

# SOME MISTAKES IN DETERMINISM.

The

# FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

VOL. XLIX.—No. 42.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1920

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
Some Mistakes in Determinism.—The Editor	- 657
The Nature of The Physical World.—Reply to Mr. Chapman Cohen.—A. S. Eddington	- 658
Blind Man's Bluff.—Mimmermus	- 660
The Keystone of Christianity.—Andrew Millar	- 661
Man's Resemblance to the Ape.—T. F. Palmer	- 667
Bishop Barnes on The Church and Modernism.—Arthur B. Moss	- 668
The Higher Power.—Alan Tyndal	- 669

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

## Views and Opinions.

### Some Mistakes in Determinism.

It is interesting to find Sir Herbert Samuel confessing, in the *Journal of Philosophical Studies*, that he was led to the study of philosophy through politics. The confession does credit to his intelligence. To the bulk of politicians one may safely assume that philosophy is a sealed book, and the philosopher a dreamy impracticable sort of a fellow whose occupation serves, on a higher scale, much the same sort of thing as a game of ping-pong or the solution of crossword puzzles. It is a thing with which "practical men"—a synonym, in most cases for short-sighted ignoramuses—have no concern. "The Republic" of Plato could have taught them better, so could so get-at-able a work as Spencer's *Study of Sociology*. But from what one reads and hears and sees of politicians, Plato and Spencer count but for very little in either their thoughts or their councils.

It is because of this that we find men "settling" questions of national consequence which involve considerations of psychology, history, and—one must whisper it—philosophy, in complete ignorance of what they are doing. Of course, here and there in the political world are men who realize that in dealing with masses of human beings, with all that lies behind and is involved in each mass, you are dealing with fundamental qualities of human nature, and that the philosopher, and not the vote-catching politician holds the key to them. But the majority of politicians are just simple, uninstructed vote-catching men, alive to the needs of the moment, and that is all. The consequence is—the present state of Europe, and the world.

\* \* \*

### Man and His Makers.

Sir Herbert's article deals with the question of Determinism, and in the succeeding—and current—issue there appears an essay on the same subject by Dr. B. M. Laing. Both discuss difficulties that would

have no existence to either of them if they had but visualized Determinism correctly for themselves instead of following the confused statements of other people. Sir Herbert writes as a convinced Determinist, and so, I think does Dr. Laing, although his position is not quite clear. The former says:—

The causes that have shaped us have been incalculable in their number. Any man may have a million persons among his direct ancestors in the last thousand years, and he may have inherited characteristics from any one of them. The separate influences which have affected him on any day that he has lived may be numbered by thousands . . . They spread out, and they stretch back through time, beyond the range of computation and even of imagination. If any of them had been different, the man would be different, in however minute a degree . . . Each human personality, then, is the outcome of hundreds, thousands, millions of causes, crowding upon each other and intermingling; sometimes reinforcing one another, sometimes in mutual opposition, some powerful, some weak, some beneficial, some harmful.

There is no doubt of Sir Herbert's position on the general question.

\* \* \*

### What is Responsibility?

Sir Herbert Samuel's difficulty has to do with an attempted reconciliation of what is called freedom of choice with Determinism. Dr. Laing's difficulty is connected with that of responsibility. Sir Herbert says that everyone who has tried to think out things is "faced constantly with the problem of individual responsibility." Starting by "accepting in its essentials the determinist position . . . How can we reconcile this principle with the fact that we choose between this and that every moment of the day? . . . So, too, the power of choice is for us, a fact. On the plane of the universe, and from the standpoint of the philosopher, things are determined; on the plane of daily life and from the standpoint of the ordinary man, there is free will." This is the difficulty Sir Herbert seeks to solve in his article.

Dr. Laing's article deals with the assumed difficulty of reconciling Determinism with responsibility, and finally he solves the problem by asserting that freedom exists "where the individual acts with a full consciousness of everything relevant to his action," which, I think, is not a true statement of the nature of freedom, and certainly does not express the meaning of responsibility, since if that were so, no one could be free, the person whose knowledge approached omniscience, if he did not actually reach it.

\* \* \*

### Freedom and Responsibility.

I have dealt with each of these issues in *Determinism and Free Will*, but I think it will serve a useful purpose to deal again briefly with each of them as

raised by these two writers. Dr. Laing's fundamental error lies in making freedom consist of a knowledge of certain psychological processes, whereas it has nothing at all to do with it. Strictly, as Bain pointed out very many years ago, "Freedom" belongs to sociology, it is what Kant would call a contingent truth. A man is free when he acts as his nature—which includes all the factors named by Sir Herbert Samuel—prompts him to act. He is not free when he is constrained to act contrary to his nature through force exerted from the outside. A thief is "free" to steal if there is no one present to prevent his stealing. It has nothing at all to do with the determination of his actions in a strictly scientific sense. A nation is a free nation, not because there is an absence of determination, but only so far as its "laws," the movements of its members, are not ruled and determined by the arbitrary decrees of some other nation. In every case freedom implies the absence of a non-essential, arbitrary constraint. So soon as the terms are carefully defined, particularly with reference to the historical significance of freedom, it is realized that the confusion arises through importing into science and philosophy a term which has relevance only to the phenomena of social structures.

Dr. Laing says of responsibility:—

This idea is in practice expressed in the form of approval and disapproval, and in a doctrine of rewards and punishments. Moral judgments, as well as law and administration of law, repose, or at any rate have repose, on this idea, Determinism has never been admitted.

This is not true. The significance of responsibility at law is quite clear. A person is responsible for his actions when it can be shown that he is so far normal as to be, or can be made to be, fully conscious of the consequences of his actions. Thus, a child who killed a man by emptying a dose of prussic acid into a cup of tea which the man afterwards drank would not be legally responsible for the man's death. An epileptic who caused a man serious harm by kicking him while in a fit, would not be held responsible for the injury. As a matter of fact, Dr. Laing admits this when he says that the individual will be held responsible when he is capable of appreciating what is significant and important for social life. But surely this implies that far from Determinism never having been admitted, it is implied all the time. The opposite of Determinism is not "Freedom," but "uncaused." If that simple consideration had been borne in mind, I think Dr. Laing would have written differently.

\* \* \*

#### Freedom of Choice.

The confusion over the question of choice is rather more gross. Because the Determinist holds that choice, like everything else is determined by definite and understandable conditions it is assumed there can be no freedom of choice. I do not know how many books I have read in which the writer argues against some mythical Determinist, that if Determinism is true there can be no freedom of choice, whereas as we know that we constantly choose between two or more things Determinism must be false. But no Determinist who understood his case ever questioned that there could exist and did exist freedom of choice. I agree that it is a fact of everyday experience. To say that I choose, and to say that my choice selects one course out of several is to say the same thing twice over. To choose is to select, to select is to choose, and the fact of choice is so patent that I can conceive no one but a fool ever questioning its reality. Freedom of choice is a fact, and it exists just so long as I am able to act in the direction

my choice indicates. If I prefer a banana to an apple, and I am permitted to take one or the other, then my choice is free because no one interferes with its expression. But if I am forced to accept an apple while preferring a banana, then my choice is not free, and there is an end of the matter.

There has never been any discussion as to freedom of choice with those who understood Determinism. The question at issue is the determination of choice, which is quite a distinct question. The determination of choice is a question of scientific fact, it is determined by a multitude of circumstances such as Sir Herbert Samuel notes. But freedom of choice is a question of social freedom. It is whether I am permitted to indulge my taste in this or that direction. It says nothing whatever as to how the existence of this particular choice comes into existence. What a lot of trouble would be saved if people would but look at a problem through their own eyes instead of through the eyes of others!

CHAPMAN COHEN.

## The Nature of The Physical World.

### A Reply to Mr. Chapman Cohen.

I HAVE not hitherto replied to any unfavourable criticisms of my book, *The Nature of the Physical World* or my Swarthmore Lecture *Science and the Unseen World*. If my contentions are of value they will ultimately find their proper level without continual parental intervention to save them from determined opponents—and, perhaps it should be added, from over enthusiastic friends. Mr. Chapman Cohen's five articles have, however, tempted me to break silence. He is a downright opponent; at the same time he is a fair-minded opponent, anxious to avoid misrepresenting my meaning, and too sincere to strive after merely verbal triumphs. In such a case there is an inducement to try to elucidate the position.

I have attempted to expound the conception of the physical universe reached through present-day theories, and to examine how this new conception reacts on our general philosophic outlook and on the tenability of religious belief. The passages quoted by Mr. Cohen make it clear that I do not suggest that the new physics "proves religion" or indeed gives any positive grounds for religious faith. But it gives strong grounds for an idealistic philosophy which, I suggest, is hospitable towards a spiritual religion, it being understood that the guest must provide his own credentials. In short the new conception of the physical universe puts me in a position to defend religion against a particular charge, viz., the charge of being incompatible with physical science. It is not a general panacea against atheism. I have to make clear something of the nature and content of the religious outlook that I am defending; but there my task ends. If this is understood, many of the points raised by Mr. Cohen answer themselves—why, for example, "science" in my writings is usually restricted (quite explicitly) to physical science. It explains my "great readiness to take the present standing of certain theories of physics as being final"; anybody can defend religion against science by speculating on the possibility that science may be mistaken. It explains why I sometimes take the essential truth of religion for granted; the soldier whose task is to defend one side of the fort must assume that the defenders of the other side have not been overwhelmed.

The chief thing that has struck me in these articles is the obscurity caused by vague use of the word "materialism." It might be said that "religion" is also a vague term; but at least I have made it clear that my variety of religion contains elements obnoxious to Mr. Cohen, whereas I am altogether in doubt whether his variety of materialism contains any elements obnoxious to me. He reproves defenders of materialism for having set out to "express all biological and psychological phenomena in terms of laws of chemistry and physics and so essayed an impossible task." "Of course we cannot explain everything in terms of physics; of course there are regions where the laws of physics are not wholly applicable." This happens to be the position I set out to establish. If Mr. Cohen remarks that he has been preaching it for thirty years, he will find my answer already given: "It is not a question of asserting a faith that science must ultimately be reconcilable with an idealistic view, but of examining how at the moment it actually stands in regard to it." His agreement with me is almost embarrassing: "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) . . ." Surely it is Mr. Cohen who has overlooked my chapter on World-Building with its contention that the great laws of field-physics are attributable to selection by mind. I even use the same word "creative" in referring to this mental element in our physical laws.

I confess that I do not see why, holding these views, Mr. Cohen calls himself a Materialist. If this is Materialism, what views must one hold to be an anti-Materialist? Apparently he attaches importance to the fact that the domain of experience which is outside physical science is nevertheless within the sphere of other sciences; he harps on it continually. (This will have the hearty assent of those who claim that theology is the "Queen of the Sciences.") But there is nothing hostile to the religious outlook in the suggestion that spiritual experience has a science of its own, and that its basis—its God—is a scientific entity; there is hostility in the suggestion that it belongs to physical science, and that its God is physical machinery. There is nothing surprising in the fact that a religious person rarely alludes to God as a scientific entity; Mr. Cohen presumably believes that I am some kind of scientific entity; but he is polite enough not to fling this irrelevant epithet at me, in his dealings with me.

"Wherever science rules the mechanistic conception rules." Having rebuked those who limit science to physical science, Mr. Cohen now seems to join their ranks. It is physics that has supplied the mechanistic conception and is the recognized exponent of it. Behaviour which is not determined by physical law is not the behaviour of a machine. Notice the result. Mr. Cohen has spread the net of science wide enough to include our spiritual experience; now, having secured the prey, science is narrowed down again and becomes identified with the mechanistic conception. He confuses the issue still more by dragging in the word Emergence, which might provide for any failure of mechanism—from the gathering of grapes from thistles to the doctrine of transubstantiation. He introduces it with an innocent example—the emergence of wetness when dry hydrogen and oxygen combine to form water. But no physicist would apply the term emergence to properties which are the direct consequence of the constitution which physical theory ascribes to the substance. It is a term likely to confuse those phenomena which the mechanistic theory accounts for with those it does not—the emergence of wetness from oxygen and hydrogen with the emergence of

thought and feeling from a somewhat more complex mixture of elements. Or, to take an example where the verdict of science is still in doubt, there is a definite scientific question whether the properties of living organisms are completely attributable to their physical constitution, so that (as Dr. Needham puts it) they differ in degree but not in kind from inorganic matter. To say that life *emerges* from inorganic matter merely conceals the question.

Rather than wander further into the ambiguity of Mr. Cohen's terminology I will state the essential problem in my own words. When we ask what science can tell us as to the nature and structure of the universe that we see around us, we must turn to the physicist for an answer. It is a physical universe, and physics is the science which delves into its ultimate constitution. It is no use turning to the biologists, for they have no "biological world" to bring forward in rivalry; they may be critical of the physicist's conception of the constitution of things, dissatisfied with it as an adequate basis for their own studies (as the Vitalists are); but they have not invented an alternative. Thus for our purposes the distinctive feature of physics is that the ultimate conceptions with which it deals can constitute a world—a world so complete in itself that the question arises whether it may not be the whole world. Its laws and entities describe an activity which already explains a large part of our experience and may be confidently expected to explain much more. Crude Materialism, which asserts that matter is the sole reality, has been replaced by a modern Materialism which asserts that the world built out of the concepts of physics is the sole reality—that the whole of experience is the interplay of these physical entities fulfilling the laws of physics, and that's all there is to it. That is the position I attempt to refute in my book. I cannot, of course, go over the arguments here. A certain difficulty arises because the conceptions, and to some extent the methods, of physics are still in a state of flux. For the way in which this difficulty can be met the reader must, I am afraid, tackle what I have written about "exact science." (I will only observe that Mr. Cohen's method of looking out the words "exact" and "science" in a dictionary, and putting the two meanings together will not help him to grasp the significance of "exact science.") But in any case we must presume that the Materialist, in asserting the all-sufficiency of physical or mechanistic conceptions, intends to rule out some conceptions as non-physical and non-mechanistic; otherwise he is merely asserting a truism; and in drawing the line the only guide is the boundary of physical science accepted at the present day.

Mr. Cohen deals at some length with my problem of "ought." He says, "of course, 'ought' takes us outside physics, but so does chemistry take us outside physics." The last statement is flatly denied by scientists; chemistry is entirely inside physics. The physicist accepts it as a matter of course that his theory of the atom must deal with its chemical behaviour as much as with its magnetic behaviour, and he ignores the historical accident that these two manifestations of atomic structure were once studied as separate sciences. Whether biology takes us outside chemistry is uncertain; the question will not be settled by Mr. Cohen's dogmatic affirmative. I am glad that he recognizes so promptly the aloofness of "ought" from physical conceptions, but his attempt to depreciate this aloofness as something frequently encountered in the extension of science breaks down. Having condemned me for dropping into the common teleological way of regarding a body as owing obedience to the laws of nature, he follows my example with the amazing addition that the movements

of bodies do not always do what they ought. "Exactitude is only accomplished *in vacuo*." Not at all; we believe that the laws of motion are obeyed as exactly in disturbed systems as *in vacuo*. The purpose of the physical theory of the atom, for example, is not to exhibit the atom as a thing in itself, but to exhibit its mode of interaction with surrounding atoms. The simple, but highly abstract, problems of uniform motion in a straight line which are treated at the beginning of physics only pave the way to the essential subject matter *interaction*; indeed it is the modern view that prediction of physical phenomena is only exact when a very large number of interacting elements are concerned.

Surely the problem of "ought" is plain enough. Consider the whole universe which moves with no interference from forces extraneous to itself (a point which Mr. Cohen will appreciate). It conforms to every law of physics or (again to suit Mr. Cohen) to every mechanistic law of nature. Therefore, there is no possible excuse for saying that it does anything it ought not to do. Yet there is one part of the universe, namely Prof. Eddington, which according to Mr. Cohen has done something it ought not to do; and he has written five articles to point this out. How can he, as a Mechanist, maintain this? He compares my delinquency with that of a moving body, say the earth, which describes the orbit prescribed for it by laws of nature instead of moving uniformly in a straight line—a standard supplied by the "creative imagination." I still do not see why the contemplation of my mental orbit should inspire in Mr. Cohen a desire to alter it; nor why the reader who watches our respective gyrations should be stimulated to judge between us any more than the astronomer is stimulated to judge between Venus and Jupiter. Finally, he advances the hypothesis, which will stagger educationalists, that "laws of logic are based on the way in which the human brain would function if it moved . . . free from all counteracting influences." I am not sure whether "counteracting influences" comprise, for example, articles in the *Freethinker*, or whether the term refers to interference from neighbouring body-cells. Mr. Cohen's statement means nothing until he tells us which external influences are to be regarded as counteracting the brain's logical functioning, and which are supporting it by keeping it alive. At present his assertion is equivalent to "laws of logic are based on the way the human brain would function if it moved free from influences which make it function illogically." I presume that Mr. Cohen does not intend to class *all* extraneous influences as "counteracting"; for in that case this perfectly logical brain would be both uneducated and unable to live.

Let me turn from Mr. Cohen to the reader. You have seen the wonders of scientific invention and machinery. You know something of the way in which science has exposed in the stars, in the flowers, in the body, and in the brain itself the same principles of machinery and unerring movement. If you are scientifically inclined you will revel in the simplicity, the just-rightness, of the machinery which underlies the varied phenomena around us. But sometimes the admiration changes to anxiety. Is it *all* machinery? Are we too machines that strut and talk and fight and laugh as the hand of time turns the handle beneath us? We had dreamt that we were different; nevertheless we want, not dreams, but the truth. Yonder there are two talking machines (Mr. Cohen and Prof. Eddington) grinding out a flow of words. What does it matter to us whether one has a more standard pattern of machinery inside it than the other? We may standardize and classify these

machines and their products in an infinite variety of ways; but one does not go to the stake for a classification. Classification is not the answer to that impulse of "ought," which urges us to find the truth and reject the falsehood, whether it lead to peaceful trust or dire pessimism, whether to frank agnosticism or an unseen power. The vital urge that asks the question, is the answer to it. Is it all machinery? No, it is "ought" and "truth" that fill the horizon. These do not "emerge" from the physical machinery; they precede it. Prior to any mechanistic conception of the human spirit, we must conceive it in ourselves as truth-seeking and responsible in its judgments. A particular belief may correspond with a particular configuration of atoms in a brain-cell, but the mechanistic conception of the atoms cannot be transferred into a mechanistic conception of belief. The configuration of the atoms is an indifferent phenomenon; *the belief matters*.

A. S. EDDINGTON.

### Blind Man's Bluff.

"The rest is silence."—*Hamlet's dying words.*

"Are things what they seem?"

Or is visions about?

Is our civilization a failure?

Or is the Caucasian played out?"—*Bret Harte.*

Two things have ruffled me to-day. One is an advertisement of a chiropodist who offers to remove corns of all sizes for half price, and the other is a newspaper article by the Rev. Peter Green, chaplain to the King and canon of Manchester, who writes under the aggressive title: "There is Another Life." As I have no corns I cannot take advantage of a truly generous offer. Brother Green's article has disturbed me because, until now, I imagined the most confident people were citizens of that great Republic, where Christian martyrs dodge armed Prohibition agents in search of a drink.

A critic said of Macaulay the historian: "I wish I were as cock-sure of one thing as Tom Macaulay is of everything." And another critic, equally eminent, remarked that the famous historian wrote in a style in which it was impossible to be truthful. Macaulay, however, was an example of shrinking modesty compared with Brother Green, whose glib assurance would excite the envy of an American estate agent.

Consider the matter more closely. The question of human survival after death has interested mankind for thousands of years. Yet the scientific verdict is "not proven." But Brother Green knows all about the whole business. "There is another life," he chortles. No question about the matter at all! Is he not chaplain to the King, and is he not canon of Manchester? Misguided folk, like Sir Arthur Keith, who "still retain the preconceptions gained by them during their student years," may talk as much and as hard as they like, but Brother Green is, like Tennyson's brook "going on for ever," and his obedient congregation will pay their pew rents and follow him through the golden streets of Heaven.

According to this chaplain to the King, the "mechanical view of the universe is deader than Pharaoh." If Brother Green means that the old idea that the Hebrew deity made the world in six days, and then had a day off like any other mechanic is discredited, he may be right. He does not mean this, however, but is referring to the natural explanation of the universe as opposed to the alleged supernatural account given in one of the many Bibles of the world. Canon Green is really attacking the scientists, but, being innocent of science, he presses himself as clumsily as a pavement artist recoding the charms of a bloater.

"There are two views of the universe," continues the King's sapient chaplain. "One was advocated by Huxley, and regards the universe as a great machine." This view, "deader than Pharaoh," is superseded, and "Science has once again found room for freedom." And so Brother Green rambles on, like a quack doctor expatiating on the merits of a cure for lumbago, rheumatism, sciatica, and other pleasantries provided by an alleged providence for the paragon of animals and other mammals.

It is news that Professor Huxley regarded the universe as a gigantic sausage-machine, or any other mechanical contrivance. His life-work lay in popularizing the scientific knowledge of his day, particularly evolution, and he did this in language so choice that most professional authors would have given their ears to have written half as well. Darwinism has been succeeded by post-Darwinism, but the theory of evolution still holds the field, and only very un-instructed persons like Brother Green, and the inhabitants of Monkeyville, U.S.A., think otherwise.

Having cleared the conjuring-table of such paltry impediments as science, Brother Green rolls up his sleeves to show there is no deception, and produces the inevitable hat. "There are three things," he says, "which go together. They are god, moral freedom, and immortality," although the hasty printing of my copy of the newspaper suggests "immortality." If you let one of these precious things go you cannot long retain the other two, or your own balance. You will paint the town red, go to the devil, and finish up like the truly awful Robert Blatchford, who, according to Brother Green, led the attack on the Christian religion during parts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

It makes me feel like Napoleon crossing the Alps, and I am speculating just how my Freethought colleagues regard such history as written by a King's chaplain. Byron declared that military glory consisted in one's carcass manuring a foreign field, and in having one's name spelt wrong in the newspapers. Freethought and military glory appear to me to be in some way associated, for both ensure the pains of martyrdom without the palms of victory.

What has all this to do with immortality? Nothing at all. It is just utter nonsense; but Brother Green evidently imagines that it helps to advance the argument in favour of human survival. Like the sailor drinking ginger-beer, he gets "no forrader." At the end of his two-column article he falls back upon the patter of his profession by saying:—

"A future life must always be a matter of faith and not of absolute demonstration."

If it is, after all, but a matter of faith, why does the reverend gentleman head his article: "There is Another Life"? He has contradicted himself, and spouted as much nonsense as the limits of two columns permit. Remember, Brother Green is not a simple curate, but one of the higher ecclesiastics, and supposed to adorn the profession that he belongs to. At the head of the printed page he dangles his decorations, "chaplain to the King and canon of Manchester," just as seaside phrenologists style themselves "professors" and attach the greater part of the alphabet to their names. It is all a piece of bluff, and by no means artistically done. Yet it will not fail to "tickle the ears of the groundlings."

Priests may not be extraordinarily clever, but they are wonderful showmen and take very good care of themselves. As for the higher ecclesiastics, no class of man has a greater sense of personal comfort. Realize how these priests corner the good things of life. One only needs to remember the palaces and

town houses of the bishops, their seats in the House of Lords, their lengthy holidays at the Riviera and the sunshine spots of the world. Remember also that England is studded with rectories and vicarages, usually the most comfortable houses in their neighbourhood. Think of the derelict and half-empty churches of the City of London, and the handsome salaries paid to the priests, who emulate the lilies of the field because they toil not, neither do they spin.

Even the average "reverend" enjoys a comfortable livelihood, and lives in a nice house. He has just as much, or as little, work as he likes to do, and if he chooses to spend three-fourths of each day reading novels or visiting, there is no one to say him nay. The word "reverend," used in association with such men, is pure flunkeyism. To apply it to the common parson, or prelate, is as absurd as to apply the term "All Highest" or "Imperial Majesty" to the pious decadent who once controlled the destinies of the German people. With all our boasted talk of fraternity and equality it is high time that Democrats realized that priests are the hindmost of the reactionaries, and a public nuisance in a modern state.

Once, clerks in holy orders lorded it over their illiterate congregations, simply because they were clerks. Nowadays, this position is reversed. The clergy are seen to be badly educated. Doubtless, they know "a little Latin and less Greek," but of science and the broader aspects of modern education they are mostly ignorant. Yet, owing to the supineness of the electorate, these charlatans are permitted to control the education of this country, and thereby ensure respect for their sorry profession, and safeguard their salaries. In the gospel legend it is said that Christ rode on an ass. Now, as Heine wittily said "asses ride on Jesus Christ." Democracy can never be the real master of its fate so long as it tolerates in its midst a tyrannical clerical caste, lagging behind the best thoughts of the age in which we live. Priests are no more entitled to reverence than the woman who can show a blacker eye on a Saturday night than any other woman in her alley.

MIMNERMUS.

### The Keystone of Christianity.

HELL has been called the Bottomless Pit, yet there is no doubt it, not Christ, is the Christian Church's "one foundation"—or the Christ is important only as a bridge over, or rope to swing clear of, that terrifying and eternal gulf. The purely mundane and moral Jesus may be the operative exemplar in the lives of many less primitive Christians; but for a vast majority still, the free fire insurance given with this gifted son of God and man, gives him that supreme importance in the minds of the "fundamentalists" in pew and pulpit. Did not the old Scotchman declare: "A Kirk without a Hell's no' worth a damn!" And he was right; for there can be no doubt the Church's original purpose was to save souls from Hell. For any other kind of salvation the Church is about as helpful as our old funny friend the eager and "busy" clown in the circus ring; how he keeps "assisting" the supers from the rear, obstructing them in front, in perfect, if unconscious satyre, of those more imposing performers! In addition to the savage and semi-savage referred to, there is a numerous class of people who are indifferent to, or impatient, irritable, contemptuous of the idea of hell. "Yes," they say, "hell on earth; that's hell enough for me!" Yes, but this is to confuse the issue; these, and all others, have to be kept to the original Hell of Holy Scripture. All the others are granted and remediable. On one, and only one, is the world at issue, and the man who does not believe in it is no Christian.

The fact is, hell—I hate to mention it so often—is the foundation feature of the mosaic of Christian faith, the

keystone, as said. Feared at first, it is now almost one of the beatitudes; No hell, no heaven; no cross, no crown: So the Christian clings to the Cross, even the fiery one: *His* burden will fall! What of the others? Saved or damned; Thy will be done! It is well, it is well, with *my* soul! Holiness without hell is not a perfect state of blessedness, as recent observations of my own seem to prove: Encouraged, perhaps, by discussions in the great dailies, our local paper has been allowing letters on "Is There a Hell?" Even a leading article has inclined to the negative attitude—no doubt to the dismay of many good people to whom hell, or what it connotes, is dear. One says to the writer: "I admire your little Nature sketches, but don't like you on your controversial subjects." We bow gratefully to the conscious and unconscious compliment and hypocritically agree with our friend's judgment, knowing the germ of Freethought is in all the writing, and that the one kind of writing balances, even makes possible the other. Also, a worthy tradesman at his shop door, a reader and good churchman, sees us coming down the street and averts his head unusually: These little things tell, how, still to Scottish hearts, how dear is hell: How:—

"From the lone shieling and the misty island, mountains surround us and a waste of seas—  
But not enough as yet, it seems, in my land, to quench,  
tho' cooled a wee, Hell's ancient bleeze.

(Anon. adapted.)

ANDREW MILLAR.

### Be Not Discouraged.

I would say to all the younger people who are moved by ideals, and to all older people who have still some youth of spirit or mind, and who are still in vital touch with the on-going powers of life: Work out what is in you to the very utmost of your power, in the wisest way you can find of doing it. Whether what you hope to accomplish *will* be accomplished or not in the world, something very precious will be accomplished in you. Whatever good you are moved to do, do it with all your might. The engagement of your mind and soul in the service of a noble purpose is always worth while, whether it succeeds in the world or not.

Why does the world come to honour the sepulchre of the stoned prophet and read the writing of the rejected teacher? . . . One answer is that it is because the world has grown better in the meantime. Some great soul grasps a great idea far in advance of his age; he is inspired with it; his whole life is a passion to incarnate it. He is able to carry a few with him, but the multitude cannot rise, it is too high for them; they may even rebel, and the whole effort may be overwhelmed in the disaster of reaction. This is the failure, but the success is coming. That idea, so far as it is true, cannot be lost; and if winter ensues, the earth will keep the seed safe, and the spring is sure to come.

This is the history of great ideas, such as the idea of freedom, or the idea of religious toleration. However much opposed and overwhelmed for a time, they never die. They come up again and again. And they win the allegiance of the best men. So I would say to you who value freedom, do not let a reactionary government, do not let the apparent triumph of a dictator or a tyrant, in any place or in any period, weaken your allegiance to that freedom which is the prerogative of the human soul. There are times when your promised land looks altogether out of reach. Nevertheless keep your faces towards it and march on. Do not be discouraged by old men who have lost their faith and think they have grown sensible; who have taken the loss of faith for the attainment of wisdom . . . This is a blundering old world, but what has been done for it by the souls of the noble is not lost.—*Rev. T. Rhondda Williams.*

If I seem to be a tactless and inconsiderate "fighter," I pray you to remember that "conflict is the father of all things," and that the victory of pure reason over current superstition will not be achieved without a tremendous struggle.—*Ernst Haeckel.*

### Acid Drops.

Mr. J. H. Thomas paid a visit to Walthamstow last week for the purpose of conferring upon the town the dignity of a Borough. As an advocate of peace, and one who does not believe in militarism, Mr. Thomas duly inspected a military guard. One humbly asks, what on earth a guard of soldiers is doing at a purely civic ceremony? We know it is customary, but all the same we wonder how long it will be before some of our public men have the courage to decline to take part in these military or semi-military displays? What is the use of talking about the horrors of war, the menace of militarism, the desire to bring up the rising generation with a hatred of war, if the rising generation see soldiers occupying a place of honour at ceremonies that are wholly civic in character? The soldier is clean, well-dressed, well-fed, and occupies the center of the picture. We need not be surprised if young people grow up with the belief that it is impossible for any nation to exist without a large army and navy. Dean Inge was expressing the fear, the other day, that the new generation know nothing of the horrors of the last war, and will therefore the more readily rush into a new one. We share the fear; but one way of guarding against it would bring up a generation to whom military parades formed no part of their civic education.

Mr. M. O. Sale, in a humorous weekly, says: "The only indecent thing about bare legs, *as bare legs*, is the sort of mind that thinks them indecent." We congratulate Mr. Sale on passing a notion from the *Freethinker* to a wider public. Maybe—who can tell?—some chapel-distorted mind will get wholesomely re-adjusted by it.

The reconstruction of the educational system in 1931, says a religious journal, is meant to give children a better chance in life, spiritually as well as materially. Our friend adds: "By common consent religion is a vital part of education, and an essential factor in social reconstruction." And we are set wondering how our contemporary knows there is a "common consent" in this connexion. Seeing that Jews, Atheists, and persons indifferent to the Christian religion comprise a very large majority of the ratepayers, we can say that our friend's "common consent," is a figment of a pious imagination. But, perhaps, "by common consent" only means—by common consent of priests and parsons, and of all other persons who are financially dependent on keeping the Christian religion going.

According to a writer in a religious weekly, re-union of the Scottish Churches "has stirred Scotland to its depths." More accurately he might have said that it had "stirred" the comparatively small proportion of pious people interested in the Churches. All Scotland doesn't consist of the pious. What the large proportion of Scots—the non-pious majority—are "stirred" about is, what manoeuvres the Churches may be contemplating as regards interference with the liberty of the non-churchgoers. When the pious unite, look out for mischief.

The *Methodist Recorder* has been talking in bulk about "The Returning Missionary Tide." Great harvests of souls are being reaped in the various foreign fields. But, alas! the money to pay for this work is not coming in as it should. Methodist mugs are getting scarcer, perhaps. Or else Methodists are beginning to realize that money can be put to better uses among their own countrymen.

Speaking about the training of youth in Christian beliefs, the Rev. H. V. Capsey said that Jesus appeals to children of all ages and stages of development. We

commend to his notice the Sunday-school gent who deplored the fact that it is deuced hard to keep children between the ages of twelve to fifteen in the Sunday schools. The Jesus appeal apparently gets worn a bit threadbare when children reach those ages.

Prof. J. Macmurray, Grote Professor of Moral Philosophy at University College, London, denies that what is best in our civilization comes from the ancient Greeks. On the contrary, he contends that:—

The real origin of what we most value in our civilization is to be found in the New Testament. Modern civilization is essentially Christian in origin.

The real roots of modern democracy are in Protestant Reformation, the attempt of the Church to develop a social order in Geneva, the battle for religious liberty, and the effects of this upon other aspects of life. The basic ideal was personal freedom.

We presume the "basic ideal" was responsible for the migration of the Pilgrim Fathers, the Blasphemy Acts, and compulsory Lord's Day Observance.

Archbishop Lord Davidson had to use words of gentle reproach to his rivals in business. Speaking at Edinburgh, he said:—

When we speak of the wonderful and encouraging response to the appeal of 1920, there is, of course, one great exception. In our endeavour to help forward the fulfilment of our Lord's great prayer, no helpful word or act comes from the City of the Seven Hills.

Members of that Church will not even join in prayer. Of course, they will tell us that the footpath is easy if we will do their bidding.

An ordinary human being is puzzled at the different kinds of truth and infallibility offered by establishments both depending on catching their followers young.

From the *Western Morning News and Mercury*, we give the following extract of a letter from the Rev. Walter Greswell:—

Sir,—11,000,000 copies of the Bible, we have been told, are sold yearly. And yet it cannot be denied that it is the least read, the least taught, and the least understood of any book in the world.

This is hardly a good advertisement for the work of thousands of parsons and the expenditure of huge sums of money on stipends. The Rev. Walter Greswell's remarks have our vociferous concurrence.

An amusing character in Mr. Hugh Walpole's book *Hans Frost* is described as:—

She was one of those old women who are for ever slapping the face of the present with the dead hand of the past.

Freethinkers recognize the old lady, but she is not the individual written about by Mr. Walpole.

The Rev. Dr. Ryder Smith has been talking about the "ministry of women," and woman's emancipation. His point of view appears to be that these things are quite all right, but they must be approached very slowly and carefully. He thinks that men of the future will reckon the emancipation of woman as this age's chief achievements. He believes that "behind the movement for giving woman her true place in life as man's equal there is the Christian impulse." Christianity alone, he says, among the religions of the world, "admits and preaches the full personality of women; it, and it alone, has set itself so to change the world as to make the practice of that high principle possible." Ye gods! Just fancy a parson having the cheek to talk this kind of balderdash. The Bible itself, the writings of the Early Christian Fathers, and the Christian Churches'

traditional attitude to woman—each or all of them give him the lie. The emancipation of woman never had the slightest encouragement from the Christian Churches in the past, nor is it getting any official encouragement from these sources to-day. The "Christian impulse," on the contrary, has always been in the other direction, and it is still set that way. Dr. Ryder Smith himself is, we gather, in favour of doling out to women only tiny bits of equality and freedom at a time. And women will require persistently to demand them, before he is willing to release even these little bits.

At Kleinow, Brandenburg, a new use has been found for the wireless. The congregation of the village church have decided to dismiss the pastor, and to replace his presence in the Church by a wireless set. The Church will receive sermons from Berlin. We commend the device to Church congregations in this country. We fancy if this were done on a fairly large scale we should soon find the clergy advocating the abolition of broadcasting religious services.

The Rev. A. J. Seaton, of the Wesleyan Sunday School Dept., has been racking his brains over the decrease in Sunday school scholars. He told a pious gathering that the decrease was "almost entirely due to two changes over which the schools had no control." These were: the decline in the population, and the shifting of the population to new areas where there was inadequate provision for religious instruction. It was remarkable, he thought, that the decline had not been far greater. He added: "it is an amazing and a wonderful tribute to the Sunday schools that, in post-war days, when so many adverse factors had developed, they have been able to hold their own to the extent they have."

Mr. Seaton, you will note, said first that the decrease was "almost entirely due to two changes." This implies that the "so many adverse factors" which have developed in post-war years are comparatively negligible. What are they? Mr. Seaton said they were: (1) the decline of parental interest; (2) the decline of interest in organized religion; (3) the change in Sunday Observance, and (4) the rising level of secular education. What is evident is that the first three are the results of the widespread disbelief in religion. And it is this, and not Mr. Seaton's two changes, which is mainly responsible for the decline in Sunday school attendances and membership. Mr. Seaton is, no doubt, well aware of this, but his job was to make the decrease seem comparatively easy to cure—which it is not, even with the inspired aid of the B.B.C. and the altruistic help of newspaper editors!

Nicholas Newcroft, in the *New Chronicle* of Christian education, asserts that:—

Despite the historians of art and literature in the suggestion underlying Browning's *Fra Lippo Lippi*, or *Andrea del Sarto*, it was more than the supremacy of the Church and the resultant ban on pagan subjects that made these thinkers in colour, from Giotto to Bellini, fill their canvases with scenes and figures drawn from the Old Testament and the New.

Mr. Newcroft contends that the artists were attracted by the "matchless material" which the Bible stories offered. Quite likely some artists were attracted by them. But just as probably others were, or could have been, attracted by pagan subjects, but for the fact of the Church's ban on pagan literature. Still more probable is that, but for the ban, and but for the Church taking up their time with Biblical subjects, many of the great artists would have painted masterpieces concerning the universal problems and facts of human nature and human society. The Church's gain was the world's loss. Mr. Newcroft is evidently not aware that the artists usually received explicit instructions what to paint, the grouping of the figures, the colours of the

robes worn by Jesus and the Virgin. The Church took care it got what it paid for. What the artist did was frequently to paint his favourite mistress as the Virgin, but that is another story.

The *New Chronicle* (a Sunday school weekly) reprints verbatim the *Schoolmaster's* reply to our criticism of the latter's fears concerning a wholly secular system of education. The heading our Sunday school contemporary affixes to the reprint is: "Our Allies in the Day Schools." This might, more accurately, have been: "Our Allies—the Parsons' Lackeys." A question we would ask our contemporary is: Was it really wise to print the reply, since the dreadful name of the *Freethinker* occurs in it five times? Was there not danger in thus bringing to the notice of Sunday school workers, who know nothing about the religious boycott of this paper, the obscene fact that such a journal as the *Freethinker* exists? Why, some of them might be open-mouthed enough to get a copy and read it! They might thus acquire disturbing doubts as to the truth of what they are asked to believe and what they persuade youth to believe.

Another question for the *New Chronicle*. As it has been bold enough to allow mention of the *Freethinker*, will it now reprint our reply to the *Schoolmaster*? In the interests of truth, fair-play, and freedom of opinion, this should be done. If it is against so doing, will it be good enough to explain why? Failure to reprint our reply or to volunteer an explanation, will suggest to readers that the *New Chronicle's* code does not value very highly the interests of truth, fair-play, and freedom of opinion.

Dr. Maria Montessori, who has been hailed as an educational reformer, has written a book called *The Child and the Church*, explaining the way to educate the child religiously by her "freedom" methods. A reviewer points out that, as Dr. Montessori is a devoted daughter of the Roman Church, "to be a good Catholic is the horizon of her religious ideas." We are inclined to suspect that Dr. Montessori's methods are deserving of less praise than our educationists have given them. Her "freedom for the child" methods appear to resolve into mere notions for making the child interested in acquiring knowledge. Whereas, the kind of education reformer badly needed is one who will show children how to acquire carefully prepared "facts."

Art, says Mr. H. H. Holden of Birmingham, "is merely the doing of a thing with taste and judgment." And we are set wondering whether "lying to the glory of God" is an art or merely a craft. It is usually crafty, not to say artful.

A little time back Mr. James Douglas explained that on three occasions, when he was given up by Harley Street specialists, God saved him in response to prayers. Now he writes in high praise of his recovery from some kind of an indisposition through the scientific treatment he received in hospital. Now we are left in doubt as to whether James Douglas has thrown God overboard, or God has got about tired of James Douglas. On lines of probability we should say that God has got tired of Douglas. But the really great thing remains. Douglas is still there to help and advise a troubled world, and we can face the future with equanimity.

A week or two ago the British and Foreign Bible Society was feeding the press with its enormous sales of the Bible, and great influence it had on the peoples of the world. Of course, most of this was sheer bunkum, as we pointed out, and we had not long to wait for the British and Foreign Bible Society to confess as much. The other day the General Secretary of the Society was addressing the Methodist Church Congress at Bristol, and his song was different. There was, he said, an

alarming growth of Secularism. It had swept over the world with all the force of a tidal wave.

The feet of the Christian Church were being crippled, its hands paralysed, and its wings broken by Secularism. It was a deadly disease, eating into its vital force.

So it does not look like the influence of the Bible in maintaining Christian belief is quite so great, after all and Secularism after being killed by all the champions of Christendom over and over again during the past half century or so, appears to be still very much alive.

In a review of *The Protestant Faith and Challenge*, by R. Pyke, the author is quoted as stating that "the fundamentalist it is who is sapping the foundations of Protestantism, while living within its borders." This is true, but perhaps not in the way intended by Mr. Pyke. The fundamentalist is the genuine Christian, naked and unashamed; he has not adjusted himself, like Protestantism, to his new environment which is the modern world. Bishop Barnes and Bishop Gore can see, that if their faith is to survive, it must adopt the Darwinian theory of "protective colouring."

There is a passage in *Something Attempted*, by Mr. Gerard Hopkins, that is a brief criticism of our national hypocrisy. It is worthy of record in "Acid Drops," and by a little imagination, can be made to fit the attitude of public men on public questions:—

What's wrong with us, Monica, with my whole damned generation? We're all tied up in beastly knots, we're all self-conscious, and so afraid of making fools of ourselves that even to speak of love, as we really want to speak of it, passionately, make us afraid. Why can't I say what I feel, why can't I do what I want to do? I'm not really afraid that you'd laugh at me, but I'm terrified that I should laugh at myself . . . We're all so proud of not having illusions, and we snigger and wink at our beastly little selves, and all the time we've nothing at all.

O MAN! while in thy early years,  
How prodigal of time!  
Misspending all thy precious hours,  
Thy glorious youthful prime!  
Alternate follies take the sway,  
Licentious passions burn;  
Which tenfold force gives Nature's law,  
That man was made to mourn.

Look not alone on youthful prime,  
Or manhood's active might;  
Man then is useful to his kind,  
Supported is his right:  
But see him on the edge of life,  
With cares and sorrows worn,  
Then age and want—oh, ill-matched pair!—  
Show man was made to mourn.

Many and sharp the num'rous ills  
Inwoven with our frame;  
More pointed still we make ourselves,  
Regret, remorse, and shame!  
And man, whose heaven-erected face  
The smiles of love adorn,  
Man's inhumanity to man  
Makes countless thousands mourn!

Robert Burns.

Pointing to another world will never stop vice among us; shedding light over this world can alone help us.  
Whitman.

Great effort for great motives is the best definition of a happy life.—Channing.



## Testimonial to Mr. Chapman Cohen.

For some years there has been a generally expressed desire on the part of Freethinkers to give a tangible expression of their regard for Mr. Cohen and of their appreciation of his work.

At the National Secular Society's Conference in 1928, the question of a Testimonial was raised, but was vetoed by the President (Mr. Cohen) himself. At the 1929 Conference another form and method overcame the President's objections, and a resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically passed heartily approving the proposal, and suggesting the formation of a small Committee to carry the matter through to a large and successful conclusion.

There is no need to recall here Mr. Cohen's able, strenuous and unselfish work for Freethought during the past forty years. This is known to, and appreciated by every Freethinker and Rationalist throughout the world—especially by the elder generation, who have watched it for so long. His numerous works are read all over the world; for thirteen years he has been President of the N.S.S., and for fifteen years has carried on single-handed the task of editing the *Freethinker*. This work has been a sacrifice on the altar of freedom, and has left the giver a poor man. Had he used his talents in other walks of life, they would have brought him much material wealth; he has had only the goodwill of his fellow thinkers and workers.

The opportunity is now presented to Freethinkers to give Mr. Cohen a more solid indication of their appreciation, and the Committee issue this appeal in the conviction that it will bring a prompt and liberal response. It is hoped to raise a sum that will not only represent a full expression of the high opinion Freethinkers have of Mr. Cohen and his work, but be sufficient to make his future secure against the fate that usually befalls the Freethought propagandist who has given himself a necessary labour that will only be properly appraised when the world no longer needs it.

**Committee:**—Messrs. C. BUSH (Weston), H. JESSOP (Leeds), F. E. MONKS (Manchester), J. NEATE, C. G. QUINTON (London), and T. ROBERTSON (Glasgow).

**Hon. Sec.:**—Mr. W. J. W. EASTERBROOK, "Hillfield," Burraton, Saltash, Cornwall, to whom all communications and donations should be sent. Cheques and Money Orders should be crossed National Provincial Bank. Acknowledgments of all subscriptions will be made in the *Freethinker*.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS—FIRST LIST.

	£	s.	d.
John Sumner ... ..	105	0	0
H. Jessop ... ..	50	0	0
G. Bernard Shaw ... ..	5	5	0
W. J. W. Easterbrook ... ..	50	0	0
J. Hopkins ... ..	1	0	0
F. E. Monks ... ..	5	5	0
C. G. Quinton ... ..	5	0	0
Mr. & Mrs. J. Neate ... ..	10	0	0
Bolton Branch N.S.S. ... ..	0	7	6
T. Robertson ... ..	50	0	0
F.D.S. ... ..	1	0	0
J. S. Kirkman ... ..	1	1	0
The Old Skipper ... ..	5	5	0
Sir J. Cahn ... ..	50	0	0
F. J. Gould ... ..	0	10	6
J. Wearing ... ..	0	10	0
J. Yettram ... ..	1	1	0
Frank Keyes ... ..	1	1	0
J. A. Fallows ... ..	10	0	0
Robert Arch ... ..	0	10	6
H. J. V. Templeman ... ..	5	0	0
William Nelson ... ..	5	0	0
J. G. Finlay ... ..	1	0	0
G. F. Margetson ... ..	1	1	0
J. Brown ... ..	5	0	0
Sydney A. Gimson ... ..	10	0	0
Robert Crum ... ..	0	5	0
J. Goulding ... ..	1	1	0
D. A. J. Young ... ..	0	10	0
W.W. ... ..	0	2	6
A. J. Watson ... ..	0	10	0
Fred Hobday ... ..	1	1	0
T. Robson ... ..	1	0	0
A. W. B. Shaw ... ..	2	2	0
Mrs. I. J. King ... ..	10	0	0
"Nordic" ... ..	2	0	0
W. H. Hicks ... ..	10	10	0
Cheadle Friend ... ..	0	1	6
Arthur B. Moss ... ..	1	0	0
Dr. John L. Speirs ... ..	1	1	0
Wm. Williamson ... ..	1	0	0
T. Tresidder ... ..	0	1	0
Dr. & Mrs. C. V. Drysdale ... ..	2	2	0
M. Steinberger ... ..	5	0	0
Arthur O'Keefe ... ..	1	1	0
H. Snell, M.P. ... ..	1	0	0
C. R. Boyd Freeman ... ..	0	10	6
W. McClellan ... ..	5	0	0
H.M. ... ..	1	1	0
A Friend ... ..	5	0	0
J. C. Thomas ... ..	2	2	0
Mrs. L. P. Clark ... ..	5	0	0
A. Harvey ... ..	3	0	0
J. Seddon ... ..	1	1	0
A. W. Davis ... ..	2	0	0
J. G. Burdon ... ..	1	0	0
Vernon H. Smith ... ..	3	0	0
Robert Muir ... ..	1	10	0
Anon ... ..	1	0	0
E. Johnson ... ..	2	2	0
T. E. Thomas ... ..	0	10	0
Mr. & Mrs. R. H. Rosetti ... ..	0	7	6
W. E. Kerslake ... ..	1	0	0
F. Gateshill ... ..	0	5	0
J.D. ... ..	7	0	0
Miss L. Snow ... ..	2	0	0
H.B.D. ... ..	1	1	0
Mr. & Mrs. E. H. Duffy ... ..	0	5	0
A. R. Wykes ... ..	0	10	0

The above represents a complete list of subscriptions up to October 14. I have to express my thanks for the tone of many letters received, from some of which, with the editor's permission I hope to quote next week.

W.J.W.E.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

S. ROBERTS.—We commented at the time the myth was propounded on Horatio Bottomley's statement that he might have been the President of the N.S.S. He stood about as much chance of occupying that position as he did of becoming Archbishop of Canterbury. The next candidate for the post will be Billy Sunday or the Bishop of London. We presume it is part of the game of playing the wild and reckless youth, who just pulled up in time. The religious analogy is the converted sinner who reels off catalogue of imaginary crimes in order to enhance his value on the evangelistic platform.

J. GUNTHER.—You would have no rights over a cemetery that was the property of a particular denomination. In a Churchyard—Church of England—your right would extend to going without the religious service on giving proper notice. In a public cemetery any service consonant with public order is quite legal. The answer to your second question is, No.

D.P.S.—It is well to read all history with a moderate supply of salt on hand.

R. CHAPMAN.—We greatly appreciate what you say, and agree with your comments, but, for the present, at least, we had better treat the letter as private, and not for publication.

E. A. PHIPSON.—You must have read the *Freethinker* very inattentively if you have discovered nothing but advice as to what you are not to believe. There is scarce any article that does not go beyond this.

B. A. MILLECHAMP, H. SILVESTER, AND OTHERS.—Glad to have your appreciation of what has been done. But for the present the best policy is to let the matter rest where it is.

## Sugar Plums.

To the editor the least attractive part of the present issue is the matter which occupies the centre page. It concerns Mr. Cohen, and he happens to be the editor. Were it someone else, his feelings would be different. But it is inserted at the request of the Committee, and there seems no reasonable ground for refusal. All Mr. Cohen desires to say at present is this. Ever since the close of the war, there have been suggestions that something of this kind should be done. In 1920, two substantial cheques were actually sent as a beginning, but these were diverted by the editor to the Sustentation Fund, which he considered of greater moment. Year by year the suggestion has been brought forward, and at the last Conference of the National Secular Society, Mr. Cohen gave way to the proposal. It should be said that he has all along felt with the deepest appreciation the good feeling such suggestions indicated. His work has brought him many friends, and that together with labour for a Cause that one loves he has always valued highly, although not talking largely about it. All he wishes to hope now is that the statement of the Committee will not be too long displayed; it is not the kind of thing which the editor desires to see for too lengthy a period. It will, therefore, appear for a few weeks only.

To-day (October 20) Mr. Cohen will lecture, afternoon and evening, in the Chorlton Town Hall, All Saints, Manchester. His subjects are "The Savage in our Midst," and "Christianity's Crowning Crime." The meetings have been well advertised, and we hope to be able to report the usual good audiences.

On Friday next (October 25), the debate between Mr. Chapman Cohen and Mr. Shaw Desmond on "Does Man Survive Death?" will take place at the Caxton Hall. Tickets for the numbered and reserved seats are 2s. 6d. each. Other seats are 1s. 6d. and 1s. each. Those who wish to make sure of good seats should get their tickets as early as possible.

We have been reading with great interest the "Fifty Years of Freethought," which the editor of the *New York Truthseeker* is running through that journal. In the instalment for September 28, there is a passage that concerns us. It is written in connexion with a Mr.

William Bowne, ex-Episcopalian minister, who poined the staff of the *Truthseeker*. Of him, Mr. Macdonald says:—

And he did not always recognize the right of others to credit for what they had written. He contributed stories to the Children's Corner, and signed one that originated with Mark Twain. Worse still, he lifted a section of good matter from Chapman Cohen's *Grammar of Freethought*, which undetected by me went into the paper as an editorial article. Mr. Cohen's letter of rebuke was as mild as could be expected, and although I assured him that I was also a victim of deception, there has not been through his paper, the London *Freethinker*, the same exchange of cordiality with *The Truthseeker* as when his predecessor, G. W. Foote, was its editor.

We remember the matter quite well, but the incident happened several times before we called Mr. Macdonald's attention to it. All we asked was that the usual courtesy of acknowledging the paper or book from which the article was taken should be given. Mr. Macdonald's letter was quite satisfactory, and his description of his contributor raised a smile. Nothing was farther from our mind than any reflection upon Mr. Macdonald himself.

The only surprise we had on reading the above is that Mr. Macdonald should think that we had any further feeling about the incident, or that he should have concluded there was any lack of good feeling on our part towards the *Truthseeker*. So we can assure him that on these points he is quite in error. The incident itself had quite passed out of our mind until recalled by Mr. Macdonald's note. And we have nothing but the warmest of feelings towards the oldest Freethought paper in the world, and the men, who under Mr. Macdonald's able leadership, are putting up so gallant a fight against the ancient enemy of human progress. We trust that Mr. Macdonald will accept what we have said as an exact expression of our feelings towards himself and his paper.

We publish, this week, Professor Eddington's reply to Mr. Cohen's criticism of his book, *The Nature of the Physical World*. Professor Eddington is one of the foremost scientists in England, and his article in this issue of the *Freethinker* is the only reply he has given to any of the many criticisms passed on his work. It is for that reason, the more noteworthy. Mr. Cohen will deal with the reply next week.

The Bishop of Wakefield writes:—

The Bishop of Wakefield desires to inform the editor of the *Freethinker* of a misquotation from some remarks of his on which comment was made in the columns of that paper on October 6. The Bishop said that he hoped that on democratic principles, the rights of parents would be respected. He did not mention priests at all in his remarks.

We gladly insert the correction, and place it here because of its greater prominence. It was a misquotation in a daily paper that misled us. It would be unfair to make further comment.

We are asked to announce for the benefit of Branch Secretaries, that Mr. Whitehead's present address is 52 Goldsmith Road, New Southgate, N.11.

Mr. Rosetti had a very successful meeting at Leicester on Sunday last. His lecture on "Where are the Gods?" was greatly enjoyed by those present, and the questioning showed the interest taken.

We are asked to call attention to a desire on the part of some Freethinkers to form a Branch of the N.S.S. in Paisley. Those who live in this district are asked to communicate with Mr. R. T. White, 23 Kolnside Road, Paisley. To further the movement a public meeting is to be held in the Co-operative Hall, Bank Street, on October 22, at eight o'clock, which will be addressed by Mr. E. Hale, of Glasgow. We hope that all Freethinkers in the neighbourhood will attend. If they do the hall will be filled.

## Man's Resemblance to the Ape.

It is constantly asserted that the upright posture of the human race distinguishes man absolutely from all lower forms of life. Most Europeans derive what first hand knowledge they possess regarding apes and monkeys from their observations of these animals in captivity. Those, however, who have studied simian life in its native home are agreed that the higher apes have, for all practical purposes, attained the erect posture. Moreover, there are various anatomical features of the human form which suggest that this framework represents a modification of that of a four-footed ancestral organism.

The earliest backboned animals that appeared on our planet moved through slush and slime on bodies supported by primitive limbs. With the ancestral birds the fore-limbs became converted into organs of flight, while the hinder limbs were retained for locomotion on the earth's surface. Among the mammals the extremities have been adapted for movements of several kinds. Some have been modified into organs of rapid progression, while others have been transformed into climbing and swimming organs. Sir Arthur Keith mentions two mammalian creatures—man and kangaroo—that carry their bodies in a strikingly peculiar manner. "In both," he states, "the hinderpair of extremities has become specialized for locomotion, but there is no real resemblance in their styles of progression nor in the manner in which the body is carried. In man only have the lower limbs been brought into line with the body, so that thigh and trunk form a pillar perpendicular to the ground on which he treads."

Man's upright position is clearly the result of a prolonged and complicated evolution. To the modern morphologist the transformation from a quadrupedal mode of motion to that attained by man involves a complete rearrangement in the bodily organization. For, when a four-footed animal is moving, its viscera are held in position by the muscles of the lower sides and surface of the body. Placed upright all the internal organs would tend towards displacement. Consequently, the evolution of the erect posture was accompanied by muscular modifications. The respiratory organs also underwent change. Thus, the human chest has become differently shapen to that of quadrupeds. Also, the nervous mechanism which regulates the blood supply among lower mammals has been materially modified to meet the requirements of the higher mammal, man. The vertebral column or backbone has likewise undergone important changes. Our illustrious anatomist, Sir Arthur Keith, assures us that: "There is not a bone, muscle, joint, or organ in the whole human body, but must have experienced a change during the evolution of our posture."

When and where did these transformations occur? Certainly in the dim past, and very probably in tropical conditions. The fossil records of man's ascent; the researches of comparative anatomists and embryologists; and last, but not least, the dispassionate study of man's kindred in their natural surroundings—these are the keys to unlock the secrets of man's genesis and development.

Prof. Keith has enjoyed the inestimable advantage of dwelling in the Malay Peninsular, a region whose forests are peopled by many species of Primates. Monkeys everywhere abound, and there the eminent evolutionist took mental notes of simian behaviour. Although each species of ape or monkey possessed some special mode of progression, still, there remained a general uniformity in their movements along the branches, or in leaping from tree to tree. Keith noticed that while the common monkeys moved on

all fours, employing their posterior extremities as aids to progression, the gibbon *walked* on the big branches on its lower extremities or legs, with its body erect, and its remarkably long arms extended above its head to grip as it passed the arching branches for support. And when seeking safety in flight, the gibbon used its large and powerful arms as its chief aid in escape. "It was marvellous," writes Keith, "to see how it could swing itself from branch to branch and from tree to tree, often bounding thus across an interval of forty or fifty feet. The ordinary monkeys were horizontal in posture of the body, but the gibbon was upright. Later, when investigating the anatomy of the animals of the jungle, to ascertain whether or not they suffered from the effects of malaria, the writer had his attention arrested by the remarkable manner in which the gibbon and the ordinary monkey differed in structure of body. In the gibbon the viscera of the abdomen were fixed and arranged much as in man; the muscles of the belly wall had the disposition seen in man; the thorax was flattened from back to front; the spinal column had the chief features seen in man's skeleton. . . . As regards the features just enumerated the monkey resembled the dog rather than the gibbon. There, then, is a most important fact—a certain stage in the upright posture has been attained in the gibbon. The gibbon is an ape adapted for an upright posture, amidst arboreal surroundings."

In certain respects the gibbon is the most primitive of the manlike apes, and it serves to link up the greater anthropoids, the orang, gorilla, and chimpanzee with the lower monkeys. That the gibbon's departure from the general type of monkey structure is of ancient standing is demonstrated by this ape's fossil remains revealed in Miocene rocks deposited several million years ago.

The greater tailless apes also possess the erect attitude. Many onlookers, however, who have seen them in cages only, and marked their shambling motions in these artificial surroundings have formed quite erroneous conclusions concerning their natural posture. We are assured that in a state of nature they stand practically erect, although they differ in their manner of walking. That long-armed anthropoid, the orang, uses its upper extremities extensively in its progress through its arboreal home. With the chimpanzee likewise the arms are largely requisitioned in locomotion. On the other hand, the leg of the gorilla is better developed, and the foot bears the weight of the body. It is also less pliable than that of its brother apes. Obviously, each has varied in different directions to meet the requirements of its particular environment.

That man has ascended from a four-footed forebear is evidenced by the rudimentary or vestigial relics still retained in his bodily framework. Next to that wonderful conundrum: "Which came first, the hen or the egg?" scarcely anything has excited so much popular amusement as the seemingly triumphant, if inane query as to how a monkey-begotten man ever managed to doff his tail. Now the tail of vertebrate animals is an external prolongation of the backbone. All the segments of this vertebral column which extend beyond those to which the posterior limbs are attached are caudal or tail vertebrae. These tail bones, four or five in number, although reduced in size and form, lie hidden beneath the human skin. Until it reaches the age of six weeks, the embryo of the human babe displays a tail extending from the body's surface. This caudal appendage appears most pronounced when the undeveloped child is about a month old. At birth, and in some instances later, a depression in the skin denotes the spot where the

tail has withered away. Prof. Keith reminds us that sometimes during dissection vestigial muscles may be traced passing to the tail which are equivalent to the caudal muscles of more lowly organisms. "Well authenticated cases are on record of children who have been born with true tails, such cases are rare, and the tails are little better than soft string-like appendages, but their structure, and the fact that they form a continuation of the backbone, leave no doubt as to their true nature." (Keith, *The Human Body*, p. 80).

Wonderful to relate, the tail of the man-like apes has dwindled to a greater degree than that of God's own image. With reference to the tails disappearance in the higher Primates, Prof. Keith, not as the scribes, but as one who speaks with authority, assures us that the attainment of an erect posture necessitated its loss. Now, if a monkey be held upright its visceral organs descend, and demand support from below. The muscles which close the hinder part of the body are those that depress the caudal appendage, and when the tail is depressed the animal can support or enclose the contents of the abdomen. In man, the great apes, and gibbon, the muscles that depress the tail stretch over the pelvis to support the abdominal or belly organs in position. So soon as the upright position developed the caudal organ ceased to function as a balancing instrument, and the body's centre of gravity became greatly altered. The tail muscles were now needed to sustain the visceral structures and the appendage was reduced to its present vestigial state, and significantly enough, as already noted, it has dwindled more in the apes than in man.

When surveyed superficially, the skeleton of the gorilla widely departs from the human form. Yet, when we carefully examine the giant ape's anatomy we discover that the entire structure is modelled in human likeness. Every bone in the gorilla's body, and even the skull of the younger specimens testify to the ape's kinship with humanity. All the organs of the body and brain have clearly been adapted both in men and apes to meet the special requirements of their lives. It is a melancholy reflection that the higher apes tremble on the verge of extinction, and when their race is run, a wide gulf will separate man from his living relatives. Fortunately, science has been able to study them in time.

The affinity of man and anthropoid has been further emphasized by the recent discovery that various diseases previously regarded as special to humanity also infect the apes. That deplorable disease syphilis is one of these maladies. Monkeys suffer slightly only from this scourge, but the orang and chimpanzee are susceptible. Prof. Grünbaum and other investigators have proved that the manlike apes are subject to several of the infectious ailments of mankind.

Prof. Nuttall, again, has established the close relationship of man and ape in various experiments with their blood. Moreover, striking evidence has been furnished during the last thirty years by the direct study of the early embryological stages of apes and men. Prof. Selenka devoted time and a fortune to researches on ape embryology, and several scientists, both in England and abroad, have recently published memoirs on human embryos less than a fortnight old. It has thus been demonstrated that not merely "is the uterus of the anthropoid and mankind similar in form, but their embryos become implanted in an exactly similar manner, a manner which is only known to occur in them." Many further evidences are available of man's kinship with "the beasts that perish," but these may be submitted at a later date.

T. F. PALMER.

## Bishop Barnes on The Church and Modernism.

WITH the ardour of an Apostle, Bishop Barnes continues to pursue his self-imposed task of endeavouring to persuade his Christian brethren that what he calls *Modernism* is the only logical position for thoughtful Christians in the Church to hold, in these days of general enlightenment. Preaching in Birmingham Cathedral on Sunday, September 29, Dr. Barnes declared that "The world scheme which our grandparents accepted has crumbled. A second Renaissance has given us a wholly new understanding of the origin and structure of the universe and of this globe.

"The history of life on this earth and man's relation to the process, constitute knowledge which many still find strange and disturbing. A new cosmology has inevitably destroyed old beliefs, and has made others seem so archaic in their setting that they are quietly ignored." Consequently we may assume from this that the modern Christian has got to throw overboard the Bible story of creation, the story of the alleged Fall of Man in the Garden of Eden, and any other Biblical stories that are either opposed to the plain teachings of modern science, or to common sense.

The Story of the Flood, The Tower of Babel, the Confusion of Tongues, and the Plagues in Egypt, assuredly come under this category.

Dr. Barnes makes bold to say, "the notion that nature is ruled by blind mechanism is now general alike, in the street and the pew." But he goes on to declare, "Religious people seek to escape the menace to faith of such a belief by asserting that God does occasionally intervene by supernatural acts to assert His Sovereignty." Then by a sort of side dig at some of his learned brother prelates and priests he says, "Some assert that God by priestly meditation consents thus to intervene." But does He? Dr. Barnes seems to infer not; although he immediately goes on to say that, "The supremacy of God over His creation is the primary conviction of the Modernist. For those who see the Reformation teaching in the light of modern knowledge such mechanical sacramentalism as transubstantiation remains unbelievable." Every Freethinker would be prepared to endorse the last part of the above declaration without the consideration as to whether the Christian God or any other conceivable Deity, has supremacy over what is called "His Creation."

"Follow the light," cried the Bishop. "Put behind you beliefs of the religious twilight which still persist in Latin Catholicism. They are not Christian and they have no future. Put behind you equally Fundamentalism, that product of ignorance and fear. Erasmus had no belief in verbal inspiration, nor had Luther. It comes from the middle ages, not from the Reformation. To-day it alienates our thoughtful young people because they cannot go freely to the Bible to take what satisfies their spiritual needs and to ignore the rest." But the question is, did not all sections of the Christian Community regard the Bible as God's Inspired Word until well into the middle of the nineteenth century—until indeed, Bishop Colenso produced his famous work entitled *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined* in 1862, which caused a great sensation, and was condemned by both Houses of Convocation, and its author declared deposed? It does not matter much whether Erasmus or Luther believed or disbelieved in the *Verbal inspiration* of the Bible, the

question is, "Did they believe the Bible to be God's inspired word, and that it was substantially true in all its parts?" If so, it has been handed down from generation to generation until the present day, and the vast majority of Christians still describe it as "God's Holy Word," and will not listen to any rational criticism of it; or if they do, will regard the critic as a "wicked unbeliever? It is all very well to tell the modern Christian to put behind him *Fundamentalism*, but if he is going to give up any portion of "God's Word" as "the product of ignorance and fear," where is he going to stop? If he gives up the absurd miracles of the Old Testament, is he equally free to give up the absurd miracles of the New? Can he give up belief in the Virgin birth and the Resurrection and still remain a Christian and a member of the Church? Can he give up the story of Jesus feeding five thousands of hungry persons on five loaves and two small fishes, and still be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus? Can they believe that two persons possessed of devils rebuked Jesus and said, "What have we to do with thee Jesus, thou Son of God—art thou come hither to torment us before the time"? But the devils besought him saying, "if thou cast us out suffer us to go into the herd of swine," and Jesus did as the devils suggested, and "the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished in the waters." (Matthew viii, 28 to 32.)

And we may ask, what had the poor pigs done to deserve such treatment, and what compensation did Jesus make to the proprietor of these poor unfortunate swine? Can Christians disbelieve the story that Jesus opened the eyes of the blind, made the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak, and the dead to come out of the grave, as in the case of Lazarus, and yet remain sincere members of the Church? But let us consider further what Dr. Barnes maintains. He says that Modernism "takes the right of private judgment which men won at the Reformation and joins that right to the illumination of the inner light and to the new aspects of the truth of the century." If Modernism gives the Christian the right of private judgment on all questions of religious dogma, can a Christian disbelieve in the fundamental teachings of the Church and yet remain a consistent and true follower of His Lord and Master?

Finally, Bishop Barnes says, "Modernism starts with a trust in God which can now be based on the knowledge that modern science does not exhibit the universe as a mere mechanism. Once such trust is regained all superstitious practices and beliefs fade away. He who has such trust will not put a mascot on his motor-car nor have the car blessed by a priest in some fanciful pseudo religious service. "God does not delegate His protective power to some trivial mascot, nor limit it to those who ride in a priest's blessed car."

Of course, all sensible people can appreciate the trenchant criticism of Dr. Barnes of the folly and superstition of many of his Christian brethren without accepting the main features of what he is pleased to call "Modernism." And if Dr. Barnes is going to continue his Rationalistic propaganda, his obvious duty is to resign his position as Bishop of the Church of England, and join a Unitarian or a Theistic Church where he can give full vent to his newly acquired views on Science and Religion. On the other hand, if he elects to remain in the Church and continue to preach Modernism, then he is deliberately disregarding all the solemn vows he made on his being ordained a minister of the Established Church, and is not worthy of the admiration of his more consistent brethren.

ARTHUR B. MOSS.

## The Higher Power.

WHEN our butcher leaves the family joint he is always ready for a little gossip. Usually we discuss such mundane matters as the price of Cattle, the prospect of harvest, or we may even touch upon the Reparation problem. He is an accommodating man and, I imagine his shade of politics vary according to his customer. He is all things to all men, if by any means he may vend his veal.

During his last visit Lucy nearly inveigled him into deeper waters. She dearly loves a discussion that calls for some philosophical acumen. She has been known to broach the question of serpent-worship when our mild-mannered curate called for a subscription to assist in carrying joyful news to benighted heathen. As a rule, curates are not fond of totems, or a disquisition on ancestor-worship.

To Lucy belongs the credit of luring our butcher on. He became garrulous. Even butchers may be philosophers in their way. The sight of blood insures them to ghastly experiences, though they may be quite humane at heart. They may be good fathers and bring up their family in a decent Christian manner.

Butchers are often jolly men. The murders they commit must lie lightly on their conscience. It may even be doubted whether they have a conscience. Their jollity is in direct proportion to their obesity. And we know what it says in the Hundredth Psalm: "He who kills fat bullocks must himself be fat." Cassius could hardly have been a butcher.

But to return to our argument. Our butcher, being fat and jolly, and therefore garrulous, enlarged upon his general attitude. His was no narrow mind. He believed in giving everybody freedom to believe and to think, and to express themselves as they liked, with due regard to the liberty of their fellows. He thought the missionary effort a big mistake. He didn't believe in forcing our beliefs and our shoddy manufactures on savage peoples who had no use for them. Thus we see our butcher possesses a good deal of common sense.

With regard to Christianity, too, he was very tolerant. It did not interest him much, and he certainly declined to differ with any of his customers on the matter. He believed in a work-a-day policy, selling fresh meat; not concerning himself with fads and fancies, and, he was in favour, generally, of allowing folks to go to hell in their own way.

But he believed in a "Higher Power." He was quite certain there was a sort of a something. He couldn't quite describe it, but he was convinced from his experience during the war and later, that this "Higher Power" existed. Without this "Higher Power" everything would go to rack and ruin. I suppose even the butchering business would cease to exist.

Many people, like our butcher, have an infinite faith in a "Higher Power." What is it they mean precisely? Is it a kind of "Mesopotamia" that soothes them amid the jostlings of an unfeeling world? Or can it be a "Mumbo-Jumbo" that has taken the place of Jehovah, who personally interviewed Moses on Mount Sinai?

No doubt there is a good deal of loose-thinking regarding the Higher Power—with capital letters; among butchers and tradesmen generally. If they simply mean that they are convinced there are forces in existence more powerful than themselves, it may be taken as self-evident. Not even a butcher is as powerful as some of our locomotives. A healthy live-wire might kill a butcher in quicker time than he could despatch a bullock. No, what these folks are thinking about is some kind of a magnified person it were folly to offend. Some super-butcher that could fell victims by the thousand. A kind of Moloch, who, if annoyed, might wreak his vengeance on a Kingdom.

It would add to our butcher's peace of mind—if he has a mind—if he were to settle the matter once for all. In his present state he cannot be sure whether this Higher Power is a Person or not. He would be improved by a course of instruction on Neo-Materialism. His mind would be clarified by a discussion with Mr. Cutner and Mr. Boyd Freeman in Hyde Park—taking lessons from the Ancient Mariner. He may be care-free now when

his business is prospering, but should adversity assail him, should foreign competition destroy his trade, if the bulk of our nation became vegetarians, what then?

Will his faith in a Higher Power stand the test, when he is overwhelmed with adversity? Or will he be like the average Praise-God-Barebones, and, in his bitterest need, address this Higher Power, saying: Though it slay me, even as I slew the bullocks, yet will I put my trust in it.

ALAN TYNDAL.

## Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—It is a significant sign of the wakefulness of the Freethinker movement, that in answer to my offer of correspondents in Germany for interchange of ideas, I have received far more requests than was expected. Evidently the readers of the *Freethinker* are not bound to the parish pump or the vestry by their beliefs.

However, I would beg the indulgence of those correspondents who have not yet received a letter from a foreign friend. Everyone will be satisfied in the course of a week or so from reading this letter. The chief difficulty has been that each correspondent can only use his own language. May I again stress the value of Esperanto? For the broadening of the Freethinkers horizon this easily acquired language is unequalled. A twopenny grammar *Esperanto for Beginners*, from any newsagent, will give our friend the key to open the door of the World of Freethought.

L. CORINNA.

## Society News.

ON Sunday, October 6, Mr. G. Whitehead commenced a series of meetings in London, opening the campaign with a good meeting on Clapham Common, where the only opposition was provided by a Christian Evidence speaker, who robbed of his crowd, came over to prove that Jonah had actually been swallowed by a big fish and not by a whale. It appears that recent (Christian Evidence) science has proved there are fishes capable of swallowing boat loads of men. Sceptics please note.

The rest of the week was spent at Liverpool Street, Camberwell, where, considering the cold weather, successful meetings were addressed, the crowds being sympathetic, and at times much amused by some of the questions put by a couple of local fanatics.

Mr. Heath, as usual, was ready with assistance, and other members also helped.

From October 15 to 20 inclusive, Mr. Whitehead will be lecturing in Walham Green, and from Monday, October 21 to 26, in Liverpool.

## YOU WANT ONE.



N.S.S. BADGE.—A single Pansy flower, size as shown; artistic and neat design in enamel and silver. This emblem has been the silent means of introducing many kindred spirits. Brooch or Stud Fastening Price 6d., post free.—From THE GENERAL SECRETARY, N.S.S., 62, Farringdon St., E.C.4

## Miscellaneous Advertisements.

FREETHINKERS—Croydon and District—Those interested in forming a Social Circle in this area please apply to W. Thompson, 63, Grange Road, Purley Oaks.

## BOOKS BOUGHT.

FREETHOUGHT AND RATIONALIST BOOKS purchased. Submit lists of any for disposal to Box No. 1, WATTS & Co., 5, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

## 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 (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, S. K. Ratcliffe—"England and America: What Next?"

HAMPSTEAD ETHICAL INSTITUTE (The Studio Theatre, 59 Finchley Road, N.W.8, near Marlborough Road Station): 11.15, Mr. J. Katz, B.A.—"What then can we hope for?"

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7.0, Mr. Herbert Michaelis—"Palestine and the British Mandate."

THE NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (The Orange Tree, Euston Road, N.W.1): October 24, Social and Dance, 7.30 to 11.30, at 101 Tottenham Court Road. Admission 1s.

#### OUTDOOR.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA BRANCH N.S.S. (corner of Shorrolds Road, North End Road): Saturday, October 19, 7.30, Mr. George Whitehead. Sunday, October 20, Effie Road, opposite Walham Green Station, 7.30, Mr. George Whitehead.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 12.30, Mr. James 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): 3.30, Mr. Charles Tuson.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Clapham Common): 11.30, Mr. J. Hart; Friday, Liverpool Street, Camberwell Gate, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury.

### COUNTRY.

#### INDOOR.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S.—A Social will be held on Saturday, October 26, in the Dance Room, 18 Colquitt Street, off Bold Street. Mr. George Whitehead will be present and Mr. Chapman Cohen has promised to come if pressure of work will allow. Tickets including Refreshments 1s. each.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S. (Top Room, Royal Buildings, 18 Colquitt Street, off Bold Street): Sunday, October 20, at 7.30, Mr. J. V. Shortt (Liverpool)—"The True Story of Jesus."

LEICESTER BRANCH N.S.S.—Miss Stella Brown will lecture in the Leicester Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate, 6.30—"Birth Control Problems, and Humanist Ethics."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Chorlton Town Hall, All Saints): 3.0, "The Savage in our Midst." 6.30, "Christianity's Crowning Crime."

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S. (No. 2 Room, A Door, City Hall, Albion Street): Sunday, October 20, at 6.30, Mr. P. Christie will speak on "Tolstoi in Relation to Russia to-day."

CHESTER-LE-STREET BRANCH N.S.S. (Club Room, Middle Chase): 7.0, Speaker, Mr. Jno. Welsh. Chairman, Mr. W. Raine. Friends and inquirers welcome.

#### OUTDOOR.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S.—Mr. George Whitehead will lecture in Liverpool at 8.0 each evening as follows: Monday, October 21, Beaumont Street; Tuesday, 22, Edge Hill Lamp; Wednesday, 23, Islington Square; Thursday, 24, corner of High Park Street and Park Road; Friday, 25, Islington Square.

## 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 1/4d. stamp to:—

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

## The Other Side of Death

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Paper Covers - - - TWO SHILLINGS

Postage 1½d.

Cloth Bound THREE SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

Postage 2d.

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

§ A §

## Grammar of Freethought.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Cloth Bound 5s. Postage 3½d.

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

## Materialism Re-stated

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

A clear and concise statement of one of the most important issues in the history of science and philosophy.

Cloth Bound, price 2/6. Postage 1½d.

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

## PRIESTCRAFT:

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.

Five Leaflets by Chapman Cohen.

### WHAT IS SECULARISM ?

6d. per 100.

### DO YOU WANT THE TRUTH ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

### THE BELIEFS OF UNBELIEVERS.

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

### DOES MAN DESIRE GOD ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

### ARE CHRISTIANS INFERIOR TO FREETHINKERS ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

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.

## History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science

By PROF. J. W. DRAPER.

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

Cloth Bound. 396 Pages.

PRICE 2/- POSTAGE 4½d.

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

# “ DOES MAN SURVIVE DEATH ? ”

DEBATE BETWEEN

**CHAPMAN COHEN and SHAW DESMOND**

Editor of the “ FREETHINKER ”

The well-known Novelist

AT

**CAXTON HALL, WESTMINSTER**

On Friday, October 25th :: 7.30 p.m.

**Chairman - - - Dr. BERNARD HOLLANDER.**

PRICES OF ADMISSION :

Reserved Seats—Stalls, 2s. 6d.; Unreserved Seats—Balcony, 1s. 6d.; Pit Stalls 1s. A limited number of Platform Seats, at 5s.

Tickets may be obtained at the offices of the “ FREETHINKER,” 61 Farringdon Street, E.C.4, the NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY, 62 Farringdon Street, E.C.4, and the RATIONALIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, 4 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4. An early application for tickets is advisable.

## DETERMINISM OR FREE-WILL ?

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

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Half-Cloth, 2/6.      3      3      3      Postage 2½d.

SECOND EDITION.

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

220 pages of Wit and Wisdom

## BIBLE ROMANCES

By G. W. Foote

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

Price 2/6      Postage 3d.

Well printed and well bound.

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

## 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 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.