

The

# FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. XLIX.—No. 36

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1929

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
What is Science.—The Editor	561
Stockbrokers at School.—Mimnermus	562
The Interdependence of Organic Nature.—T. F. Palmer	564
Leo Tolstoy.—W. Mann	565
The Mystery of Apothecary.—Nechells	566
Charles Southwell.—V. B. Neuburg	570
Those B.B.C. Sermons.—M. Colvin	571
Among the Ruins.—Joseph Marah	572
"Goodwill Towards Men."—George Bedborough	572
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

Views and Opinions.

(Concluded from page 546.)

What is Science?

It has been pointed out that Professor Eddington's case for religion rests primarily upon his restriction of science to physical science. This is usually stated as "exact" science, but as the difference between exactitude and inexactitude is only that between complete and incomplete knowledge, the qualification does not seriously alter the sense. The sole reason avowed for this restriction of science to physics, is that as science depends upon the construction of a metric standard; you must express what occurs in terms of mass, or motion, or weight. Really, that kind of definition is more worthy of the pulpit than of one of our leading scientists. It fails to take into consideration what is the true nature of science. The standards applied in physics are examples of the scientific principle and method applied to one department of experience, but it does not follow that they are the only kind of standards possible, or that they exhaust the possibilities of science. What, after all, is science? We are so astounded by the knowledge of things which is now possessed by man, and this knowledge is, on the whole, so new, it is moreover so generally, and one may add generously placed before us by scientists, that we are apt to fall into the vulgar error of confusing mere knowledge with science. But mere knowledge is not science at all. One might have an almost complete knowledge of all the fossils found in a given geologic stratum, with an equally comprehensive knowledge of the deposits in which the fossils rested, but that would not give one a science of geology. The acquisition of knowledge is essential to science, the arrangement of knowledge into groups of similar facts is essential to science, but neither separately, nor both together are they enough to constitute science. Science commences with the framing of descriptive formulæ, or "laws," which enable us to accurately describe what is occurring, to understand

what has occurred, and to predict what will occur in the future. And it happens that this kind of knowledge is most precise in the field of physics. Our formulæ there are most precise, because our knowledge of the forces or factors involved is most exact; but it is hardly to be expected that the same precision in knowledge can be reached in directions where the factors are less definitely known.

\* \* \*

Science and Pseudo-Science.

Why, then, does Professor Eddington restrict the application of scientific principles to the physical world? The world of human nature is as much a part of the totality of experience as the movements of the planets or the growth of a tree. Why cannot pure science be applied in the one case as well as in the other? Well, here is the reason as given by Professor Eddington why we cannot bring religion and the "spiritual" nature of man within the domain of science:—

The limitation of natural law to a special domain would be more obvious but for a confusion in our use of the word law. In human affairs it means a rule fortified perhaps by incentives or penalties which may be kept or broken. In science it means a rule that is never broken; we suppose that there is something in the constitution of things which makes its non-fulfillment an impossibility. Thus in the physical world, what a body does, and what a body ought to do are equivalent; but we are well aware of another domain, where they are anything but equivalent. We cannot get away from this distinction. Even if religion and morality are dismissed as illusion, the word "ought" still has sway . . .

We cannot assimilate the laws of thought to natural laws; they are laws which ought to be obeyed, not laws which must be obeyed . . . "Ought" takes us outside chemistry and physics. It concerns something which wants or esteems sugar, not chalk, sense, not nonsense. A physical machine cannot esteem or want anything; whatever is fed into it, it will chew up according to the laws of its physical machinery.

I have not the slightest desire to be disrespectful to Professor Eddington, but I am left marvelling at the confusion that could father sentences of this kind. The mixture of commonplace and fallacy is so great that it would take columns to disentangle them. It is unfortunately true that the legal and the scientific sense of "Law" is confused in the general mind, but Professor Eddington would have contributed to greater clarity had he used language less teleological in its style. To say that in the physical world, what a body does is what it ought to do implies just that ordering and arranging of nature which is the bug-bear of scientific thinking, and the refuge of all sorts of superstition. There is no "ought" in nature, there is only an "is." Things occur, and it is the whole work of science to plot the curve of their behaviour. Of course "ought" takes us outside

chemistry and physics, but so does chemistry take us outside physics, so does biology take us outside chemistry and physics, so does every fresh category take us outside other categories. In a pontifical manner Professor Eddington is just saying that so soon as things differ from each other they cease to be identical. Even the statement that scientific laws are laws which "must be obeyed" is deplorable. Whence comes the "must"? Professor Eddington is introducing into science a conception that has no rightful place there, and so confusing the whole issue. If a man continually writes and thinks of nature as something that has been arranged or ordered to do something, he will not be long in deciding that some *one* must have done the ordering and arranging. He is merely repeating in a conclusion something that he has already stated in a premiss. Once again the rabbit has been pulled out of the hat, after being carefully placed within it.

\* \* \*

#### The Ethical "Ought."

Professor Eddington is playing with the question of "values"—a conception that has of late been made much of by hard-pressed theologians. The theory is that as science is—quite wrongly—made to deal only with things that can be weighed or measured, it can have nothing to do with questions of value or significance, and therefore science cannot deal with the "higher" or "spiritual" aspects of life at all. This leaves the theologian a whole region in which he can wander about at will, quite safe from the intrusions of science and scientific methods. But what, after all, are these things that give us "value"? Science, as I have already said, deals with the movements, the behaviour of things. The "laws" that are, literally, made by science (for Professor Eddington appears to overlook the fact that scientific laws are products of the creative imagination) are devised to describe their behaviour; and so must vary with the behaviour of the things to be described. To describe a sensation in terms of the push and pull of physics would be absurd, and no one but an anti-materialist would be foolish enough to do so. That is why, for every special group of things under examination we have laws of physics, laws of biology, of psychology, etc. The behaviour with which sociology deals is that of human beings living in groups.

Now the "ought" with which sociology deals is the kind of action that would ensue if human beings acted up to a standard pattern, and reacted in an identical manner to identical stimuli. And there is no substantial difference here between the "ought" of physics and the "ought" of morals; for Professor Eddington, above all men, should have born in mind the truth that if in practice men do not always do what they "ought," neither do movements of matter. In both cases exactitude is only accomplished *in vacuo*; all forces have to be considered as free from counteracting influence if we are to witness absolute equivalence with "law." But the question I would like to put to Professor Eddington—I haven't the slightest hope that he will essay an answer—is just this. If the social "ought" does not exist as a generalization based upon experience, and indicates the way in which people would act if their minds moved with the directness of theoretical physical movements, what does it signify? But if it does exist as something based upon the experience of the past, and counting upon certain things in the future, and therefore counts upon certain reactions of human beings to the social command, in what substantial way does it differ from the "ought" that meets us in physical science? The illustration given that "the

laws of logic do not prescribe the way our minds think; they prescribe the way our minds ought to think," introduces another confusion. Laws of Logic are based upon the way in which the human brain would function if it moved; as physical laws are presumed to move, free from all counteracting influences.

\* \* \*

#### Is Man a Machine?

To come closer to Professor Eddington's case. A physical machine, he says, chaws up whatever is fed to it according to the laws of its physical machinery. A human, psychical, machine does not. The alleged distinction between the physical and psychical organism is vital to Professor Eddington's case, and it is plainly and hopelessly wrong. The "mind," equally with a machine, does actually "chaw up" whatever is presented to it in terms of its structure. Strike a man a blow, deprive him of some legal or some social right, and we know that the man will react in terms of his constitution, his education, his environment. Keep him without food and we know that he will rush for it at the first opportunity. There are a thousand and one ways in which we are able to foretell how human beings will act, and we can do so because there occurs what Professor Eddington says does not take place. He is himself a decisive disproof of his own statements. Note that he is giving us certain arguments, that is, he is feeding the machinery of his readers with certain food. But unless he is counting that we shall "chaw" this up according to the laws of the human machine, what is the good of presenting arguments at all? His arguments in favour of the absolute autonomy of the mind may have a precisely opposite effect. He cannot count on the statement that twice two equal four, without reckoning on the machine chawing up what is given to it in terms of the laws of its machinery. He is thus bound to endorse in practice all that he repudiates in theory.

In commencing these notes I pointed out that one had only to analyse the statements made to realize that we were once again being presented with the argument from ignorance. It is the helplessness of science which is stressed, not the possession of knowledge. Professor Eddington plainly tells the world that if you look for exact knowledge to provide a basis for religious belief you will look in vain. If you want religion you must find it in a region to which science has not the entry, which is free from all the usual tests that are applied by which men verify the truth of what they are told. Find a region of this kind where ignorance takes the place of knowledge, and you may establish religion. Make sure that science can never enter this territory, and you may have a permanent religion. And in these statements I entirely agree. Atheists have been saying the same thing for many years.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

#### Stockbrokers at School.

"There is no danger to a man, that knows  
What life and death is."—Geo Chapman.

"We men, who in our morn of youth defied  
The elements, must vanish—be it so!  
Enough, if something from our hands have power  
To live and act, and serve the future, pour."  
Wordsworth.

A REPORT of the first meeting of the World Conference on Adult Education at Cambridge should make all those interested in such an important matter as education "think furiously." And when one finds that a Bishop of the English State Church is prepared to "ride the whirlwind and direct the storm," the

sense of amusement is not lessened. To be precise, it was the Bishop of Plymouth who spoke on "The Principles and Problems of Adult Education," and from his remarks it is quite apparent that the subject presented numerous problems and precious few principles, as is customary in clerical utterances.

The Bishop presented his case in the form of Big Business. No small shopkeepers, nor poor clerks need be considered. Even bookmakers, whose activities are almost as colossal as those of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, were politely ignored. But the Bishop would have bankers educated in scholastic philosophy, and stockbrokers instructed in the rudiments of European history. Why the stockbrokers should be limited to old-world history is inexplicable except that the record of alleged statesmen in the United States and South American countries is almost as painful reading as that of the Newgate Calendar, and nearly as high-minded.

Knowledge is power, as the proverb reminds us. Presumably a stockbroker who had a nodding acquaintance with the French Revolution, would have an advantage over his innocent colleague, whose interests were narrowed down to the tape-machine and the front row of the ballet. Similarly, a banker who knew a little of Aristotle, and knew nothing of Herbert Spencer, would, perhaps, be more of an "intellectual" than his partner, whose sole relaxation was a bowling club. I can only conjecture. The only bankers who interest me are John Lubbock, who was instrumental in obtaining Bank Holidays for the citizens of this country, and a polite gentleman who writes to me occasionally to remind me that my balance is on the wrong side of the ledger.

To do him justice, the Bishop of Plymouth sometimes lets his eyes roam beyond the spacious offices of bankers and stockbrokers. He has glanced at the working-man, and his wife, and they both need an episcopal warning. Listen to the right-reverend Father-in-God:—

"The workers of this country have lost their capacity to appreciate beautiful things."

Indeed, these naughty artisans need music and drama and other things to make them intolerant to ugliness.

It would be interesting to know the bishop's definition of "beauty." Perhaps he imagines that a bishop in full war-paint, crozier and all, is a sublimely beautiful object. And because artisans' wives no longer curtsy to the clergy, "the workers of this country have lost their capacity to appreciate beautiful things."

The working-classes of this country are better-dressed, better behaved, and have better homes than their predecessors. To-day there is colour in an English crowd, and foreigners are finding out that English women are good-looking. Artisans enjoy good music in the parks, and over the wireless. Even the newspapers of the present-day are more informative and more artistic than the magazines and periodicals of a bygone generation. The horrors of the Victorian highly-coloured lithography have been replaced by the photogravure, and even wall-papers show that the aesthetic pleasures of our own time are better cultivated than of yore.

All the talk of "adult" education is, in the last analysis, but an impeachment of the present system of national education. The late George Clark, the principal of a great commercial college, said that, if the education imparted by the State had been worth a straw, there would have been no room at all for his own chain of colleges. It was only too true. Because the scholars of the National schools were turned out into the world only half-equipped for business, they had to spend money to acquire that knowledge

that the State should have given them, and the rate-payers already paid for in hard cash.

The reason of the failure of State education is not far to seek. It is due to the clergy and their satellites having control of the machine. These men have no real concern for education as such. They wish to impart theological instruction to the children, knowing that by so doing the fool-crop will be perennial, and their own livelihoods assured. "Fear God and honour the King" sounds well, but in actual practice it means supporting Priestcraft and Kingcraft. The object of education should be the manufacture of good citizens, not goody-goody busybodies. A boy who has been taught to do honest work for real money, who has been trained not to throw bottles out of train windows, and who can say "no" when necessary, is worth a score who can repeat the problematical dates of the kings of Israel and Judah, and who can sing "Rule Britannia" very loudly.

The Universities, which are under clerical control just as much as the National schools, are open to the same objections. True, the undergraduates are nearly double the age of the State scholars. But manufacturers, merchants and business men, all complain that these "curled, perfumed darlings" require very special training before they are of any use. The young graduate, in his turn, finds that he has paid a very high price for his aristocratic veneer, for he has wasted three or four years of his life, and is handicapped in his business career.

A complete system of education should enable a man to "see life steadily, and see it whole." It should give a man a well-filled mind, enabling its possessor to be independent of the slings and arrows of fortune. But a broad intellectual inheritance is impossible if the clergy of one particular creed have control. Neither the present academic, nor State education is of much use in practical life. Many of the very best men come from the private schools, where there is no clerical axe to grind, and where the scholars are not thrown into commercial life at fourteen years of age. The curricula may be narrow, but it has the supreme merit of being thorough, which is the thing that matters.

Matthew Arnold once said that Oxford University muttered the last incantations of the Middle Ages. All Universities do so, with the solitary exception of London. Moreover, they will continue to do so until the clergy are displaced by better men. What is needed is not "adult" education, but real education, which, during the plastic and receptive years, imports the art of being a decent citizen of a civilized country. Humanism is a virtue of great and not of petty souls. The Englishman's fault is that he is too good-natured. He tolerates the intolerant in national education, the priests who not only threaten our liberties, but are doing their best to make us a badly-educated race.

MIMNERMUS.

#### CARDIFF AND CASTLES.

The best and truest of all building and architecture is that which is done by the people, for the people, to the people's order and account. We are prone to admire over much the ruined castles and abbeys, forgetting, in the strong grandeur or decorated grace of these treasured remains, the motives that begat them and the means that reared them.

When the people create a building like Cardiff's City Hall, of their own free-will, and at their own expense, dealing fairly with the craftsmen employed, they are doing a magnificently greater thing than what was done by Roman generals, or Norman barons, or abbots. Cardiff's castle was for suppression and oppression, and likely enough built by forced labour.

"Kuklos" (in Daily News).

## The Interdependence of Organic Nature.

MAN'S complete dependence upon the products of the soil is constantly overlooked. Yet when one pauses to think of it, the entire food supply, apart from which the multifarious activities of contemporary life become impossible, is all derived from mother earth. Moreover, all our iron, coal, cotton and wool, to mention a few only of our staple industries, relate directly, or indirectly, to the land.

Throughout the unspeakable ages of the earth's history which embrace the existence of animal life, the faunal has ever depended upon the floral world. In final analysis, animal nutriment has always been supplied by vegetation. The flesh-devouring creatures prey upon animals whose sustenance is supplied by green plants. And when the refreshing rains refuse to fall, the crops fail, and famine soon stalks the land.

In times precedent to the Devonian, animal life increased and ramified in many directions in its ocean home. But when the land flora had successfully established itself near the shores of the streams and seas, animal organisms slowly adapted themselves to a newly arisen vegetable realm. Countless centuries came and went before certain denizens of the deep were transformed into early forerunners of the vast insect world.

Testimony concerning insect life in the Devonian and early Carboniferous Eras is fragmentary, but this is presumably due to the imperfection of the palæontological record. But during later Carboniferous ages the insect order multiplied amazingly, over one thousand species having been revealed in the rocks, and remarkably enough, they then attained the largest dimensions ever evolved in the long course of their history, with dragon-flies, whose outspread wings measured more than two feet, and cockroaches four inches in length.

The inclement meteorological conditions that prevailed in Permian times appear to have proved detrimental to insect existence, for few fossil remains are recorded in the deposits of the succeeding Triassic period. During the subsequent Jurassic epoch they completely recovered, and the petrifications of this period represent the ancestral forms of numerous extant species such as ants, locusts, beetles and many others.

In Cretaceous times, the immense chalk-beds were deposited beneath the waves of the ocean, and the rocks of that period are less rich in insect remains, but there is little reason for thinking that the insects had suffered any serious reverse. They maintained their position so successfully that in our own day the known and described insect species number nearly 650,000. On a conservative estimate at least one million species are extant. Indeed, an eminent entomologist has expressed the opinion that it is probable that more than five million species inhabit the planet which we commonly assume to be ours. Dr. Knowlton thinks that this is most markedly the "Age of Insects," and he reminds us that "more than once the prediction has been made that they may ultimately destroy civilization and reduce the world to a barren waste."

Although many of the leading living insect groups trace their descent from ancestors who flourished long prior to the advent of the Angiosperms or flowering plants, yet, as these higher plants developed, the mutual adjustments of their floral organs to insect existence proved a powerful stimulus to the evolutionary advance of the organisms involved. Before the coming of the Angiosperms, no attractively

coloured and sweetly perfumed flowers existed. Nor were insects more than adventitiously instrumental in their fertilization. Blooms there were, but like those of the oak, elm, and other modern plants, they were inconspicuous, and the great quantities of the male element, pollen, produced were distributed chiefly by the agency of the winds.

Innumerable plants are partly dependent upon insect visits in securing fertility. Many have become entirely dependent. Even where the male and self-female organs are present in the same flower, self-fertilization has been completely prevented. The orchid family supply a striking illustration of this truth. The classical investigations of Darwin recorded in his celebrated work *The Fertilization of Orchids* furnish various examples. The blossoms of these beautiful plants "are so arranged that the pollen grains are held together in a compact club-shaped mass that must be forcibly removed from the modified stamen by sticking to the head of the visiting insect, and when the insect visits another flower the pollen mass is in the exact position to be brought in contact with the stigma."

Another interesting example is that of the edible fig. The tiny fig-flowers appear within a closed and hollow stalk, but the plant is incapable of self-pollination. For this the presence of a small wasp is essential, and the insect bites its way into the receptacle, wanders along the tube in search of food, and thus fertilises the fig. It is stated that: "When the fig was introduced into California and Arizona from its home in Northern Africa it failed to mature fruit until the wasp was introduced and liberated in the fig orchards. Neither apparently can thrive without the other."

Those early toothed birds of reptilian ancestry that lived in Jurassic and Cretaceous times progressed in the direction of modern forms. Nearly all the fossil fragments of birds so far recovered from the later Tertiary deposits approximate towards living avian forms. Birds of prey now form a goodly array, but the immense majority of birds feed upon the seeds, fruits, nuts and foliage of Angiospermous plants. Again, the purely insectivorous birds prey upon insects which mainly feed upon the higher floral plants. Thus, with the rise and expansion of the Angiosperms the bird world has grown from more to more.

The Angiosperms proved themselves indispensable to the evolution of the mammals. Very meagre is our knowledge of the more primitive mammals. But the paucity of the Jurassic and Cretaceous mammalian fossil-beds stands out in striking contrast to the opulence of mammalian remains revealed in the Tertiary formations. In Eocene times mammals everywhere abounded, and their advanced structure plainly indicates a prolonged period of antecedent evolution. For instance, two able American specialists, Drs. Miller and Gridley have demonstrated that "two of the four great divergent lines of rodents could not possibly have been derived from any known Tertiary ancestors, but must have originated well back in the Cretaceous."

The rise and development of the Mammalia practically coincides with the advent and advance of the flowering plants. Until the opening period of the Cretaceous, terrestrial plants were composed almost exclusively of ferns, conifers, cycads and kindred types, which were unfavourable to the requirements of mammalian organisms. Innutritious, repugnant and even poisonous as these plants sometimes proved, it seems reasonable to assume that if this type of flora had continued dominant, mammalian life would never have reached its later luxuriance.

In later Cretaceous times the highly important

group of grasses made its appearance. These grasses established themselves in suitable surroundings, and soon occupied the downlands and open spaces. This succulent and nutritious herbage furnished the grazing essential to the rapidly multiplying and far spreading herds of herbivorous organisms. In early Tertiary days these creatures were strongly in evidence, and displayed marked adaptation to special modes of life; some persisted in modified form throughout the Tertiary ages, while others have descended to the modern world. The genesis and subsequent almost ubiquitous distribution of the herbivorous mammals supplied the prey for the immense army of carnivorous organisms, all ultimately dependent upon the flower-bearing plants. For even the grasses are Angiosperms that bear inconspicuous blossoms, which develop into their highly nutritious seeds.

In company with the lower mammals, man, proud man himself, is a thing of grass. Whether Asia or Africa was the cradle of the human race is still a matter of dispute. That man was evolved in a tropical or sub-tropical continent seems almost certain. The Pliocene Period probably witnessed man's emergence from the simian stage. The group of Primates of which man is a member appeared at least as early as Miocene times, and was apparently the offspring of more generalized mammalian fore-runners. After many adventures two leading branches of the Primate family steadily diverged from some common ancestral organism, one evolving the higher apes and their near relatives, while the other generated the races of mankind.

The path was prepared for the future onward sweep of humanity, but the way was long and steep. In his semi-brute state man must have remained purely dependent on the bounties of Nature and his diet must have long continued chiefly vegetable in character. Wild fruits, nuts, seeds, and edible roots were probably his mainstay. To-day, even, there remain various unprogressive peoples who have advanced but little beyond this rude stage of culture. The more energetic and enterprising stocks, however, forged ahead and ultimately attained the hunting and agricultural states.

Tens of thousands of years rolled away before man abandoned what Perry terms "the food gathering stage," which he justly distinguishes from the cultivation of the soil for the production of food. But the wild hunter tamed the cat and dog, and these, with all the pastoral animals, such as cattle, sheep, and horses were made subservient to his pleasure. As the arts of agriculture and horticulture advanced, man not only cultivated the wild fruits and grasses, but vastly improved them as well. And during all these changes of time and circumstance the food of man has been continuously supplied by the Angiosperms. These form the sustenance of his leading domestic animals as well as that of most of the animals hunted for food, both in the past and at present in all parts of the world. This clearly demonstrates the invaluable part performed by the flowering flora in the ascent of the human race.

Yet, despite these favouring circumstances William Watson, the poet, probably more than adumbrates the truth concerning man's perilous journey towards such civilization and culture as we possess:—

"In cave and bosky dene  
Of old there crept and ran  
A gibbering form obscene  
That was, and was not man.  
The desert beasts went by  
In fairer covering clad;  
More speculative eye  
The couchant lion had,  
And goodlier speech the birds, than we,  
When we began.

"Was it some random throw  
Of heedless Nature's die  
That from estate so low  
Uplifted man so high?  
Through untold aeons vast  
She let him lurk and cower;  
'Twould seem he climbed at last  
In mere fortuitous hour  
Child of a thousand chances, 'neath  
The indifferent sky."

T. F. PALMER.

## Leo Tolstoy.

(Concluded from page 555.)

THERE has been a vast amount of writing about Tolstoy and his teaching. That from the Christian side is so invariably futile, wrong-headed, and sloppily sentimental, that it is not worth noticing. But even those least under the hypnotism of Christian mythology, like Janko Lavrin; Stefan Zweig; and Mr. Fausset, have failed to point out the greatest lesson of Tolstoy's life. And that is, the outstanding fact, that Tolstoy adopted the teachings of Christ as a guide of life. He tried to live up to the literal teachings of the Gospels. He failed, and ended miserably, because those teachings are fundamentally unworkable, and, carried to their logical conclusion, would result in the bankruptcy of all civilization and end in race suicide.

They throw all the blame on Tolstoy, while really they should bestow it upon the absurd and irrational teachings of the New Testament which he took for his guide. Mr. G. K. Chesterton, the Falstaff of modern Fleet Street, or, perhaps a better comparison would be with Friar Tuck; replying to the patent fact of the failure of Christianity; retorted that Christianity had not failed. It has been found difficult and not tried. Protestants have received this piece of special pleading thankfully, and it has reverberated from pulpit to pulpit ever since. But it is utterly false.

We know that the early Christians did endeavour to carry out the teachings of Christ. Many of them withdrew altogether from the world into the desert, or lived in cells and caves like wild beasts. Of those remaining behind, many made eunuchs of themselves, as Christ advised, Origin, the most learned of the early Christian Fathers, did so. No religion based on such principles could survive. But that did not trouble the first Christians; they believed that the end of the world was close at hand. Christ had declared that some of those listening to him would see it, therefore the question of survival did not arise. But as time wore on, and Christ failed to appear, the church was forced to make a compromise. It adopted the marriage sacrament—for which there is no warrant in the four Gospels—it allowed its members to make money, incidentally, taking a tithe of it for itself. It taught that the more extreme teachings, such as, Resist not evil, Take no thought for the morrow, Consider the lilies who toil not or spin, and trust the heavenly father to provide food and raiment, to be counsels of perfection not intended for daily practice, and this compromise prevails to this day.

But Tolstoy would have none of this. He declared that Christ really meant what he said, and that these teachings were intended for our practical daily life. He went the extreme limit. He declared, says Janko Lavrin:—

One must love one's enemies to such an extent as to let them do whatever they like. Even if they wish to kill us we must passively sacrifice ourselves to this conception of love without raising a finger

in self-defence. For if the self as such has no right to exist, we have no right to defend this self.

Owing to his logical ruthlessness, Tolstoy forbids even resistance against raving drunkards or madmen. Thus in a letter about Adin Ballou's rival theory of non-resistance he writes (1889), "The comments that I wish to make on Mr. Ballou's explanation of the doctrine are: First, that I cannot agree with the concession he makes for employing violence against drunkards and insane people. The Master made no concessions, and we can make none. We must try, as Mr. Ballou put it, to make impossible the existence of such people, but if they do exist we must use all possible means and sacrifice ourselves but not employ violence. A true Christian will always prefer to be killed by a madman, than deprive him of his liberty."<sup>26</sup>

Upon the strength of the text, Judge not, that ye be not judged, he denounced every Law Court. Nor did he stop at teaching. Two years before writing *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (1893), says Mr. Fausset: "He renounced his copyrights and divided his property among his family; six years before he had renounced hunting, tobacco, and animal food. Continually he worked with the peasants in the fields, and more than once he determined to go away, to abandon the comfortable family life which was bought by the sufferings of the people, and the wife whose love he had described 'as an obstacle to the service of God.'"<sup>27</sup> He would have beggared himself but for the good sense of his wife.

In his selfish preoccupation with his spiritual welfare, Tolstoy never stopped to consider how his wife and family were to continue to exist after he had given away his wealth and estate. How could the Countess set to and earn her own living without any training or preparation? This led to much friction and domestic unhappiness, as Christ, by the way, foretold would happen to his followers. As Lavrin truly observes:—

As a good and wise mother, the Countess Tolstoy was much more concerned about the concrete future of her numerous children than about the social principles of her less practical husband. So she bravely took the entire burden of management and the care of the family upon her own shoulders. The fact that she resisted her husband's theories, in so far as the welfare of her own family was concerned, proves only that she had a strong sense of motherly responsibility as well as the courage to face reality as it is: "I did not know how to live with such views; I was alarmed, frightened, grieved," she defend herself in her Autobiography. "But with nine children I could not, like a weather-cock, turn in the ever-changing direction of my husband's spiritual going away, with him it was a passionate, sincere seeking; with me it would have been a silly imitation, positively harmful to the family. . . . If I had given away all my fortune at my husband's desire (I don't know to whom), if I had been left in poverty with nine children, I should have to work for the family—to feed, to do sewing for, wash, bring up my children without education. Leo Nikolævitch [Tolstoy] by vocation and inclination, could have done nothing but write!"<sup>28</sup>

And his writings would no longer support them, for he had renounced his copyrights. As Lavrin further remarks, the Countess is not in the least to blame for not making her husband and family beggars, with the sole object that there should be no incongruity between Tolstoy's life and Tolstoy's theories. This opposition to his unreasonable and unnatural ideas increased his natural discontent and irritability, and

added to the friction and estrangement between him and the Countess, and the crisis came about fifteen months later, he ran away from his home and family, and during his flight was taken ill and died at the little railway station of Astapovo.

As his friend and biographer, Alymer Maude, records the Tolstoy colonies which now sprang up all came to grief. He gives several instances, of which the following is a sample. One of the members of a Colony adopted a neglected youngster. "He listened to their discussions, readings, and conversations, and learnt that no physical force should be used to any one, that it is wrong to possess property, and that no Colonist should have anything to do with the police or the Law Courts. One morning the Colonist who had special charge of the lad, awoke and began to dress, but could not find his waistcoat until at last he discovered that the boy was wearing it. The Colonist asked for the waistcoat, but the boy refused to give it up. The man explained how wrong it was to steal, but the boy could not see the point of the argument. If property is wrong, why was it any more wrong for a boy to have it than for a man?" The other Colonists were called in, but could do nothing. The boy was "therefore able to assume a tone of moral superiority. He wanted the waistcoat as much as the man did. He was quite willing to discuss the subject; but it was impossible to alter his opinion, that he was going to keep the waistcoat, and that it was very wrong of any one to want to take it from him." He gives other cases much more serious than this, and observes: "If we accept all he has said as valid, any lunatic, drunkard, wayward child, or angry man, may block the traffic in Cheapside indefinitely; and it would not need many such people to plunge a whole community into chaos." True, and that is the fruit of pure unadulterated Christianity. It is a deadly poison which has already killed several civilizations, and any revival of its primitive form would destroy ours as well.

W. MANN.

### The Mystery of Apothecary.

BOOKS on arts and crafts are always of very great interest, partly because they show how knowledge has been painfully acquired by man, and because they show how erroneous notions have been discarded as man gets nearer the light.

In *The Mystery and Art of the Apothecary*, by C. J. Thompson, published by the Bodley Head at 12s. 6d., is told the remarkable story of how the modern chemist has been evolved from the ancient witch-doctor.

Mr. Thompson points out that the first impulse of primitive man when wounded, would be to apply a leaf to the wound, and in time he would learn which leaves possessed soothing properties, and which were best left alone.

The early belief about drugs of all kinds was that the drugs drove out demons and evil spirits, and as primitive man saw gods in everything, he imagined that beneficial herbs were really parts of gods. God-eating was but another way of looking at herb cures.

For some diseases, so we are told, incantations to an unseen power were employed alone, but usually they were employed with material treatment.

Mr. Thompson says "The recital of an incantation may have had some efficacy in soothing nervous patients, just as is known in that class of disease called neurosis, where drugs are of little value, much benefit may be obtained by suggestion of and other psychological measures." Mr. Thompson will have the Christian Scientists on his track if he goes about making such statements. There is much in the book which would interest Freethinkers, particularly the many accounts of priest and god-healers.

Of great interest are the chapters on the apothecary

<sup>26</sup> Janko Lavrin: *Tolstoy: A Psycho-critical Study*. p. 165.

<sup>27</sup> Fausset: *Tolstoy: The Inner Drama*. p. 245.

<sup>28</sup> Janko Lavrin: *Tolstoy: A Psycho-critical Study*. pp. 171-172.

in the middle ages. The church had stepped in and taken over all the apothecary's learning and monopolized it. That the church was not so much concerned with healing suffering humanity as in concentrating power, is evident from the statement that when the monks found a certain formula to be specially efficacious, "they guarded it carefully as a precious secret, and even the compounding of it was surrounded with great mystery."

Ordinary humanity suggests that a man who finds a certain cure deserves to profit by it, but that he ought to see to it that the remedy became available to all sufferers.

Religion was well mixed-up with medicine. St. Hilary was besought while attending to a fracture of the arm, St. Liborius was useful for stone; St. Louis was invoked for diseases of the ear; St. Clare for diseases of the eye; St. Genevieve for fever, St. Blaise for throat trouble, and so on.

One amusing item of news is contained in the story of Brother John Mirfield, who used to recommend for rheumatism the rubbing of the affected part with olive oil. The olive oil had first to be put in a clean vessel on the fire, and left there while the psalm "Quare fremuerunt gentes" was said as far as a certain verse; The Gloria and two prayers were then to be said, and the whole repeated seven times. Why all this pious procedure?

Not for Divine aid, as the ignorant sufferer would think, but for the practical reason that this particular formula took just fifteen minutes, which was the right period for heating the oil!

NECIELLS.

### Acid Drops.

In a Sunday paper, Mr. Seymour Hicks explained that once at a performance at which the Prince of Wales—now King George—was present, he accidentally gave the Prince a kick on the leg. He explains how extremely perturbed he was at such an accident, and how it weighed on his mind. Afterwards the Prince gave him a cigar. On receiving it he asked the permission of the Prince not to smoke it, and explains that he had a special cabinet built for it, in which it reclines until this day.

Two days later the *Evening Standard* told a story of the first Duke of Wellington. When an old man he was helped across the road by a man, who explained elaborately how pleased he was to assist the greatest hero of his time. The Duke replied: "You are a damned fool," and then after a pause, "and a damned smirking monkey." All we have to say to Mr. Seymour Hicks is that he did not rise to the occasion. The proper course would have been to have had amputated at once the plebian foot that dared to kick a prince. As to the cigar, instead of a cabinet, he should have had a shrine built for it, and his family could have daily performed their devotions before it. Some men never know when good fortune comes their way.

Dr. Arthur E. Holt, the patient statistician of the Chicago Theological Seminary reports that during the last few years (since 1916) thirty-two new varieties of religious organizations were added to the already immense number existent. Possibly, for all we know to the contrary, some of these denominations may have some new or different creed from all the others. It is hard to guess. It seems incredible that Christianity can be defined thirty-two times beyond and in addition to all the existing definitions. We know that Jesus is God, that he is not God, and that he is something so exceedingly near God that he can be called Our Divine Master, and yet be a Perfect Man. And, of course, one Church can teach that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father. And a war can be waged for many years to prove that the Holy Ghost proceeded also from Jesus Christ. But one would imagine that not more than a hundred or two hundred theories could be called into being, and churches be founded thereon, to explain exactly how matters stand on so important a subject. We once heard a first-class religious lunatic ex-

plain, if Christianity appealed to common sense there would be no need of a revelation.

Lord Baden-Powell, the Chief Scout, insists that the Scout Movement is a great educational method of character-building through Nature-lore, handicrafts, games, and the development of the team spirit; that by discipline and training the boys become happy and healthy citizens. We note there is no mention of religion. The omission is significant. Undoubtedly the Movement could not build up character and produce the aforesaid kind of citizens, if religion was the only thing employed to that end. But take away what religion there is in the Movement and the results would be very similar, perhaps better. Religion has been tacked on to the Scout Movement by parsons who are professing interest in the Movement in order to catch clients for their particular churches. "B.P." might make a note of the fact that religion is the only thing that brings disunity among his boys.

An International Conference on "The New Psychology and the Curriculum," was held recently in Denmark, under the auspices of the New Education Fellowship. One matter discussed was "The Child and Religion." And the conference agreed, according to a report, that religious feeling is innate in the child, finding expression at a very early age. It was urged that care should be taken not to direct this expression into too definite a channel in its early beginnings, but to allow it freedom of growth.

A reviewer in a pious weekly solemnly avers that "This is an age when thought both within and without the Church is directed mainly upon Jesus." We should say this reviewer is a parson, and that his mental energy is largely devoted to reading pious weekly journals and books by religious writers. Otherwise he might have observed, as regards "thought without the Church," that people with any reputation for thinking at all have left Jesus to the parsons, and are talking about things that really matter.

The Rev. C. Carroll (of somewhere) is spiritual chief of an unusually intelligent lot of parishioners. Says he: "The majority of the people in our parish realize no need of any kind of religion in their lives." Presumably that "yearning for God," which the parsons declare is a very common phenomenon, must have got lost in the post on the way to Mr. Carroll's parish.

There is to be, in October, a call to united intercession on behalf of Sunday schools. Seeing how important the Sunday schools are to the welfare of the churches, and knowing that God must be aware of it, the pious might, one would fancy, leave God to look after the schools without being asked. Doesn't God, then, do anything for the good of the Churches unless he is badgered to do so?

Apropos of the Annual Report of Sir George Newman, Chief Medical Officer to the Ministry of Health, the *New Chronicle* comes out with an editorial, "Health—Spiritual and Physical." The following is a portion:—

People are living longer; the infant mortality rate has been almost halved during the past twenty years; year by year the doctors are slowly gaining ground in the vast and complex study of disease; and as we watch we can visualise the medical profession as a modern St. George fighting the dragons of ill-health and disease. They are very largely dragons unknown and unseen, for with full knowledge comes victory, or at least partial victory. Blame for the black spots in this Report cannot fairly be placed upon the medical profession. Theirs is an increasing war . . .

The doctors are but slowly gaining ground—the study of disease is vast and complex—the "dragons" of disease are very largely unknown and unseen—the medical profession cannot be blamed for the slowness in which they discover knowledge to combat disease . . . All this forms an excellent indictment of the Christian God. God brought disease into his scheme of things. God

made the study of disease vast and complete. God made disease unknown and unseen. God is to be blamed for the snail-like slowness in which the medicos discover means of combating and curing disease. An excellent God to pray to and be thankful to for small mercies, and to ask for more slow and painful discoveries of cures for his diseases! It says much for the efficacy of the Christian dope that Christians never can see this aspect of the matter.

Bishop Welldon says: "If people all think alike the reason is that they do not think at all." Whether meant as such or not, this is a nasty knock at the Roman Catholic Church and its adherents. If meant, the pot would seem to be calling the kettle black. For the Bishop's own Church is not exactly guiltless of striving to get people to "not think at all." If not meant, the Bishop has overlooked a fact of which most priests are aware, namely, that a Church cannot be held together unless it achieves considerable success in persuading its adherents to "think alike"—that is, to believe the same dogmas. Moreover, a Church whose adherents are permitted to think "not alike" is fundamentally un-Christian. For it was the supreme aim of Jesus to get all men to think exactly as he did. The Bishop is, we suggest, doing the Christian cause a disservice when he discourages people from thinking alike. Surely he must be aware that the Church was strongest when people all believed the same things, and that it is weakest to-day when people don't all think alike?

A minister's wife, in a Methodist paper, writes as follows:—

It is a mystery to many of us that our ministers so often discard the clerical collar. The collar lends dignity to an ordinary minister and adds distinction to the best.

By all means let the parsons wear the collar of their craft. If they leave it off, they might be mistaken for ordinary folk who earn an honest living by the sweat of their muscles or brains.

If God has a sense of humour he must be laughing now. Moslems and Jews are killing each other in the name of the one and only God. And a Christian nation—the British—which professes to follow a pacifist Master is called upon to restore peace—with the aid of gunboats, armoured cars, and rifles!

At Westminster Abbey a woman was asked to leave because she was worshipping God without a hat. If God prefers women to worship with a hat, there can be no doubt about the fact that a woman's first call in heaven is at the hat department. Otherwise she will get no chance to strum a harp around the Throne of Heavenly Grace. We presume mirrors are provided in order that the ladies may get their hats tilted at a righteous angle.

A tablet to perpetuate the memory of the Rev. A. J. Forsyth is to be placed in the Tower of London. This gentleman invented the percussion lock for small-arms. Soon after 1836, percussion rifles were generally adopted in the British Army. We hope the reverend gentleman had a good excuse ready, when his pacifist Master enquired what he meant by making murder more efficient.

During the Festival of Drama and Music, held at Canterbury Cathedral recently, Kit Marlowe's drama, *Dr. Faustus* was staged. Marlowe was a militant Atheist whose violent end happened at the very moment when the Church was thinking about suppressing his too free tongue. This staging of an Atheist's drama perhaps foreshadows what will happen in days to come, when churches will be put to more useful purposes.

The thoroughly educated boy and girl, declares Ex-Baillie C. M. Crichton, are the nation's greatest asset. We are inclined to agree, if by "thoroughly educated" is meant more than acquaintance with the "three R's," plus a dose of religious instruction. Children equipped with the latter type of education may be the greatest

assets of Churches, and of popular newspapers and journals with million circulations, but they are not assets to the State.

A Plymouth vicar says he would be sorry for his dog to live in the room where one of his parishioners has died. A priest ought not to trouble about that. The chief thing is, did the parishioner die confessing his sins and affirming in faith in Christ? If so, nothing else matters. God specializes in compensation for favours withheld in this world.

Mr. Warwick Deeping, the novelist, declares that "happiness is somehow the perfume of a life well grown and well lived." This implies conversely that unhappiness is the stench of a life badly grown and badly lived. Neither assertion is true to fact. Mr. Deeping should have said "some" (or much) happiness, etc. Much unhappiness is caused by the way in which Nature works. Or, if the Christian tale be true, much unhappiness is the result of the manner in which God has ordered the world.

According to the Bishop of Ripon, "War only happens because human beings have not stopped being beasts." On the other hand, war, as history reveals, has happened because human beings have been very religious. But perhaps this is further proof of the rightness of the Bishop's assertion.

The Bishop of Durham declares that "Establishment has become an anomaly which is ceasing to function tolerably." Speaking for the more enlightened citizen, we would say that Establishment always has been an anomaly and has always functioned intolerably.

Father Paul Bull has noted that there is nowadays a growing disposition "to treat God as a sort of ornament and added luxury to a worldly life." A most regrettable tendency, is that. The proper way to treat God, as all sound Catholics should know, is as a sort of awful Bogey. As Father Paul is interested in "dispositions," we hope he hasn't missed another—that of treating God as a superfluity in intelligent and educated life.

Sir Arthur Yapp, late of the Y.M.C.A., thinks that "truth is indeed often stranger than fiction." To be philosophizing in this wise, he must have been listening to Catholic and Protestant Truth in Hyde Park.

The Rev. Joseph Johnson, a Primitive Methodist, is an enthusiastic Freemason. He claims that Freemasonry is religious in spirit and administration, its real mission being to build in human life an ideal temple. He believes that its call to fellowship is a blessed influence in its brethren's lives, because its governing principles are faith in God, hope of immortality, and charity towards all men. We are glad to learn all this. Freemasonry must be truly religious, for it excludes women for its very blessed fellowship. For our part, we always thought the Freemasonry was an organization of men who, after dining well, very reverently wondered what charitable actions they might do.

There is some bother in as to what is to be done with St. Mary's Church, Greenwich, which is kind of derelict. The Vicar, on being approached by a reporter of the local press, expressed a wish not to be bothered, and said that people were asses. We have no great desire to contest the truth of the statement, but the Vicar should bethink himself. An ass was the animal on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem. Asses have largely supported Jesusism ever since. The only animal that is reported to be in heaven is an Ass—this on the testimony of the Mohammedan religion, and but for asses there is hardly a Church in the country that would be open, for if others than asses go there, they go for the encouragement of asses, and if one lot of asses stay away so would the others. A Christian priest should always speak respectfully of asses.

## National Secular Society

The Funds of the National Secular Society are now legally controlled by Trust Deed, and those who wish to benefit the Society by gift or bequest may do so with complete confidence that any money so received will be properly administered and expended.

The following form of bequest is sufficient for anyone who desires to benefit the Society by will:—

I hereby give and bequeath (*Here insert particulars of legacy*), free of all death duties, to the Trustees of the National Secular Society for all or any of the purposes of the Trust Deed of the said Society, and I direct that a receipt signed by two of the trustees of the said Society shall be a good discharge to my executors for the said legacy.

Any information concerning the Trust Deed and its administration may be had on application.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Will subscribers to this journal please note that the green wrapper, which heretofore has given notice that subscriptions are due will no longer be used. A printed communication will take its place.

H. SILVESTER.—We miss quite a number of things we ought to see, because so many conclude that someone else is certain to send. It is better for both to send than for both to omit sending.

C. R. GOUGH AND H. BLACK.—Mr. Chapman Cohen is debating with Mr. Shaw Desmond in the Caxton Hall, on Friday, October 25.

H. LEVY.—We have no knowledge of any decree in Italy, under Mussolini, forbidding the holding of Protestant meetings.

I. HUMPHREYS (Toronto).—Sorry, but your letter reaches us after the correspondence had been closed.

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

The Secular Society, Limited, 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. R. H. Rosetti, giving as long notice as possible.

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

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

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 editor begs to thank the many friends who have written offering him congratulations on the anniversary of his birthday—September 1. We hope to be in the saddle long enough to be able to receive the same for many years to come, but only so long as we are fit to go on working.

We are continually receiving letters from friends in various parts of the country, asking whether some lectures cannot be given in this or that town. We can only say here what we have said before. If three or four

people will undertake the necessary local work of booking the hall, and looking after other local arrangements, they need only write the Secretary of the N.S.S., and a lecture will be fixed up. With proper attention locally a good meeting is almost a certainty.

May we also add that our offer to send the *Freethinker* for six weeks to any one who is likely to become a reader of the paper, still holds good. All we require is threepence in stamps to cover cost of postage, with name and address, and we will see to the rest.

In the *Sunday Express*, Mr. Hannan Swaffer calls attention to the fact that in his earlier years, George Bernard Shaw figured on the open-air platforms of the N.S.S., one advertised lecture being "The Attributes of God. An Impeachment." Mr. Shaw is not the only man who has received his education in controversy in the N.S.S., and has afterwards bulked prominently with the public. In the days to which Mr. Swaffer refers, G.B.S. and G. W. Foote were friends, and ready to take on anyone or anything who challenged their opinions.

Mr. R. H. Rosetti, the General Secretary of the N.S.S., is taking a few days holiday away from the office. All urgent communications will receive attention, but other matters will await his return on the 11th or 12th September.

The West Ham Branch is carrying on a very vigorous and a very successful open-air meeting during the summer months, just outside the public library in the Romford Road. The lecturer on Sunday last was Mr. B. A. Le Maine, and we are pleased to learn that the audience was large and delighted with the address delivered. Mr. Le Maine appears to be a welcome visitor at this station.

The R.P.A. has added another two volumes to their very useful and very cheap "Thinker's Library" series. These are Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and *An Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, edited by Sir Francis Darwin, with a chapter on Darwin's religious opinion. The price per volume is one shilling.

### To a Lane.

THERE are men who love the city;  
There are men who love the sea;  
But a lane adown a valley,  
Has far greater charms for me.

Where at even I may wander,  
And list to the nightingale,  
And watch the purling brooklet gleam  
And glance, in the moonbeams pale.

Where the Cuckoo calls in May-time,  
And the Hay smells sweet in June;  
Where the wild bees gather honey,  
While they hum a pleasant tune.

Where the Youth and Maiden linger,  
While he tells the old, old tale,  
'Neath the silent stars which twinkle  
O'er a lane adown a dale.

Where the Blackbird's flute-like music,  
And the Thrush's joyous song,  
Cheer me, when my heart is weary,  
As I go Life's way along.

Where in Summer, or in Winter,  
In the sunshine, snow, or rain,  
There's a welcome waiting for me  
In a cottage, by a Lane.

J. R. HOLMES.

## Charles Southwell.

### A PROTEST AND A VINDICATION.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON'S *History of Freethought in the Nineteenth Century* has given us so much pleasure, both for its matter and its manner, that it seems ungrateful to complain about it. But frequently we differ so strongly from the erudite author that it is imperative to speak out. Many names that are to us worthy of full and sympathetic treatment are slurred over as mere incidentals, while others are given, we hold, far more space than their owners' achievements warrant. The work as a whole, excellent though it be, is strongly overweighted on the side of Respectability.

Mr. Robertson would be the first to agree with us that every serious writer has his special affinities or "pets" amongst his fellows. This is temperamental, and neither to be explained-away nor deplored. It is "natural," and there is an end to it. We know too that no historian can be absolutely impartial; but we do expect him to be sympathetic to his fellow-soldiers of the past. It is here that Mr. Robertson sometimes lets his readers down badly. His treatment of Charles Southwell (1814-1860), to which we shall for the moment confine ourselves, is a case very much in point.

The tragedy is this: not one in a thousand of the readers of this *History* knows anything of Southwell beyond what Mr. Robertson chooses to tell him; to many he is not even a name. The dust of nearly seventy years has settled on his memory. He is all-but-forgotten; and so, in the exquisite phrase of Sir Thomas Browne—"remembering the early civility [he] brought upon these countries, and forgetting long-passed mischiefs, we mercifully preserve [his] bones," . . . Hence this attempt at vindication, of which, in the interests of justice and of truth and of honour, we ask Mr. Robertson to be heedful in his Second Edition.

In the case of great, or even odd, artists, these little matters of justice frequently adjust themselves, sometimes very curiously. For instance, Percy Bysshe Shelley, who devoted his life and art to advocating the cause, and demanding the emancipation, of the penniless underdog, and who, eighty years or so ago, was being issued at a few pence by James Watson (another forgotten hero), is now ridiculously being "done" at Three Guineas a Volume by a firm of millionaire publishers for the use and pleasure of millionaire readers, who have as much business with Shelley as a porcupine has with a shaving-brush. But in the case of men who are not primarily artists this posthumous justice is frequently lacking.

Here are the quotations from Mr. Robertson's *History* whereto we object:—

Like the Churches, the English Freethinking Movements had their imperfectly white sheep. Charles Southwell, an unbalanced and unstable young man, who had been a soldier and actor, and had a gift for quarrelling, broke with the Owenites, and established the first avowedly atheistic English periodical, *The Oracle of Reason* (1842-3).<sup>\*</sup> In its fourth number he inserted an article which he entitled "The Jew Book," and which, as he afterwards declared, he made as offensive as he possibly could. He was duly prosecuted, fined £100, and imprisoned for a year. (*History*, p. 73.)

In a footnote Mr. Robertson generously adds that "The most memorable biographic item about Southwell is that he was the youngest of thirty-three children."

Southwell afterwards broke with Atheists on the

<sup>\*</sup>Mr. Robertson is slightly in error here; the first number of *The Oracle* is dated November 6, 1841.

score that there was no sense in taking a title from the negation of a [sic] hallucination; quarrelled with Holyoake on that ground; published an unpleasant biography without a publisher's name; emigrated to New Zealand; worked there on a Methodist journal, and on his death-bed informed his employers that he was still an Atheist. (*History*, p. 74.)

To this passage also a footnote is appended: "Compare Mr. McCabe's *Life of Holyoake*, i, 58." We will obey Mr. Robertson's injunction, and very gladly; for he has enabled us to kill two birds with one stone.

Now, if Mr. Robertson, who is writing for the future, and who is master of a sound, if seldom sparkling, prose, cannot be fairer than this, it would have been better to omit all mention of Southwell, except possibly his name. But the Historian of Freethought knows as well as we do, and even better, that the omission of the name would be impossible, owing to Southwell's essential importance to his *History*. As, then, he *must* be mentioned, why not try to do him justice? Are we, as keen students of early English Freethought, asking too much?

For many years we have been readers and admirers of Charles Southwell; and we shall try to rehabilitate him in history, that he may not appear the bedraggled and feckless ragamuffin depicted by Mr. J. M. Robertson and Mr. Joseph McCabe. Yet the latter has been known to contribute to the unrespectable *Freethinker*; and the former, years and years ago, wrote a series of pamphlets for the late Mr. J. W. Gott, who disgraced himself and his cause by dying for Freethought.

The charges brought by Mr. Robertson against this "imperfectly white sheep" are that he was "unbalanced and unstable." Well? Could not the same be said of more than half the great ones of the world? So many names crowd in upon ones mind that a catalogue would be almost endless. We will content ourselves, and—may we hope?—our readers, by recalling the facts that George Jacob Holyoake, one of Mr. McCabe's and Mr. Robertson's heroes, was not invariably stable, and that there were times, in his earlier days, when Charles Bradlaugh was not perfectly balanced.

Poor Southwell, "imperfectly white sheep"! What are his achievements? We will remind Mr. Robertson of them; and they are many. He has the distinction, a distinction that will gain him a statue within a century or two, of being the first editor of the first avowedly Atheist periodical, *The Oracle of Reason*, ever published in this country, or probably on this planet. He was the first, so far as we know, of the modern agnostics, preceding Huxley and Holyoake by years. For proof of this we cite his *Impossibility of Atheism Demonstrated* and *Another Fourpenny Wilderness*. He was a debater of marvellous—yes; marvellous—skill and wit, as may be seen in his published debate with Alexander Jamieson (1854). According to G. J. Holyoake, who knew Southwell and his work intimately, he was "incomparably the best speaker that arose in our time in the Socialist or Freethinking ranks." (*Half-Hours with Freethinkers*, Second Series, No. 24 (1865); quoted from *The Reasoner* of December 2, 1860). He made a superb defence at his trial for Blasphemy in 1842, as the report abundantly shows. In spite of his lack of balance and instability, he taught himself French well enough, according to his intensely candid autobiography, to write tolerable love-letters in that tongue; and his translation of Dupuis shows his skill as a "renderer"; according to W. H. J. Saffern, who claims to have been "very intimate" with Southwell, and who knew him in Auckland, New Zealand, at the close of his life, "he was a well-

educated man, and a good Latin and Greek scholar." For this piece of information we are indebted to *Our Corner* for May, 1888. The March, 1888, issue of this magazine (to which, by the way, Mr. Robertson was perhaps chief contributor), contains a very sympathetic, though very incomplete, article on Southwell, by the late George Standring. The last achievements that we shall name here were the production, by this piously-maligned hero, of two very able Freethought papers, in addition to the *Oracle*; *The Investigator* (1843), and *The Lancashire Beacon* (1849-50);† and also one of the most moving pieces of autobiography in the language, Mr. Robertson's "unpleasant" *Confessions of a Freethinker*, undated, but about 1850. (Standring says, "about 1845"; but, by internal evidence, he is badly "out." His error is repeated by J. M. Wheeler on page 303 of his *Dictionary*.) This little book of ninety-eight pages is one of the frankest and bravest pieces of life in the English tongue. Southwell lacks, of course, Rousseau's charm; but, in his degree, he may claim to be the nearest approach to an English Rousseau that our race has so far produced. His little book is ill-arranged, perhaps; it is certainly tantalisingly incomplete, and the printing is dreadful; but it is in its curious minor way, a little classic. It is so rare that it never appears in booksellers' catalogues, and our own copy is the only one that we have ever seen. We owe it to the courtesy of our old friend Mr. A. G. Barker, of Walthamstow.

VICTOR B. NEUBURG.

(To be concluded.)

WHAT is it, that the crowd requite  
Thy love with hate, thy truth with lies?  
And but to faith, and not to sight,  
The walls of Freedom's temples rise?  
Yet do thy work; it shall succeed  
In thine or in another's day;  
And, if denied the victor's meed,  
Thou shalt not lack the toiler's pay.  
Faith shares the future's promise; Love's  
Self-offering is a triumph won;  
And each good thought or action moves  
The dark world nearer to the sun.  
Then faint not, falter not, nor plead  
Thy weakness; truth itself is strong;  
The lion's strength, the eagle's speed,  
Are not alone vouchsafed to wrong.  
Thy nature, which, through fire and flood,  
To place or gain finds out its way,  
Hath power to seek the highest good,  
And duty's holiest call obey!

John Greenleaf Whittier.

Those B.B.C. Sermons.

"THE LISTENER," for August 7, reproduces a sermon entitled "Our Ideals," which was broadcast by the Rev. B. G. Bouchier, on August 4 last, the speaker introducing his remarks by reminding his hearers that the day was the fifteenth anniversary of our entry into the war of 1914-1918.

With the signing of the Armistice, "we began to visualize a better world," but in 1929 the Rev. Bouchier assures us "our post war hopes have not been fulfilled"—a conclusion to which all will readily, though sadly, assent.

Christian nations having ignominiously failed to prevent war amongst themselves, evidently also lack the stimulus to wage war against the evils and injustices which bar the way to a "better world." What an indictment of Christianity!

Unemployment, want, the desire for World Peace, are some of the problems which occupy men's minds at the present time, we are told. What is the remedy? "You cannot have peace on earth and good will among men so long as men are disrupted from and out of touch with their Maker." How or why men were any more in touch with their Maker in 1918, when these high ideals were formulated is not made clear to us.

That the hysterical and emotional reaction, which followed the cessation of hostilities, should be interpreted by the clerical mind as abiding symptoms of man's determination to found "a land fit for heroes to live in," need not surprise us. Emotionalism is a powerful regenerating adjunct indispensable to religious activities.

However, let us direct our attention to the "main theme" of this gentleman's "message." You are to ask yourself "what in the main, are the ideals which have made our Empire the greatest in the world?" Quite a simple question for, the Rev. Bouchier has the solution all pat and conveniently condensed into five short words. It is—"our reverence for the Scriptures."

Just think—"our reverence for the Scriptures" has enabled us to successfully wage war against infidels and those Christians who speak other tongues than ours, it has supported us in building up a mighty Empire, it prompts us after 2,000 years of preaching the advantages of giving instead of receiving, of being humble and meek, of loving our enemies and so on, *ad nauseam*—to spend a hundred million of money annually in maintaining Fighting Services to protect and perpetuate our supremacy—and yet this mighty stimulation, this inspiring reverence which has cost millions of lives, sorrow and suffering beyond computation—mark you, "when it comes to laying the foundation for a "better world," when it is a question of the practical realization of ideals for a world at peace, "reverence for the Scriptures" no longer has any power to move us, it is impotent to spur us to make parallel efforts to those dedicated to war. Truly Jehovah is the God of Battles, and verily Christ came not to bring peace but a sword.

This reverential Book-idolatry, it seems, will steel men's hearts to hazard their very lives to add to our national possessions, but it has no like force to stir them to exert themselves in the comparatively tame endeavour to promote social reform and resist social injustice. No, our post-war record is one of failure and a "lowering" of our ideals despite our reverence for the Scriptures.

I am not concerned here with the ethical aspects of Empire-building, Imperialism, or patriotism—these are questions quite beyond the scope of this article. But I am concerned with the ethics (!) of a conception such as this which claims the authority and sanction of Holy Writ for the imposition of our will upon that of weaker races. Even the Rev. Bouchier would not deny that any Empire could be acquired and maintained except by force of arms.

Speaking as an Englishman it is, of course, quite natural that this reverend gentleman should come to the conclusion that God is on the side of the British Empire. China, for instance, which has produced a civilization of her own, with no Empire (except that within her own confines) has been at peace with the rest of the world for thousands of years—but alas! they are not Christians, and they have no reverence for our Scriptures.

†Southwell's bad luck holds. On page 305 of the *History* Mr. Robertson gives a list (which we admit does not claim to be exhaustive) of Freethought periodicals; from this list Southwell's *Investigator* and *Lancashire Beacon* are omitted, probably because the compiler has never seen them, while the comparatively-unimportant *Atheist and Republican* and *Blasphemer* are included. There are many errors and inaccuracies in the list; and, in the interests of a second edition of Mr. Robertson's book, we give those that we have found: *The Lion*, 1828-9, not "1828"; *The Prompter*, 1830-1, not "1830"; *The Oracle of Reason*, 1841-3, not "1842-3" (an error we have mentioned above); *The Movement*, 1843-5, not "1843"; *Cooper's Journal*, 1850, not "1850, etc."; *The Freethinker's Magazine* 1850-1, not "1850, etc." *The Freethinker's Information for the People* is given by Mr. Robertson as "undated; after 1841." Here he is right; but by internal evidence we have succeeded in dating it: the first number appeared on March 5, 1842; the last on March 11, 1843. It ran therefore for almost exactly one year, though Mr. Robertson says (*History*, p. 75), "two years." The omissions of importance from this list are too numerous for mention in a footnote; we will give two only: *The Isis* (1832), memorable on several counts, the chief one being the name of the Editress, Eliza Sharples Carlile; *The Secular Review*, later *The Agnostic Journal* (1876-1906), edited at first by G. J. Holyoake, and later by Charles Watts and "Saladin."

So anxious is the Rev. Bouchier to enforce his "message," that he quotes Queen Victoria in like vein. When asked by a stranger for "the secret of her country's greatness," the Queen crossed the room and returned with a Bible in her hand. "This book has made my people what they are," she said.

Whether mere "reverence for the Scriptures," or the interpretation thereof provides the essential principle and driving force necessary for the founding of Empires is an interesting point on which our broadcast speaker does not throw any light. It can hardly depend upon interpretation, however, in view of the woeful lack of unanimity so characteristic of Biblical investigation.

A disunited front would not make for successful effort towards territorial expansion!

Is this the way to sue for World Peace?—to vaunt our greatness from the pulpit, disguised as the Will of God, and to broadcast it to the world? Have the B.B.C. authorities no sense of proportion that they permit such pernicious rubbish free expression confirmed by official publication, and yet obstinately refuse opportunities for the frank and open discussion of religious questions?

In conclusion, the Rev. Bouchier warns us that "we neglect the Bible at our peril," a pessimistic prophecy which he, no doubt, interprets as presaging the initial crumbling and final downfall of the British Empire.

For fear the Rev. Bouchier should, at any future date, experience difficulty in selecting suitable subjects for his sermons, I venture to suggest that he will find sufficient opportunity for the exercise of his eloquence in the fifth verse of the fifth chapter of St. Matthew: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth."

M. COLVIN.

### Amongst the Ruins.

TOUCHED by the subtle alchemy of the evening light, the grey stone walls glowed as if plated with gold; the gold of blood-money, stained crimson with a thousand crimes. In graceful flight around the old tower, the jackdaws circled, with barely perceptible movements of their outstretched wings. Monotonous but soothing notes issued from their wide-open bills, the deep caws of the adults, harmonizing with the shriller tones of the young. Occasionally, one alighted nearby and, with bright, curious glancings from his diamond eyes, investigated the human figure lying there outstretched. A flutter of wings: a flirt of the tail; and he soared again to join his brethren circling overhead. A light haze gathered in the dale below, mounting slowly the steep hillside. The limestone boulders appeared like crouching animals, in the deepening twilight, or the backs of dolphins visible for a moment above the waves. The poet lay dreaming, as poets will; his body lying there supine, but his mind, on the wings of Fancy, sped down the echoing vault of the vanished years. And many forms he called, and conversed with; the spirits of the mighty dead. And each, for him, had some one thing to tell: the philosophers some moral tale of how men lived and loved in olden times: the poets, poured forth for him, in rich and diverse melodies, the glories of their ancient songs. And, even in the shades, he found—so restless is the mind of man—the sages still were building systems for the salvation of their kind: the poets, singing verses as yet not given to the world. . . . And long he stayed, conversing, hearing many things, and asking each if they could give some word to act as beacon for his guidance through the World of Life. And much advice they gave, with wise and gentle noddings of the head; on how to live, and how to die. And, as they sped by, one by one, he heard a voice from out the ruck. . . . "But two things, mortal, dost thou need. . . . Fear nothing; and have tolerance, too, and pity; let thy pity be unbounded, and thy tolerance as wide and all-embracing as the sea." The last dim shade had vanished; then one came by, and stood before him, and he knew it not, and thought. . . . what could it be, this strange, wild-looking thing; this polyglot. . . . And he looked, and saw its naked form was smoothly rounded like to that of womankind; but the

lower limbs were harsh, and strong, and clothed with long brown hair; and hooves were for its feet in the stead of toes; above the waist rose large and firm white breasts, but the skin was scarred and fleshed with many wounds from which the blood flowed down: and its smile was as the smile of Mona Lisa; half pitiful; half ironic; while the eyes, twin flames, shone glowing with the light of thought; upon its brow, a crown of thorns, encircling, tore the quivering marble flesh. . . .

The poet hailed it, where it passed, saying. . . . "Stay, I prithee, stranger Spirit; converse awhile and tell me what thou art; why this so sad and pitiful mien?" The Spirit answered, and its voice was mellow as a golden flute, soft blowing from behind the Hills of Death. . . . "I am the Genius of Humanity. Say on, what thou wouldst ask. I know not everything, but that I know, will gladly answer thee. Say on, my time is short." And the poet spoke, with quivering lips, and many a question of the past he asked, and had reply; and then. . . . "What meaning has the race of Man?" "Whence come we here, and why?" The Spirit smiled with gentle pity, answering. . . . "Seek for this that thou wouldst know, where the scorpion and the scorpion make their home, amongst the monuments of Egypt's former greatness: let thy wandering footsteps guide thee hence, to Mexico, to where the red blood flowed erstwhile, in continuous streams, along the gutters of the Temple of the Sun: then wend thee back to Greece and Rome, and take thy wandering way amid the marble ruins of their long vanished glory: and, if thou hearest nought; no whispering voice to tell thee what thou seekest; go hence again and lean with listening ears against the barrows of Upsala, or sit and watch the sun rise o'er the altars of Stonehenge. Thou, who art a poet, will find there what thou seekest." The Spirit voice was silent. "But this, all this, and more, already have I done," the poet cried, "And many things have been revealed, but one, and that I fain would know." "Tell me, tell me, or I die. What is the future of Humanity? What do the years, as yet unborn, hold for us still, of weal or woe?" The last rays of the dying sun fled laughing down the sky: the sough of the wind swept along through the fir wood and over the hill: the jackdaws cawed derisively: and a fool waited for an answer, in the dark.

JOSEPH MARAH.

### "Goodwill Towards Men."

EVERYBODY who has tried to work with Christians "for common ends" finds in nine cases out of ten that the Christian double-crosses him. The splendid exceptions deserve our appreciation, but indeed we should appreciate them less if we found more fellowship and loyalty amongst the common Christians.

Christians can no doubt organize amongst themselves. There may be a determined crusade to sink minor and sectarian differences in order that "The Free Churches," or "The Evangelicals," or even on some rare occasions, "The Christian Churches" may speak with one voice.

As a rule the Christians do not invite or welcome outside co-operation in public affairs. Generally their idea of education is Christian propaganda: of charity, a means for bringing the poor, the sick, and the bereaved into the Christian fold. Christians, like other people, differ in politics, but whether Conservative, Liberal or Labour, the Christians expect their politics to further the interests of their creed. Many frankly admit it.

Lord Phillimore repudiated the idea that he objected to Turkish "atrocities on humanitarian grounds. He confessed that his duty as a citizen was "first to the household of faith." He pitied the Armenians because they were Christian victims of a non-Christian Government.

Christians will never agree to non-Christian chaplaincies, or relinquish their own monopolist prerogatives in army, navy, hospital, prison or asylum. They have divested such universal memorials as the many war-monuments, into the narrowest credal advertisements.

In America a few years ago, some doubtless well-meaning men met together to found what they called "The Goodwill Movement between Jews and Christians."

Seeing that Jesus was a Jew, and that the Christian

persecutions of the Jews form one of the bloodiest chapters in all history, this ought to have been a very interesting "movement."

For five years there have been regular meetings between the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

The United Presbyterian General Assembly began long ago to criticize severely the Christian section for its alleged "liberality" towards Jews. The Presbyterians, being one of the units forming the Federal Council "put on the screw" by depriving the Council of half its annual subsidy.

Possibly the Presbyterian objections have led to a more truly Christian spirit inspiring the Federal Council. The Jews have come to the conclusion that the only "good-will" on the part of the Christians consists of sponsoring and assisting the crudest forms of proselytizing. They have used the "goodwill" movement as a means to encourage the missionary activities of Christians (or rather of Protestant Christians) amongst American Jews.

In effect the Christians plead guilty to this despicable meanness, which was apparently the sole object of their identification with the movement. A Jewish member of the movement accused the Christian section of "using the organization as a smoke-screen for converting Jews to Christianity."

It now transpires that a Protestant minister, the Rev. Anthony, started this movement while he was Secretary of a proselytizing society, and cleverly roped in the Rabbis by cant and hypocritical pretences such as Christians have always indulged in. Faced with the direct accusation, the Rev. Mr. Anthony admits that he "would never give up the attempt to spread the Christian gospel among the Jews."

One marvels at the credulity of Jewish Rabbis and others who can be so easily taken in by those tricksters.

The fact is that Rabbis, like many other good people, do not realize that the difference between Christian and Jew, at any rate in England and America, is entirely a question of religious intolerance and its results.

Norman Angel and many Jews deny this. The Jewish newspaper *Forward* (U.S.A.) claims that "To-day the world is in the grip of the cult of nationalism. The reason for modern anti-Semitism is based on national prejudices rather than religious." Such a doctrine might apply to anti-Germanism in allied countries, and may apply generally to the Balkans against all foreigners without discrimination. But the United States population consists mainly of foreigners naturalized or otherwise. It has a big population of aliens of all kinds. None of its alien immigrants are subjected to national prejudices. Colour is another question. Even Germans, against whose nation America recently waged war, are in no sense an unpopular people in the U.S.A.

The Jewish newspaper is satirical in dismissing "the ridiculous idea that Jews are still looked upon with disfavour, because somewhere sometime our remote ancestors are alleged to have betrayed Jesus."

It may be ridiculous, it is probably even untrue, that Jews betrayed Jesus, but the allegation was used for centuries to excuse persecution, and the Christians of to-day have inherited the bigotry, but not the power of their Christian ancestors.

Some American Jews are raising a fund to build a great Jewish university in U.S.A. Why? Because there are so many Christian universities, that non-Christians (not Jews alone) suffer from Christian administration of educational centres. The Jews will only add another religious college to the many already existent. It may inflame rather than allay Christian prejudice. What a pity these Jews will not join hands, as many Jews are beginning to do, with Freethinkers, to promote the cause of Secular education. Secular education is the real remedy for anti-semitism.

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH.

We reap what we sow, but Nature has love over and above that justice, and gives us shadow and blossom and fruit that springs from no planting of ours.

George Eliot.

## Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER,"

### IRELAND AND THE PAPACY.

SIR,—The letter of appreciation by J. Tullin, in the current issue, extolling the recent article "The Pope's Green Island," by P. Murphy, must surely reflect the considered opinion of every reader.

Although the *Freethinker* very wisely excludes politics, yet it must be apparent to every citizen, that in the case of Ireland can be discerned the handiwork and the subterranean methods of the political Jesuit, or the Jesuitical politician—whichever you prefer.

As a youth, I was a great, but mistaken, admirer of W. E. Gladstone, he who threw down the gauntlet of "Home Rule for Ireland." I never could then understand why Queen Victoria disliked him—a man of undoubted erudition, who appeared, in addition, to be actuated by high ideals and humanitarian principles. But was he so actuated? The sagacious old Queen thought differently. She *knew*. While she was Queen of all the Britons she would be mistress in her own house, and did not intend to play second fiddle to any foreign potentate masquerading as the Vicar of Christ on Earth. In this respect, upon Queen Victoria fell the mantle of the redoubtable Henry VIII, King of all the Britons, whether by *Dei Gratia* or *Diabolus Gratia*.

The lessons of history had not been forgotten. For many years the life of Queen Elizabeth was not safe for an hour from the hand of Rudolf, who, with his secret confederacy, headed by the then Duke of Norfolk, was bribed by Pope Pius V to assassinate her. This Papal ruffian, whose bloody hands were stained with the murder of thousands, was canonized by the Church! A Holy God Almighty.

Ireland has got Home Rule—at a price. She has exchanged the "Curse o' Cron'll" for the ten times greater curse of an oppressive Church which demands its votaries to hand over their heart and soul and body, and to slavishly sacrifice their freedom of intellect and conscience, or—be damned!

But great numbers of the Irish, joenlar though their Gaelic character be, cannot see the joke. Their reputed native wit fails them. In consequence, they are leaving Erin by the hundreds. So great has been the influx into Scotland, particularly Glasgow, of impecunious Irish, who are subsisting upon parochial relief, that the harrassed local authorities are reviewing the whole question with grave concern.

Others are coming further south and flooding the navying and building trades, at a lower wage are ousting the hatred Saxon. Great Scotland Yard, I understand, receives increasing applications from Irish immigrants anxious to join the Constabulary here. Is there no particular meaning in all this, or is it "according to plan—Papal plan?"

And here's another view-angle. The Empire Marketing Board is by posters pushing the sale in England of Irish Produce. Though I strongly disapprove commercial boycotts, I ignore that aspect of the Empire call of patriotism. A boycott usually has its rise in pique, as in the case of Napoleon's Continental essay against England. It can be only temporary in any case, and usually hurts the originator the more. Circumstances differ, however. Under the present regime of the Irish Papal State, with the thumb of the Church at the throat of the people, and when such a large proportion of the income of the State, goes directly or indirectly into the coffers of the Church, one is reluctant, by inter-trading, to support a religious system which in its essence is the very personification of greed and brutality, and the very negation of regard and love for humanity.

That article, "The Pope's Green Island," would make a most influential leaflet for free distribution. Therein are facts which would make every individual elector, whatever his or her political creed may be, think—and think hard.

Let us hear from yez again, Paddy Murphy, me bhoy.

ARTHUR HUGHES.

## SCIENCE AND SCIENTISTS.

SIR,—I am much obliged to Mr. R. B. Kerr for calling attention to the mistake, which has been corrected by an erratum slip in the paragraph he quotes from my "Human Migration and the Future." The figures for the urban populations were omitted from the typescript, and the figures for the metropolitan population of the three countries read as those of the urban population.

Owing to the proofs having been passed at the time when I was preoccupied in other work, I did not notice the omission which made nonsense of the sentence and omitted the intended comparison between the urban and metropolitan populations of the three countries.

J. W. GREGORY.

## National Secular Society.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE MEETING HELD AUGUST 30, 1929.

THE President, Mr. Chapman Cohen, in the chair.

Also present: Messrs. Quinton, Moss, Dobson, Wood, Silvester, Corrigan, Hornibrook, Easterbrook, Mrs. Quinton, Junr., Miss Kough, and the Secretary.

A number of apologies for absence, owing to holidays were read.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and accepted, and the monthly financial statement presented.

The President reported legal advice concerning the police and the right of public meetings had been obtained, and the speaker concerned had been instructed.

New members were admitted for West London, Bethnal Green, and the Parent Society.

A suggestion from Liverpool, that Mr. G. Whitehead conducts a week's open-air work, prior to the first Picton Hall meeting, was agreed to.

A number of minor matters were discussed and the meeting closed.

R. H. ROSETTI,  
General Secretary.

## Society News.

EIGHT meetings were addressed by Mr. George Whitehead in the Manchester district. The meeting held at Alexandra Park passed off with none of the unpleasant interruptions witnessed here on previous occasions although many questions were asked. Fair sales of literature were registered. The two meetings held on the Sunday, in Stevenson Square, were also successful, several friends being present from Bolton, Ashton and other places. A large number of specimen *Freethinkers* were distributed. The two meetings held in Salford were not too well attended, the rain interfering somewhat on one occasion. The three meetings held near All Saints Church were quite good, the Catholics being well represented. Some of their questions and remarks were more reminiscent of a barrack-room than redolent of piety, and the flames of the Inquisition seem to still smoulder in their sweet souls. On Saturday, September 7, Mr. Whitehead commences a fortnight's campaign in Glasgow.

## LECTURES IN N.E. LANCASHIRE.

The meeting at Nelson, on Wednesday, became very lively at question time. Questions and opposition were still forthcoming when we had to apply the closure at almost 10 p.m., in order to catch the train home. A gentleman followed us to the station to tell us about the inner light that he possessed, although he had kept the matter to himself at the lecture. Good meetings were held at Todmorden on Thursday, Cliviger on Friday, and Hapton on Sunday Afternoon. On Sunday night we had a very attentive hearing from a big crowd at Clitheroe, where we had previously had police interference. On this occasion the meeting was in no way interfered with.

J.C.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

Lecture notices must reach 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.5, by the FIRST POST ON TUESDAY, or they will not be inserted.

## LONDON.

## INDOOR.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (The London Institution Theatre, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.2): 11.0, H. W. Nevins—"The English Gentleman."

## OUTDOOR.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 12.30, Mr. J. Hart; 3.30, Messrs. E. Betts and B. A. Le Maine; 6.30, Messrs. A. H. Hyatt and B. A. Le Maine. Freethought meetings every Wednesday at 7.30, Messrs. C. Tuson and J. Hart; every Friday at 7.30, Mr. B. A. Le Maine. The *Freethinker* may be obtained during our meetings outside the Park Gates, Bayswater Road.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Ravenscourt Park, Hammersmith): 3.45, Messrs. C. Tuson and J. Hart.

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

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common): 12.30, Mr. L. Ebury; Brockwell Park, 6.30, Mr. F. Mann; Wednesday, Clapham Old Town, 8.0, Mr. F. P. Corrigan; Liverpool Street, Camberwell Gate, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Regent's Park, near the Fountain): 6.0, Mr. L. Ebury—A Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Outside Technical College, Romford Road, Stratford, E.): 7.0, Mr. J. J. Darby.—A Lecture.

STREATHAM COMMON BRANCH N.S.S., 6.30, Mr. H. Preece—A Lecture.

FINSBURY PARK BRANCH N.S.S., 11.15, Mr. H. Preece—A Lecture.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA BRANCH N.S.S. (corner of Shorlands Road, North End Road): Saturday, 8.0; Effie Road, Walham Green Station, Sunday, 8.0—Various Speakers.

## COUNTRY.

## OUTDOOR.

MR. J. T. BRIGHTON will lecture at the following places: Friday, September 6, Queen Street, Spennymoor, 7.15; Saturday, September 7, Anthony Street, Stanley, 7.15; Thursday September 12, White Lion, Houghton, 7.15.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE BRANCH N.S.S. (Town Moor, near North Road entrance): 7.0, Messrs. Atkinson and T. Brighton. A good assortment of literature on sale. Members, please rally up.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S. (Beaumont Street): Monday, September 9, at 7.30, Mr. J. V. Short.—A Lecture.

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S.—Ramble to Douglas Moor. Meet at Hillfoot Car Terminus at 11 o'clock prompt.

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S.—Mr. George Whitehead will lecture from September 7, and during the week following.

## Miscellaneous Advertisements.

MR. B. O'CONNELL, who intends returning to England from India early next year, will be pleased to hear from some Freethinker interested in poultry farming in or near suburbs of London. Is prepared to put in about £200, as well as assist generally, and keep the accounts.—Apply, Box A 16, FREETHINKER, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

WANTED—Man or woman to address envelopes on the typewriter or in clear handwriting, at home or in our office.—Apply, LYCEUM INSTITUTE, 85, New Oxford Street, London, W.C.1.

## 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.)

# 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 arguments 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

# PRIESTCRAFT:

A Study of the Exploitation of the Religious Sentiment

BY

C. R. BOYD FREEMAN

MR. FREEMAN writes with the gloves off, and does not mince matters when handling what is really one of the greatest curses from which modern civilization suffers.

PRICE 6/-, postage 3d.

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

# FOUR LECTURES on FREETHOUGHT and LIFE

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Four Lectures delivered in the Secular Hall, Leicester, on November 4th, 11th, 18th and 25th, 1928.

Contains lectures on: The Meaning and Value of Freethought; Freethought and God; Freethought and Death; Freethought and Morals.

Price - One Shilling. Postage 1½d.

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

# Grammar of Freethought.

A Statement of the Case for Freethought, including a Criticism of Fundamental Religious Doctrines.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Cloth Bound 5s.

Postage 3½d.

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 *Freethinker* 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 largest subscribers, it has since been resolved to increase the Trust to a round £10,000, and there is every hope of this being done within a reasonably short time.

The Trust may be benefited by donations of cash, or shares already held, or by bequests. All contributions 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 concerning 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 Freethought 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.

## Two Books for Thinkers.

# MIND AND REALITY

— AND —

# LIFE, MIND & KNOWLEDGE

— BY —

J. C. THOMAS, B.Sc.

(Keridon).

The Rt. Hon. J. M. ROBERTSON is in full agreement with the Author's philosophic attitude, and highly appreciates the "pungency and alertness of his handling and especially his strictures on the Metaphysician."

Price, 6d. each.

Postage for the 2 copies 2½d.

# DETERMINISM OR FREE-WILL?

An Exposition of the Subject in the Light of the Doctrines of Evolution.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Half-Cloth, 2/6.

Postage 2½d.

SECOND EDITION.

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

## The Bible and Prohibition.

# BIBLE and BEER

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

By G. W. FOOTE.

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

Price - - - - - TWOPENCE.  
Postage ½d.

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

## CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY

With a Chapter on Christianity and the Labour Movement. Portrait and Illustration of the —slave-ship "Brooke."—

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price - - - - - ONE SHILLING. Postage 1d.

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

## PAINE THE PIONEER

# Life of Thomas Paine

By F. J. GOULD

GILT CLOTH PORTRAIT PUBLISHED 4/6 NET.

Price 2/- Postage 3d.

Only a limited number of copies available.

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

# The Secular Society, Ltd.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 62 FARRINGTON ST., LONDON, E.C.4.

Secretary: MR. R. H. ROSETTI.

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 Bequest.*—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. R. H. ROSETTI, 62 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Evolution for the Young.

## Prehistoric Man and His Ancestors

By ONA MELTON.

Cloth with 5 Plates.

Price - - - - - 1s. 6d. Postage 1½d. extra.

## MATERIALISM: HAS IT BEEN EXPLODED?

Verbatim Report of Debate between

Chapman Cohen and C. E. M. Joad.

One Shilling Net. Postage 1½d.

Revised by both Disputants.

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