule out the Christian religion as being true. It never has been universal, despite 2,000 years of money, power and effort to make it so. And it—to grudge by the modern trend of things—never will be universal.

The same Mr. Jones says that India is challenging everything, because she has been galvanized into a new

life by a new "inspiration"—to wit, the impact of Jesus Christ; and he claims that there is no reform in India to-day that is not inspired by the message of Christ. We presume that, besides gift of the gab, imagination is a prime qualification for the job of missionary. It enables the missionary to see so very much more than an impartial social observer or historian. This is different from "lying to the glory of God"; it is imagining to the glory of the Church—and the parson.

There seems to have been a great deal of "God" in the Great War. Readers will remember how God interfered by sending the angels of Mons to interfere on the side of the British—a story that was awavely invented by Mr. Arthur Machen, but which the Bishop of London and others swore they had evidence of their actual appearance. There was the leaning Virgin of Albert, on the top of the Church tower, which Mr. Bottomley, in his newly found fervour for God, said was a miracle. The Virgin was really wired up by the Engineers, because it was used as one of the points to regulate gun fire. God was very much in evidence, but whatever he was after he took four years to do what he wishes, and no one is yet quite certain what he was after.

Then there was the German Emperor, who was certain that he was carrying out God's will in fighting the British Empire and the Allies. Now we see from a biography of Earl Haig, by Brigadier-General Charteris, Haig believed that he was divinely appointed to lead the Allied Armies to victory. That hardly looks like playing the game. To convince the Germans that he was on their side, and then to convince Haig that he was with him, and then set them going for each other, is not quite the way one likes to see God act. But, says General Charteris, Haig regarded himself as "the chosen of the Lord." One wonders who chose French and Foch, and all the others? We are not, of course, in a position to say whether the statements about Haig are reliable or not, but Haig is dead, and it seems a pity for a biographer to go out of his way to emphasize that the dead Field-Marshal suffered from a delusion that generally springs from a distorted egotism. After all the delusion that a man has been picked out by God to win a war is not substantially different from the delusion of some poor mother that she has been directed by God to murder her own children.

A pleasing item of news from the newspapers, which, by law of accident, and not of design, must publish something worth reading, is the reference to the Prince of Wales and the miner's leader, Mr. A. J. Cook. The latter is reported as having said that:—

His conduct and his attitude have shown that all mankind have great qualities in common, one man with every other.

If it were not for the disadvantages in the carefully fostered ideas of the divinity of kings, and the nonsense seriously distributed by those in charge of "religious" education, Mr. Cook might have made the discovery earlier, for the Prince of Wales as a man is nearer to the hearts of mankind than say—the Bishop of London or Cardinal Bourne.

As an example of Jesuitical reasoning, it would be hard to better that from Dr. Stanley Jones, author of *Christ of the Indian Road*. In the following extract, Dr. Jones is like the famous Dr. Johnson; if he cannot shoot his opponent he will knock him down with the butt-end of his pistol.

The reason that Mahatma Gandhi is definitely non-Christian is due, the Doctor says, to two failures at a critical time of Gandhi's development:

"The Christians with deep conviction whom he met were lacking in intellectual power, and could not frame their message to suit his need. The intellectuals could not give the note of conviction to their appeal."

Ordinary men without swollen heads about their own brand of religion, would say that the reason why Mahatma Gandhi is not a Christian, is because he prefers to remain a member of his own particular belief. If a learned writer said this, however, there would not be much left for a book *Query*; is the effort of missionaries to convert India an outward and visible sign of Christian humility?

Two instructive items from the *Northern Echo* of April 5, a copy of which has just reached us. The first is from the Vicar of St. Peter's, Sunderland, who is "alarmed" at the secularizing of Sunday, and is afraid, if this continues, of the effect on the state of the town. The other item is from the Recorder, who sat as Judge at the Sunderland Quarter Sessions. He complimented the town on the decrease of crime and the comparative freedom from it, and said that the decrease had been going on for some years. What *will* the Vicar think of the Recorder?

Yet another miracle has been shown to be true. We all know the story of Christ causing the blind man to see. The latest news is that archæologists have now unearthed the very street in which the miracle took place. What does one want more? If Christians are able to show the street in which the miracle was worked, nothing more is needed to prove its truth. If this goes on we shall have to cease issuing the *Freethinker*.

The Bishop of Southwell says that anyone who reads the Gospels must realize how very rarely Jesus refers people to the future life. Maybe, but when he did he "gave 'em hell."

The Rev. A. E. Bowse told a Northampton audience that when he went to Welton Chapel, Northamptonshire, to preach the congregation consisted of two women. One was deaf, and the other was the chapel keeper. Well, that was one congregation that would never "talk back"; and what could a preacher ask for more?

The Egoism of Belief.

"We simply do not know," says Miss Elizabeth Drew, in *The Modern Novel*, "the secrets of the universe we inhabit, and the civilized modern does not pretend to know."

The late Katherine Mansfield, in a letter, wrote: "I wish I could believe in a God. I can't. Science seems to make it impossible. And if you are to believe in a God, it must be a good God, and no good God could allow his children to suffer so."

Both these writers voice the attitude of the educated modern—by which I do not mean "educated" in the narrow, academic sense; indeed, many "educated" people remain credulous and impressible to the end of their days; but in the sense of being able to think for oneself, to form one's own opinions, in place of accepting them ready-made. In the face of recent discoveries in many branches of science, astronomy, geology, anthropology, biology, analytical psychology (with its studies of the origins of myths and taboos), it is indeed difficult to understand how any being with the smallest amount of reasoning-power can exhibit orthodox beliefs. I used to wonder how such a giant of commonsense as Dr. Johnson could have found it in him to believe in a God, till I reflected that it was mostly a matter of the spirit of the time, and that science had not yet contributed its vast weight of destructive evidence.

How are we to account for the many thousands of believers to-day? These may be divided into two classes—the enlightened and the unenlightened. The first have not the excuse of ignorance, even. The average parson, for instance, since he has in most cases had a university education, comes within this category. He must be cognizant of recent scientific developments, yet he ad-

heres to his creed. Is it not certain that not only many parsons, but many other, and more prominent, public men, do not and cannot believe what they profess to believe, that they profess these beliefs for reasons of policy, or self-interest, or simple moral cowardice?

The second class, the vast mass of the faithful, are actuated by pure ignorance. Of independent and original thought they are quite incapable. They resolutely decline to discuss the other side of the question; in fact, they will admit no other side. They know they are right, and there's an end of it. Argument is wasted on these. They have succeeded where the greatest intellects of the ages have failed, for they have solved the cosmic riddle; they have provided themselves with a final, satisfactory, and delightfully simple explanation of the universe. It is in vain to remind them gently that all the facts are directly against them. They will only patronize, or pity, you. "Poor fellow," they will say, "some day you will see the light." If, in addition, you happen to have been in the war, they will charitably conclude that, *ipso facto*, has disturbed your reason, and say a prayer for its early restoration. Useless to point out that you have at least thought these things out for yourself while they have taken them on trust.

They will reply that such things are "not meant to be probed into too deeply," that the mysteries are too sacred to be subjected to inquiry. Uniquely, religion transcends reason.

This egoism has always been a concomitant of belief. Every sect has been convinced that every other sect is wrong, and has expressed that conviction in every conceivable form of persecution. In the Middle Ages men, merely because they thought differently from others, were fiendishly tortured or burnt at the stake. In later times less violent penalties, such as imprisonment or being deprived of the custody of one's children, have been inflicted upon those who affirmed the rights of Free-thought and free speech.

This bland assumption by orthodoxy of its absolute rightness may be seen at work to-day, in more harmless, but none the less insinuating, ways. An example is the cool manner in which the B.B.C. broadcast religious services, irrespective of whether the listener wants them or not. The standard reply to this is, I believe, that a licence-holder gets roughly three days' entertainment for a penny, and if he doesn't like the services, he needn't listen. That is not the point. Apart from the question whether it is the B.B.C.'s province to educate or improve its subscribers (who, however much or little they pay, are entitled to equality of treatment), this supreme piece of impertinence, this arrogant taking for granted of the right to impose a particular system of beliefs upon everybody, together with an unconditional refusal of any hearing to the other side, remains.

Then there is the case of Thomas Hardy. He expressed a wish (not for reasons of religion, since he was an avowed Freethinker, but doubtless because he felt that he belonged to the countryside) to be buried in the churchyard of a Dorsetshire village. This wish was ignored. He was "raked in" by the Church and, after his heart had been removed, interred in the Abbey with the customary ritualistic observances. It would be instructive to know who precisely was responsible for this outstanding instance of presuming to impose, upon the remains of a man of genius, and expressly against his desire, the ritual of a creed that in life he repudiated.

ARTHUR W. GAYTON.

WHO KILLED MOSES?

Who killed poor Moses
Goethe supposes
That the terrible son
Of a masculine nun,
And Caleb, his crony,
Whose sire was Jephone,
Together killed Moses;
So Goethe supposes.

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.

S. P. BRANDALL.—See "Acid Drops," where you will find the case of a Church in your neighbourhood in which the congregation numbered only two. This beats your congregation of three.

J. BARTRAM.—Thanks. We have made a note of the information.

F. BRADFORD.—The newspaper correspondence is certain to do. Your own letter is very much to the point.

W. COLLINS.—By Saturday morning is the best time for convenience.

F. H. DELL.—See "Acid Drops."

W. A. EVANS.—We are delighted to learn that the *Freethinker* has been of so much assistance to you. We do not know about the paper you name being politically free, but we are fairly certain that its freedom does not extend to the free discussion of religious subjects. Pointing out the comparatively harmless humbug of particular parsons is hardly exhibiting freedom on religious subjects.

G. P. LAWS.—Pleased to hear from you again.

W.G.—Next week.

L. S. LUCKENS (Auckland N.Z.)—Pleased to learn the *Freethinker* is proving of so much use to the Cause in New Zealand. Keep it up.

L. MASON.—You are misinformed. There is no question whatever as to the legal right of a Secular Society to a bequest, whether the Society is registered or unregistered. The House of Lords decision in the Bowman case settled that question once and for all. As a matter of fact, bequests have been paid over to the Society by the Public Trustee. The decision in the Bowman case, in favour of the Secular Society, Limited, was the greatest legal victory Freethought has ever won in an English Court of Law.

W. SABINE.—We already send the *Freethinker* to many public libraries, and shall be pleased to send it to the one you name if it will accept the paper.

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.

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums.

The National Secular Society's Conference is drawing near, and we hope friends from all over the country will be present. The place of the Conference is Manchester. There could not be a place more central for the whole of the country, and those who intend being present, and wish hotel or other accommodation secured, should write at once saying what it is they require.

At the request of the Editor of *Everyman*, Mr. Cohen has written two articles on "The Psychology of the Idea of God," for that journal. The first article appeared in the issue for April 25, the second will be published in the issue for May 2.

The Secular Society, Limited has issued a new edition of G. W. Foote's *Bible and Beer*. This has been done specially with a view to the General election, and should prove very useful for propaganda. The pamphlet extends to forty pages, and is priced at twopence. At least a thousand of our readers ought to send for copies for distribution. Parcels of six copies and upward will be sent post free. We hope to have the help of many of our readers in getting this pamphlet into circulation as quickly as possible.

The Bethnal Green Borough Council, predominantly Liberal, has decided to remove a number of Labour papers from the Public Library, and also the *Freethinker*. This is a piece of impudent bigotry, and we should be glad to hear from Freethinkers in the Borough as to what can be done in the matter.

We notice that the New York Courts have decided that *The Well of Loneliness* is not obscene, and has restored the work to circulation. What will "Jix" do now? It is enough to make him resign his post, and for the policeman who acts as his literary adviser to throw up his position in the force. We imagine the book will now have a great sale in the States, thanks to "Jix," and we are quite sure that the English visitors to America, who quite agreed with the suppression of the book here, will mostly return with a copy of the book for themselves. And there is no law to prevent them bringing in the book. The fact that a book is not permitted to be sold, does not prohibit anyone possessing copies of that book for their own use. At the time of the trial there seemed to be an impression in some of the papers that the police could seize copies of the book in private collections.

We remember that during the war, when certain plays and other things were suppressed, a notice was issued that anyone retaining copies of these books were liable to prosecution. On which we wrote to the authorities specifying the copies we had invited them to seize—if they dared. Of course, the notice was a piece of bluff, and we heard no more of the matter.

The control of the wireless is not so rigid in the United States as it is here, and a friend wrote us that Mr. Percy Ward is broadcasting a series of addresses every Wednesday afternoon at five o'clock (American central time), and is also announcing his own meetings in Chicago. What a fit the clergy would have in this country if anything approaching Freethought was ever allowed to be broadcast.

We are asked to announce that on Saturday, April 27, Mr. J. T. Brighton, of the Chester-le-Street Branch is holding a discussion at Bearpark, on "Does the Christian God Exist." Mr. Brighton's opponent is Mr. N. Lamb, and the proceeds from the discussion is to go in aid of the Durham County Hospital.

Whatever religion may be in the ascendant, the influence of its ministers is invariably strengthened by a long and dangerous war, the uncertainties of which perplex the minds of men, and induce them, when natural resources are failing, to call on the supernatural for help. On such occasions the clergy rise in importance, the churches are more than usually filled, and the priest, putting himself forward as the exponent of the wishes of God, assumes the language of authority, and either comforts the people under their losses in a righteous cause, or else explains to them that those losses are sent as a visitation for their sins, and as a warning that they have not been sufficiently attentive to their religious duties; in other words, that they have neglected rites and ceremonies in the performance of which the priest himself has a personal interest.

Buckle's "*History of Civilisation*."

The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Obedience.

(Concluded from page 251.)

THIS is the Jesuit conspiracy in every State, of which every member of the Roman Catholic Church is an aider and abettor. Let every Roman Catholic understand that his membership in his Church means that he considers this world ought to be run absolutely by priests, with an absolutist ruler at Rome. Any man who thinks priests are fit for such a job is a fool.

The Catholic Emancipation Act in England was granted on the distinct understanding from Roman Catholics, that civilly and politically they were free men. At the time they could make a case out for themselves—if one gives them the credit for being moderately honest. Forty years afterwards, those of them who were left, and their descendants and converts, surrendered their freedom to the Pope by accepting the doctrine of Obedience. They deliberately allowed themselves to be made slaves to a foreigner, and in doing so broke the condition implicit in the Act. They have therefore no right now to citizen rights in England. They have proved themselves unfit and unworthy of English freedom. They are in fact undisguisedly enemies of English freedom; and ought to be dealt with as such.

I promised to give chapter and verse showing that the Infallibility business was leading on to a claim that the Pope was divine. Feeble-minded dupes, besotted with superstition are quite likely to take the step, and the priests are not likely to discourage them. "Infallibility" is something more than normal human, and it is "reasonable" to think that God would not impose absolute and abject obedience to a mere man. The Pope (Pious IX.) who had the impudence (or was it lunacy?) to pronounce the dogmas of Papal Infallibility and Obedience had also enough diseased swelled head to give the dupes a lead in the process of Papal deification. He was, as might be expected, exceedingly and childishly garrulous. In a period of less than three years, he delivered 292 Discourses, which were published under his own supervision. They ran to over 1,100 pages. They are published as "a treasure," "sublime," "inspired," "divine" (i. 1, 2, 3), "The faithful are to receive as from the hands of angels this Divine Volume of the Angelic Pio Nono" (p. 4) "the most glorious and venerated among all the Popes" (p. 3) "the portentous Father of all the nations"—who, on p. 9, is "the living Christ;" and then "the Voice of God," and on p. 1 gets his final promotion, "he is God that condemns." (The last two words are characteristically Catholic. The priests base their power on fear; the chief trait of their God is that He *condemns*.) After such flights of fancy, it is only to be expected that there will be some materialistic wallowing, and we find references to the sacred hands and feet of the Pope, etc.

Roman Catholic bishops, mitred abbots and cardinals wear a ring, which is the sign of Papal authority. On due occasions the chattels must humbly kneel down and kiss the ring in sign of fealty and submission. Roman Catholic kings (*e.g.*, the King of Spain) noblemen (*e.g.*, certain English Dukes, etc.) have to do a grovel just like the rest. Nice healthy pastime, eh? Splendid display of independence and freedom, what? Fancy an English Duke kneeling to an Italian or Irish bishop.

The chattels have not to have any opinions of their own. They are told both what to believe and what not to believe—especially the latter. That beauty, Pious IX, issued a "Syllabus" of errors

which were reprov'd, condemned, forbidden. Practically all liberal or democratic principles were included. We mention a few out of the eighty items of the Syllabus.

Nos. 1-3. These condemn liberty of speech and of the press. (In the Papal States, nothing could be printed but what the Vatican approved.) One of the foundation reasons for liberty of the utterance of opinion is that human reason is the only or final arbitrator concerning what is true or false, good or bad, and is competent to care for the benefit of men and peoples—but this reason or principle the Pope condemns and pronounces a curse against anybody believing in it and acting on it.

Nos. 5 and 36 condemn "those who assign to the State the power of defining the civil rights and power of the Church. In other words, the Pope says, "let him be cursed who says the State is above the Church," or (still another translation) let him be cursed who does not agree that the Church is above the State.

No. 15. "Let him be cursed who says that every man, guided by his own reason, is free to adopt any religion he likes."

No. 7. "Let him be cursed who says that in Catholic countries the free exercise of any other religion may laudably be allowed."

No. 45 and 47. "Let him be cursed who holds the State should have absolute control of education without interference from the Church."

No. 24. "Let him be cursed who says that the Church has *not* the power (or right) to employ external pressure or any direct or indirect temporal force (*i.e.*, let him be cursed who says the Church has not the right to persecute.)"

No. 18. "Let him be cursed who says that Protestantism is another form of the Christian religion."

No. 80. "Let him be cursed who says that the Pope must conform and accommodate himself to progress, liberalism and modern civilization."

The above propositions give some idea of the real political principles of Roman Catholics. They show that Roman Catholics are a conspiracy against all the principles of freedom. If Roman Catholics call themselves democrats they are hypocrites. If they work or vote for liberalism, socialism, or anything democratic, they do it with the ulterior motive of getting to a position where they can betray and ruin the principles they have temporarily adopted. As soon as they can they will throw off the mask and hand over the position to the priests. They are utterly untrustworthy. I suppose they salve their consciences by putting the moral responsibility on the Infallible Pope, the Infallible Church, the Infallible Priesthood. (You see how the word comes in useful?) One wonders how far they *would* go, with Infallibility behind them, the Dogma of Obedience to make them uncritical of the morality of orders, and excommunication on earth, and hell for the hereafter, if they disobeyed—to say nothing of their "principle" that the end justifies the means? Who can doubt, in the light of their past history that they would refrain from no blackguardism whatever? Why read history, unless its lessons are taken to heart? Before the priests had completed their fabric of dogma up to its present height, they were able to get their chattels to do nearly any sort of dirty work. In one direction only did they find some difficulty—that of making them run counter to patriotism. When the Popes issued orders that would make their adherents renegades and traitors, a big proportion would refuse obedience. When, *e.g.*, Roman Catholic Spain, egged on and "blessed" by the Pope, attacked England, and when the Pope ordered the English Roman Catholics to help Spain, only a few did

so. Why? because at that time it was no part of Roman Catholic doctrine that the Pope was infallible, or that he had a right to their absolute obedience. Consequently they fought like patriots, with no superstitious fear that they were in mortal sin, entailing (if they were killed) condemnation to hell. But now it is different. The Pope has the dogma in black and white. If he orders them to act as renegades and traitors, then behaving as patriots means one of two alternatives—either to believe they will go to hell for it, or to throw over their religion. Under the new conditions, it is plain that the proportion of renegades would be much larger than in the old days. At this very moment Roman Catholic priests are playing a dastardly part in Mexico, but their nefarious work is largely kept hidden from the English public by the renegade Roman Catholics who swarm in the London press—the same crew that has also managed to keep us very ignorant of affairs in Southern Ireland. What the priests are doing in Mexico and Ireland at this very time is what they would do anywhere else if they saw the chance. And if chance seemed to promise opportunity to behave worse still, they would behave worse still. How can anyone of sense doubt it?

How do other people argue otherwise? I remember somewhere reading an argument by one of those miserable Pope's toadies called Anglo-Catholics. He said it was surely not hard to imagine that the Pope, as the highest placed individual in God's Holy Catholic Church, would be specially guided by God in all he did, and that therefore there was no difficulty about imagining him, if not absolutely infallible, yet to a certain extent not, shall we say, inspired, but influenced in a special way to do God's will. Oh the doddering idiot! The vile thing is there to be seen and known, its history is plain—and yet the fool "imagines." With a mangy cur in sight he "imagines" a pet Pom. Let me give something for your imagination to get to work on, you miserable victim of superstition. First a fact—one of a countless number of blackguard facts that are in the bill against the Papacy. I quote from Froude (*History of England*, Vol. VII, p. 177.) One of your Holy and God-guided Popes offered "remission of sin to them and their heirs, with annuities, honours, and promotion, to any cook, brewer, baker, vintner, physician, grocer, surgeon, or other, who would make away with the Queen (of England) . . . and the Papal fanatics in England began to weave their endless web of conspiracy—aiming, amidst a thousand variations at the heart of Queen Elizabeth."

Valiant Englishmen saw to the safety of our Queen, but—here get your imagination going—suppose they had failed. Suppose the Queen, our Queen, had been assassinated. What would have happened before their, our, vengeance was glutted? Within a month Drake and his sea dogs would have thundered into the Tiber, they would have hung the vile priest high as Haman, above his own altar, knocked his church into a heap of ruins over him, blown most of Rome to bits to keep it company, and on their journey home would have destroyed every port and ship of Spain. There's something for you to imagine!

C. R. BOYD FREEMAN.

SPRING.

Mindful of disaster past,
And shrinking at the northern blast,
The sleety storm returning still,
The morning hoar, the evening chill,
Reluctant comes the timid Spring.

Thomas Watson.

Correspondence.

SECULAR EDUCATION AND THE N.U.T.

Following our "Views and Opinions," of April 14. We have received a letter from Mr. Capper, the mover of the Amendment in favour of the abolition of definite religious instruction in State-supported schools, which we print with the deletion of a few explanatory lines. Mr. Capper is quite correct in assuming that all we had to go on when writing the "Views," was the somewhat meagre newspaper reports.

SIR,—I have read your leading article in the *Free-thinker*, for April 14, on "Secular Education and the N.U.T." It appears from your article that you had read only the scrappy report of my remarks, which appeared in most of the newspapers.

Might I venture an explanation of the line I adopted and a friendly criticism of your own attitude?

Firstly, the wording of the amendment was not my own. I spent two days searching for a seconder, and though numerous delegates expressed their sympathy and support, none was prepared to second (a further example of the power of religious bigotry mentioned in your article). Finally—noblesse oblige—I had to re-word my amendment.

Secondly, this highly controversial issue was raised (as far as I could gather it had never before been raised inside the N.U.T.) in *public session*, in the presence not only of over 2,000 delegates—head and assistant teachers from all over the country—but of Directors of Education, representatives of Local Education Authorities, etc., the teachers' employers, as well as of the Press.

Whatever the wording of the amendment, I think my speech, as well as the replies from the Executive members, make it quite clear that I was moving in favour of the complete removal of all forms of religious instruction from schools supported from public funds. Nor did I suggest (as maintained by one of my opponents) that contracting-out of religious instruction should be replaced by contracting-in!

You might perhaps desire to reprint in your journal, all or part of my speech as illustrating the point of view of a large number of teachers on secular education. Should you do so, I would like you to indicate that I am well aware of the weakness inherent in the attitude I had to adopt at the Conference, and, particularly, that I do not expect for a moment that secular education will be achieved in this country without the bitterest opposition of the organized religious bodies. I emphasized the last point, because one sentence of my speech, as reported, would seem to indicate a belief that such opposition would not arise! I should state, however, that I had to present my case inside twenty minutes with no right of reply, in face of the platform's heaviest gunfire.

Further, although my amendment was defeated by "an overwhelming majority," my speech and that of my seconder were very well received, even the platform admitting in laudatory terms that a good case had been made out for secular education. The *Times Education Supplement* declares that this discussion was the best of the Conference. It has undoubtedly drawn the attention of teachers all over the country, and serves as a useful beginning in the campaign for secular education which must be carried on henceforward among teachers.

I am in agreement with the general tenure of your article. Your criticism of the N.U.T., that it is approaching the subject rather as a trade union than as a body of citizens, is, however, faulty. My contention is that there is no such division of interests. In the interests of their own profession as well as in their interests as citizens, the N.U.T. representing 131,000 teachers must, in the near future, adopt the secular solution. The wholesale re-organization of the school system now in progress, in particular, the amalgamation of departments and of whole schools, is bringing the whole profession face to face with the gigantic obstacles arising from "dual control" and religion in schools. This tendency is reinforced by the developing offensive of the

religious organizations on the status quo. The N.U.T. Executive was therefore correct in so far as it opposed *any change for the worse* in the present position, but it and Conference failed miserably to face up to their responsibilities by declaring in favour of secular education. My speech made that perfectly clear, and I would refer you to it for further points in this connexion.

The N.U.T. is *not* a trade union, as we in the Teachers' Labour League realize only too well. Were it a trade union, the flunkeyism of many of its leaders to which you draw attention, would be far more easily combated. In our view, indeed, the school and teacher will only achieve freedom from religious, as from all other forms of capitalist control, when the present social system has been revolutionized and the teachers are organized together with the rest of the workers.

Might I suggest, finally, that the Secular Movement it ignoring its most vital function so long as it fails to organize *among teachers, the educational workers*, an effective and powerful opposition to the status quo, an opposition which will not fear to express its opinions openly and boldly in favour of the removal of all forms of religious instruction from the curricula of State schools.

D. CAPPER.

Secular Education at the Teachers' Congress.

The following is the speech of Mr. Capper, delivered in support of his amendment, and to which reference is made in his letter which appears in the preceding column.

Mr. D. Capper (Gillingham) proposed, as an amendment, to add to the motion, the following words:—

Further, Conference expresses its opinion that definite religious instruction, being the function of the organized religious bodies, should be removed from the curricula of all schools supported by public funds.

He said he agreed whole-heartedly with the motion, but the Executive had not taken the necessary logical step which should follow. He did not desire to wound the religious susceptibilities of any delegate or member of the N.U.T.—the time had passed for that kind of thing—but the time had come for teachers to attempt to free themselves and their profession from out-of-date obstacles to the unification of the profession as a whole. (Cheers.) He welcomed the publicity which had recently been given in the *Schoolmaster and Woman Teacher's Chronicle* to the problem which faced them in this connexion. He referred, in particular, to an article by "Advena," which contained in a headline the words "Too Much Parson," and also to the guarded references to the secular solution made in the *Schoolmaster* during the last month. Reference had been made to the Cowper Temple clause. He wished to suggest that the freedom which seemed to be guaranteed to parents, teachers, and children under that clause was not as real as it would appear to be on the surface. In actual fact, that clause simply gave a minority of the people the privilege of appearing as rebels against a universally-accepted system by withdrawing their children from the schools during religious instruction, and allowing them to be looked upon as peculiar and of being therefore penalized by the rest of the children and the teachers in the school. ("No.") He would put it this way: If instead of having the present position of allowing people to contract out of religious instruction in the school, they had a position of allowing people to contract into religious instruction, and such instruction to be given only to the children whose parents definitely signified in writing that they desired such instruction, they would agree that a tremendous outcry would be raised by the religious organizations; and yet it was clear that such a proposal would give people generally more freedom than at present. Therefore, in actual practice, although it was claimed that full religious freedom was allowed, the churches to some degree maintained control over the

schools and only exceptionally allowed such control to go. It seemed to him impossible to envisage the claim made by the Executive unless one took up boldly the secular solution. (Cheers.) He doubted whether many delegates realized the magnitude of the problem of the Church schools. With the approach or reorganization in the schools, it was becoming absolutely vital to education and to the teaching profession that there should be some unification of the present system. The Kent Education Authority, in their record for the years 1923-28, although stating that they were working amicably with the churches, pointed out that there were extremely serious difficulties in the way of reorganization owing to the existence of large numbers of Church school buildings in the area. According to the Board of Education figures for 1925-26 for England and Wales, fifty-five per cent of the total schools were maintained by the various religious organizations, and of 180,000 elementary school teachers over 60,00 or one-third, were subject to religious tests.

How on earth were they going to achieve the demand put into the election address of their Vice-President for the abolition of religious tests for teachers unless they pressed for the secular solution? He was not asking for anything extreme or for something which had never yet been adopted. In such countries as New Zealand and France the secular solution had been in force for many generations, and had proved satisfactory not only to schoolmasters, but also to religious denominations of every kind and sort. ("No.") He wanted to suggest that the churches could not possibly come to an agreement as to the kind of religious syllabus to be provided, and he maintained that the State had not a duty to the population as a whole to provide religious instruction of any kind. The experience of the past hundred years had failed to solve the problem. It would be urged that they should let sleeping dogs lie. How could they when they found the religious denominations making advances which they had to resist? (Cheers.) How could they when a third of the profession in the elementary schools were still subject to religious tests? If the N.U.T. stood for the abolition of religious tests, he challenged any member of the Executive or any delegate to tell him how it was going to be achieved without the secular solution. It would undoubtedly be said that he was voicing the opinions of extremists in the N.U.T., but no less a set of respectable persons than Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Morley, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Professor Findlay, and Sir Michael Sadler had said that the only logical solution was the secular solution.

"Buddha, the Atheist."

Buddha, the Atheist is the provocative, one might almost say, the defiant, title of a little book published by the Secular Society. Provocative and defiant it really is, because even at this late day there are quite a number of pious people who, in their artless innocence, imagine that when they have fastened the label "Atheist" on anyone, they have held him up to the well-deserved contempt and loathing of all decent, right-minded citizens. And there are also others, not quite so innocent, but more calculating in their malice, who know well that some of the best men that have ever lived have been "Atheists," whilst some of the worst were unimpeachable, fervent, and zealous believers in "god"; but, in order to create prejudice against everyone who does not belong to their particular sect, they imply in all their words and ways, that to be an Atheist is to be something quite too deplorable for anything but pity and commiseration.

Against all these, the artless as well as the cunningly artful "Upasaka," the author of this sketch of Buddhist beliefs, peals out the bugle blast of his challenging title; and he proceeds to show, as he has no difficulty in doing, that the founder of the most rational—to every intelligent man—the most appealing, and the most widely spread, religion in the world, was an Atheist in the old, simple sense that his teaching takes no account of god or gods, and it remains perfectly valid whether there is one god, or a million, or none at all. He makes

it clear that this "Atheist" propounded an exalted ethic and philosophy, and a method of life whereby the highest results of such ethic and philosophy may be actually realized, without the slightest reference to what any "God" or gods might be able to say or do.

This may be very disconcerting, even bewildering, to innocent minds prone to imagine that exclusive rights in all that is good and worthy is, as a matter of course, possessed by those who use the word "God" most plentifully, and by no others. Yet the fact remains, as "Upasaka" states it, that the world's best and noblest son, the supreme flower of the human race in depth of intellect, greatness of heart and nobility of life, Gotama called the Buddha, finds in the gods only matter for gentle jesting, deems them not worth the trouble of serious polemic.

How one can ignore God and gods, and yet find good reason to lead a life directed towards the highest ends, is precisely what one may learn from "Upasaka's" pages, at least in outline; for the whole teaching of the Buddha can hardly be given in sixty pages of any book however compressed. But the reader who wishes to know what exactly is the place which Gotama the Buddha occupies among the religious teachers of mankind, will find, in the necessarily brief sections of this book, a reliable first guide to that knowledge. Bearing in mind what "Upasaka" here tells him, he can safely pass on to some of the other, fuller books on the subject, and from them select what further details he desires concerning Buddhist teaching, without being misled by the bias which many of them betray in one direction or another—in some cases unconsciously, but in others quite deliberately and of purpose prepense.

For it constitutes a sad commentary on the honesty—or lack of it—of our human species that, after maintaining for years the ethical inferiority of every other form of religion but their own Western sort, when at last the truth about Buddhist teaching can no longer be effectively concealed, some of the propagandists of the Western form of religion seek to patronize the Buddha and make out that he was only a rather good kind of pre-Christian Christian!

The technical make-up of the brochure is excellent, and does credit to its producers, the Pioneer Press. The type is clear, the paper good, and it is bound in tough, parchment-like cardboard that will stand handling.

The price, we may mention, is a shilling; and no Buddhist will grudge it for such an entirely satisfactory messenger to send to quarters where it may do some good in removing misapprehensions, and in arousing interest in the Dhamma it outlines so succinctly, yet so plainly and clearly.

(From THE BRITISH BUDDHIST, the Organ of the British Maha Bodhi Society, November, 1928.)

Obituary.

MR. JACK FITZGERALD.

THE cause of intellectual freedom has lost a sturdy champion in the passing of Mr. Jack Fitzgerald.

For the past thirty-five years, and practically up to the day of his death, Fitzgerald toiled untiringly to free mankind from economic and intellectual bondage. Although an economic scholar of the first magnitude, it is for his work with others in laying bare the falsity of religion that Fitzgerald was most widely known to Freethinkers in general. He was one of the founders of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, and the pronouncements of that organization on the subject of the relationship between Socialism and religion has often brought forth the appreciation of many members of the N.S.S.

Religion, to Fitzgerald, besides being civilization's inheritance of the ignorant savage, is an instrument of class oppression. In that light did Fitzgerald contest religion at every step of the way. That social forces are to be explained only in terms of natural causation, not by the god idea, is part of the task which Fitzgerald set himself to accomplish.

Fitzgerald was cremated at Golders Green, on Monday April 22. The funeral service was absolutely Secularist in character.—P. REYNOLDS.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

A READER'S COMMENTS.

SIR,—The facts given in "Views and Opinions," this week, are very interesting. I suggest more about Mr. Foote's achievements might be written up, for guidance of future historians of the Movement.

"Keridon's" article was vastly interesting. Could not he be persuaded to write more on the same topic, with special reference to the discoveries of the psychoanalysts and the new psychology?

I enjoyed *The Dismal Science*. I think the writer might have recommended Locke's *Conduct of the Human Understanding* (Oxford Press). Perhaps he could say something of this and of its value to Freethinkers.

D.P.S.

Society News.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH.

THE Third Annual General Meeting of the members of the new Liverpool Branch was held at 18 Colquitt Street, Liverpool, on the 7th inst.

Proceedings were opened by Dr. C. H. R. Carmichael, who gave a short address on "Freethought and the Upbringing of the Child."

The financial and secretarial reports presented to the meeting, showed that the Branch had been very active during the past year, but that the financial position was only fairly good. Thanks were rendered to the small band of enthusiasts who had been so energetic with the outdoor work during last Summer. The Winter Session had been very successful with its regular indoor meetings, but had been handicapped by the Branch's inability to hire the Picton Hall for special meetings.

The following officials were elected for the forthcoming year: President, Mr. E. Egerton Stafford; Vice-President, Mr. W. McKelvie; Secretary, Mr. S. R. A. Ready; Assist.-Secretary, Mr. J. V. Shortt; Committee: Mrs. P. Ready, Mrs. J. V. Shortt, Miss H. Wilson, Dr. C. H. R. Carmichael, Messrs. G. H. Cassles, A. Jackson and W. Wearing.

Motions dealing with revisions of Branch rules were dealt with, and decisions given to commence the outdoor work as soon as possible after the 21st inst.

S.R.A.R.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH.

THOUGH Dr. Dunlop was unavoidably prevented from giving his lecture on "The Illegal Operation," members had the good fortune to hear Mrs. Hornibrook give, quite impromptu, one of the best addresses she has ever given to the Branch. As usual, she was frank and outspoken, and her decided views on contraception, abortion and sexual morality provoked a good discussion.

This was the last meeting of the session, and it is pleasant to record it was well attended.—H.C.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY.

THE Annual Meeting, held on April 14, was better attended than some in recent years. The report of propaganda meetings in the Winter months was satisfactory, attendances—except during the flu period—better than previous years. The amount of controversy evoked at most of the meetings showed that interest in Secularism and Freethought was being sustained. Meetings had been held in Paisley, Motherwell and at Shotts, the last-named being, of course, in conjunction with the Shotts Branch. Speakers have been provided for other societies, where the principles the Secular Society stands for has been laid down.

The financial report showed that the Society managed to make ends meet.

Committee was appointed under the Presidency of Mr. H. MacEwan, the Secretary for the new session being Mr. John C. MacKay, 88 Eastwood Avenue, Glasgow, E.I.

There was a lengthy discussion on future efforts, especially the next winter campaign, during which the Executive Committee heard the views of members who are at other times silent. And so ended another year. Let us hope that not all of the seed fell on stony ground.
E.H.

A Note on W. R. Cassells.

BEYOND the two notices given in their *Dictionaries*, by J. M. Wheeler and Mr. J. McCabe, I have been unable to find any biographical particulars of the author of *Supernatural Religion*. Mr. McCabe does not mention the fact recorded by Wheeler, that he was a nephew of Dr. Pusey, which accounts, in some measure, for his wonderful knowledge of Church literature. Nor does he mention the *Reply to Dr. Lightfoot* (1889), which, to my mind, disposes of that eminent churchman, thoroughly and efficiently. For the rest, Cassells was a merchant dealing mostly with India, and he became a member of the Syndicate of Bombay University, and the Legislative Council of Bombay, in 1863. His most famous work appeared in 1874-6. He was born in 1826, and died a very active member of the R.P.A. in 1907. He seems to have passed through all the stages from believer to agnosticism, and I sincerely hope the R.P.A. can be induced to give us another edition of the famous work. I understand Mr. Robertson deals fully with it in his latest *History*.
H. CUTNER.

THE EINSTEIN THEORY.

Even should the Roman Church elect to move backwards, politically, by a concordat with Fascism, the non-Catholic world is likely to go forward both politically and intellectually. While laymen can hardly be expected to follow the abstruse mathematical reasoning by which Professor Einstein has added the "Unitary Field Theory" to his "Special" and "General" theories of Relativity, little imagination is required to perceive the importance of his attempt to unify what are known as the "Field laws" for gravitation and electro-magnetism. By the ingenuity of mathematicians and physicists the range of physical phenomena had been reduced to two main systems—the electro-magnetic and the gravitational. Einstein now shows reason to think that they are combined in one system. Thus he advances the philosophic conception of the Universe as consisting of infinite diversity within an infinite unity. If he brings us no nearer to a solution of the problems of life and of consciousness, he demonstrates at least the power of trained human intelligences to penetrate more and more deeply into the mystery of the Cosmos, and to discover grounds for a not irrational faith that there is an underlying purpose in things. The efforts of both spirits to grapple with these mysteries deserve our gratitude, for only by such efforts can the frontiers of light be widened and those of darkness be driven further back.

Review of Reviews.

Miscellaneous Advertisements.

SOUTH AFRICAN AGENCIES WANTED.

CAPABLE Commercial Traveller, taking up residence in South Africa in September, would like to hear from Manufacturers, etc., regarding agencies or sales management. Thorough knowledge of Stationery business.—Box S.A., *Freethinker*, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

GENTLEMAN in business requires bed-room, sitting-room and light breakfast; South of London; within 20 minutes of Victoria; altitude at least 400 ft. above sea level. Ten to fifteen minutes from station not objected to.—Full particulars, Box H.H. 61, "FREETHINKER," 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

LADY, resident in Monmouthshire, desires companion, who would also undertake cooking and household duties. Household of two: husband and wife. Maid kept. Wage £40 per annum.—Reply, FREETHINKER, Box C.P. 681, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

SITUATION WANTED, by old Sailor, age 54; active, yachting or ashore; well educated; best references. Can any Freethinker assist.—Box W.H.S. 10, The "FREETHINKER," 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

Lecture notices must reach 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, by the FIRST POST ON TUESDAY, or they will not be inserted.

LONDON.

INDOOR.

HAMPSTEAD ETHICAL INSTITUTE (The Studio Theatre, 59 Finchley Road, N.W.8): 11.15, Dr. C. W. Saleeby—"The Armour of Light."

THE NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (The Orange Tree Hotel, Euston Road, N.W.1): 7.30, Annual General Meeting.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (The London Institution Theatre, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11.0, C. E. M. Joad, B.A.—"The Mind—Body Problem, with Particular Reference to the Case for Survival."

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7.0, Harry Snell, M.P.—"What I Saw in American 'Family Courts.'"

OUTDOOR.

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

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common): 11.30, Mr. G. Whitehead. Mr. Whitehead will also lecture each evening, Tuesday-Saturday inclusive, at 8 p.m., at Wren Road, Camberwell Green (alternative meeting at Liverpool Street, Camberwell Gate).

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 3.30, Mr. R. Betts and Mr. B. A. Le Maine. 6.30, Mr. A. H. Hyatt and Mr. Maurice Maubrey. Every Wednesday at 7.30, Mr. James Hart. Every Friday, at 7.30, Mr. B. A. Le Maine. The *Freethinker* is on sale outside the Park at all our meetings.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith): 3.30, Mr. R. G. Lennard.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

CHESTER-LE-STREET BRANCH N.S.S.—Saturday, April 27, Bearpark Institute Hall. Debate—Subject: "Does the Christian God Exist." *Affir.*: Mr. N. Lamb. *Neg.*: Mr. Jno. T. Brighton. Chairman: Mr. J. Arnott. A collection is to be taken in aid of Durham County Hospital Funds. Commence 7.0 p.m. sharp.

FAILSWORTH SECULAR SUNDAY SCHOOL, (Pole Lane): 2.45, "The General Strike and the Prayer Book," 6.30, "Freedom and Authority."—Mr. H. D. Dickson, M.A.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE BRANCH N.S.S.: 3.0 p.m., Members Meeting at Socialist Club, Arcade, Pilgrim Street.

OUTDOOR.

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

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S.—Ramble to Killoch Glen. Meet at Mount Florida Car Terminus 12.0 prompt.

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.)

LADIES' WEAR



Tasteful Styles, faultlessly cut, and made up by experts. Our Ladies' Pattern Card and handsome fashion book, which will be sent to you by return of post, will tell you all about these.

In the bargain way, our 33/- ready to wear Tweed Coats take a lot of beating. Ask for patterns and styles of these.

MACCONNELL & MABE, LIMITED
High Class Tailors
New Street, Bakewell, Derbyshire

CHEST DISEASES

"Umckaloabo acts as regards Tuberculosis as a real specific."

(Dr. Secheyay in the "Swiss Medical Review.")

"It appears to me to have a specific destructive influence on the Tubercle Bacilli in the same way that Quinine has upon Malaria."

(Dr. Grun in the King's Bench Division.)

If you are suffering from any disease of the chest or lungs—spasmodic or cardiac asthma excluded—ask your doctor about Umckaloabo, or send a post card for particulars of it to Chas. H. Stevens, 204-206, Worple Road, Wimbledon, London, S.W.20, who post same to you Free of Charge.

Readers, especially T.Bs., will see in the above few lines more wonderful news than is to be found in many volumes on the same subject.

BIRTH CONTROL

Successful "ANTIBION" System

A practical treatise with clear anatomical descriptions and diagrams. Latest medical information on absolutely safe and hygienic lines. Send stamped addressed envelope for pamphlet issued by ALKHANA, 14 FULWOOD PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1.

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

The Secular Society, Ltd.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 62 Farringdon St., London, E.C.4.

Secretary: MR. F. MANN.

THIS Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this world is the proper end of all thought and action. To promote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Education. To promote the complete secularization of the State, etc. And to do all such lawful things as are conducive to such objects. Also to have, hold, receive, and retain any sums of money paid, given, devised, or bequeathed by any person, and to employ the same for any of the purposes of the Society.

Members pay an entrance fee of ten shillings, and a subsequent yearly subscription of five shillings.

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up.

All who join the Society participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, one-third of whom retire (by ballot), each year, but are eligible for re-election.

Friends desiring to benefit the Society are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favour in their wills. The now historic decision of the House of Lords in *re Bowman and Others v. the Secular Society, Limited*, in 1927, a verbatim report of which may be obtained from its publishers, the Pioneer Press, or from the Secretary, makes it quite impossible to set aside such bequests.

A Form of Request.—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—

I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £—free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy.

It is advisable, but not necessary, that the Secretary should be formally notified of such bequests, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid. A form of membership, with full particulars, will be sent on application to the Secretary, Mr. F. MANN, 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

Pioneer Press Publications—

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 3¼d.

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

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.

RELIGION AND WOMEN. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. 6d., postage 1d.

MAN AND HIS GODS. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. 2d., postage ½d.

THE COMING OF THE SUPERMAN. By GEORGE WHITEHEAD. 2d., postage ½d.

PRIESTCRAFT: A STUDY OF THE EXPLOITATION OF THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT. By C. R. BOYD FREEMAN. 6s., postage 3d.

MATERIALISM RE-STATEd. By CHAPMAN COHEN. A clear and concise statement of one of the most important issues in the history of Science and Philosophy. Cloth bound 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.

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

Now Ready.

The Bible and Prohibition.

BIBLE and BEER

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

By G. W. FOOTE.

A careful examination of the Relations of the
and Christian leaders to the Drink Question.

Price - - TWOPENCE.

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

The Case for Secular Education

(Issued by the Secular Education League.)

THIS booklet gives a concise history of the
Secular Education controversy, with a
clear and temperate statement of the argu-
ments in favour of the abolition of religious
teaching in all State-aided schools.

PRICE SEVENPENCE
Postage 1d.

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

SPECIAL OFFER—

THE ETHIC OF FREETHOUGHT. By KARL PEAR-
SON, F.R.S.

Published at 12/6. PRICE 4/6. Postage 6d.

A CANDID EXAMINATION OF THEISM. By
"PHYSICUS" (G. J. Romanes).

PRICE 3/6. Postage 4½d.

KAFIR SOCIALISM AND THE DAWN OF INDI-
VIDUALISM. By DUDLEY KIDD.

Published at 10/6. PRICE 3/-. Postage 6d.

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

THE "Freethinker" Endowment Trust

A Great Scheme for a Great Purpose

THE *Freethinker* Endowment Trust was registered on
the 25th of August, 1925, its object being to raise a
sum of not less than £8,000, which, by investment,
would yield sufficient to cover the estimated annual
loss incurred in the maintenance of the *Freethinker*.
The Trust is controlled and administered by five
Trustees, of which number the Editor of the *Free-
thinker* is one in virtue of his office. By the terms
of the Trust Deed the Trustees are prohibited from
deriving anything from the Trust in the shape of
profit, emoluments, or payment, and in the event of
the *Freethinker* at any time, in the opinion of the
Trustees, rendering the Fund unnecessary, it may be
brought to an end, and the capital sum handed over
to the National Secular Society.

The Trustees set themselves the task of raising a
minimum sum of £8,000. This was accomplished by
the end of December, 1927. At the suggestion of
some of the larger subscribers, it has since been re-
solved to increase the Trust to a round £10,000, and
there is every hope of this being done within a reason-
ably short time.

The Trust may be benefited by donations of cash,
or shares already held, or by bequests. All contri-
butions will be acknowledged in the columns of this
journal, and may be sent to either the Editor, or to
the Secretary of the Trust, Mr. H. Jessop, Hollyshaw,
Whitkirk, Nr. Leeds. Any further information con-
cerning the Trust will be supplied on application.

There is no need to say more about the *Freethinker*
itself, than that its invaluable service to the Free-
thought Cause is recognized and acknowledged by all.
It is the mouthpiece of militant Freethought in this
country, and places its columns, without charge, at
the service of the movement.

The address of the *Freethinker* Endowment Trust
is 61 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science

BY PROF. J. W. DRAPER.

This is an unabridged edition of Draper's great
work, of which the standard price is 7/6.

Cloth Bound. 396 Pages.

PRICE 2/-. POSTAGE 4½d.

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