

The

FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. XLIX.—No. 43

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1929

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
Professor Eddington and Materialism.—The Editor	673
A Campaign of Calumny.—Mimmermus	675
Masterpieces of Freethought.—H. Cutner	676
How an Entity is Evolved.—Keridon	677
"Critters."—Bob Lyle	679
Tolstoy.—C. Clayton Dove	683
Dolet.—G. W. Foote	684
Propaganda Work (!) in Poland.—H. Halper	685
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

Views and Opinions.

Professor Eddington and Materialism.

WHEN I wrote my criticism of Professor Eddington's *Nature of the Physical World*, I said I was not sanguine that a reply would be offered. I was very pleased to find my prophecy falsified by the article which appeared in the last issue of this paper, although in justice to myself it may be said that my prophecy was based upon a lengthy experience. I have criticized very many books by scientists and others aiming at some reconciliation of science and religion, but generally the authors criticized decided that discretion was the better part. I am conceited enough to believe that this was not because the criticism was not pertinent, but because there was everything to be lost and nothing to be gained by entering on a controversy with the *Freethinker*. Writers might trust to the religious world not seeing the criticism, and there was no profit in risking censure in these columns—none, save that of getting at truth. Silence in their case spelt safety, or promised less danger than speech.

All the more, then, I appreciate the candour and single-mindedness of Professor Eddington in answering my criticism in the journal in which it appeared, when he might so easily have adopted the same policy of silence with me that he did with his other critics. I am sure that readers will share my feelings in this direction. For myself I would say at the outset, that no one admires Professor Eddington's work more than I do. If, as I think, he falls into error in his championing religion, he merely illustrates the truth that when a man begins to adulterate his science with religion, inexact reasoning claims him as its own.

A Doubtful Friend.

One thing that led to my criticizing Professor Eddington's position was the use made of his name and of his book by a number of clergymen who valued only its weakest and least scientific part, and by journalists who were writing for the market. Ac-

ording to these illuminants of contemporary society, the new views of the universe as expressed by Professor Eddington completely ruled out Materialism and provided an impregnable platform for religion. As for Atheism, that was no longer possible for any well-informed man. It is pleasing, therefore, to have it reaffirmed by the author of *The Nature of the Physical World*, that he does not suggest the new physics proves religion to be true, or that "it gives any positive ground for religious faith." Again, I venture to prophecy that the parsonry will go on saying what they have said about the book, no matter what Professor Eddington cares to affirm. Men who could go on affirming the reality of the angels of Mons, despite the author of the story saying that it was pure fiction, are not likely to be deterred by any disclaimer that Professor Eddington may make.

Professor Eddington says that his sole aim was to defend religion against the charge of being incompatible with physical science, and to suggest that present-day science would show itself hospitable towards an idealistic philosophy, but that the guest who arrives with a "spiritual religion" must provide his own credentials. He must expect none from science. This means that in the opinion of one of our leading scientists, obviously with friendly feeling towards religion, all that science can say is, "we have nothing against you and nothing for you. You are welcome to visit us; we are willing to listen to what you have to say, but you must prove your case yourself. We can give you no positive help." I do not think that hard-pressed religionists will feel very thankful for this. I may also point out, in passing, that an idealistic philosophy is not necessarily a religious philosophy. Of course, you may make religion mean anything—so long as you use the term without reference to either its historic meaning or the nature of its origin. But religion has no necessary connexion with idealism in either ethics or philosophy. At any rate, I am quite sure that our pulpiteers have no more interest in science in praising the book, than their predecessors had when they denounced Copernicanism and evolution.

* * *

The Scientist and the Religionist.

I regret that Professor Eddington should have found my use of "Materialism" vague, and some of my phrases ambiguous. This may, of course, be due to my clumsiness, but I am inclined to attribute it to Professor Eddington's conception of Materialism as something concerned solely with physical things, and that laws of physics must be, not merely universal, but must account for everything if Materialism is to stand. This seems to me to be the case from his saying that the position he sets out to establish, namely, that we cannot explain everything in terms of physics and chemistry, is identical with my own position, and therefore there is no difference between

us. I should prefer "describe" to explain, in the above passage, but that may pass. But while what we say may be identical, what we mean is not so. Professor Eddington's thesis is that the fact of certain "spiritual" phenomena being non-describable in terms of physics and chemistry removes them from the sphere of science. My position is that the fact of formulæ (laws) applicable to chemistry and physics not being applicable to mental phenomena means no more than a call for new formulæ to describe new categories, but does not remove them from the scientific Protectorate.

In fairness, it should be said that while this is overlooked by Professor Eddington, the defender of a particular "religious outlook," it is not overlooked by the eminent scientist of the same name. For he writes that "strictly speaking," while he has identified the "domain of physics with that of exact science, the two are not synonymous. We can imagine a science which has no contact with the usual phenomena and laws of physics, which yet admits of the same kind of exact treatment." Precisely; and that is the point for which I have been contending—merely that phenomena which cannot be covered by the laws of physics, may be covered by other laws and so brought within the general domain of science. But we have also to reckon with the religious Professor Eddington, who once more comes to the front and writes, and which I commend to the scientific Eddington for castigation.

When we ask what science can tell us of the nature and structure of the universe 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.

I think that Professor Eddington, the scientist, might then explain to Professor Eddington the defender of a certain religious position, that to say the universe is a physical universe is only taking a partial view. The universe of our daily experience is obviously made up of other than physical objects. At present my universe includes Professor Eddington and his opinion about me. It is true he is a physical object, but I fancy he is more than that, that there are things about him which cannot be brought within the category of physics. I do not see how Professor Eddington's opinions can be brought within the laws of physics, but I do think that they may be fitly described by laws of psychology, either now or at some future date when our knowledge may be adequate to the task. I merely suggest that to apply the same kind of exact treatment to phenomena that has been found so successful with physics, while it does separate psychology from physics, does not remove psychology from the scientific area.

My point is that except as indicative of the class of experiences with which a particular science deals, science is everywhere fundamentally the same, capable of dealing with every phase of human experience, that its methods are the same, and that the degree of success which attends its efforts is entirely a question of exactitude of its knowledge. Naturally, one requires a different standard of measurement when dealing with feeling than when one is dealing with the parcelling out of land; the creation of the standard itself may take time, but, again, it is surely the work of science to create the tools as well as to learn their use. I also dissent very strongly against the statement that the new Materialism says "the whole of experience is the interplay of . . . physical entities fulfilling the laws of physics," and also his identification of physical with mechanistic conceptions. The two may be identical, but they are not always so—except so far as the identity may be necessary to a defence of religion. A physical law

involves the mechanistic conception applied to a particular aspect of experience; but the mechanistic conception may be applied to the whole of experience without any exception whatsoever. My contention is that the mechanistic conception may be applied to the whole of existence under its three categories of matter, life, and mind, and must be applied if we are really to understand what is going on around us. If Professor Eddington had read my *Materialism Restated*, he would have found this worked out with as much force and clarity as I possess. I am afraid, however, that Professor Eddington has permitted himself to take his conception of Materialism from religious sources. I do not blame him very much, for I find some of the defenders of Materialism doing the same thing.

* * *

A few Remarks by the Way.

I cannot deal with the whole of Professor Eddington's reply without allotting to myself an undue share of space, so must defer dealing with the question of the "ought" until next week. But I may touch upon one or two minor points here. These turn on matters of illustration. When, for example, I replied to Professor Eddington's contention that the "ought" of conscious life takes us outside physics, that so does chemistry, I am informed that chemistry is "entirely inside physics." I am afraid I do not understand this, because I quite fail to see how, say, the phenomena of organic chemistry can be expressed in terms of the laws of physics, or how one can express, say, the luminosity of phosphorus by any such law. A chemical change surely implies more than is there, when we are noting mere physical association. Professor Eddington says, concerning my illustration of the emergence of a new and (prior to experience) unpredictable quality of wetness which emerges from the union of H.O., that no physicist would apply the term "emergence" to properties "which are the direct consequences of the constitution which physical theory ascribes to the substance." If that be so, I submit that the philosophical equipment of physicists must be very poor. The capacity of H. & O. to form water is now a commonplace of physics, but unless some physicist can show that this was known prior to it being seen that the combination did produce wetness, and can deduce from the known qualities of H. & O. that wetness must result, I think my illustration must stand.

It is possible that my statement "Exactitude is accomplished only *in vacuo*," was too sweeping; but we are neither of us seeking a verbal victory, and I am quite willing to let it read, most "laws" achieve exactitude only *in vacuo*. But I am a little surprised to find that the example I gave of laws of logic being based upon the way in which the human brain would function if it moved free from counteracting influences would "stagger educationalists," and that the phrase "counteracting influences" is obscure. I can only again express surprise that any educationalist would be staggered since he is always assuming it, and if he were he would furnish another example of the prevalence of the M. Jourdain type. And "counteracting influences" clearly mean all influences that prevent the mind working in a logical manner. As a further illustration of my meaning I would simply say that in logic conclusions are assumed to flow directly from premises. But it is notorious that many conclusions drawn do not flow from the premises assumed. But this would not show laws of logic to be faulty. I admit that if, and so far as, psychology fails to account for these departures from strict logical lines it would prove psychology to be inadequate, but that is another question.

The logician assumes that logical principles will be put into operation in the cases before him. When they are not in force he looks round for the "counteracting influences," and I am sure that Professor Riddington will not have to look far for these. I should not be in the least surprised if he finds them, or thinks he has found them in what I have been saying.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

(To be concluded.)

A Campaign of Calumny.

"It is not poverty in money, but poverty in men and in brains, that makes a country weak."—*Voltaire*.

"The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."—*Christian Bible (Romans)*.

FREETHINKERS are only too familiar with the methods of the Press Boycott by which all matters relating to Freethought are either excluded or grossly misrepresented by Christian editors in the interests of the popular superstition. Indeed, in some quarters, the conspiracy of silence against Freethought is passing wonderful. The very name is like that of the deity of the ancient Hebrews, which was never to be spoken. Where this conspiracy of silence is broken, accidentally, the Christians display another aspect of their attitude towards Freethought, which is then misrepresented and slandered. Few, however, are fully aware that this peculiar Christian failing is extending to literature itself, and that the campaign of calumny is just as apparent in some books as in newspapers and the periodical press.

Look, for example, at the popular works of reference which are to be found in most libraries, and in so many homes, and notice how Freethought and Freethinkers are treated in their pages. Sins of omission and commission constantly leap to the eye of the reader, who may be ill-prepared for this flash of the primitive spirit of Christianity. For, nowadays, Christians are no longer able to crush opposition, and they are obliged to answer its arguments, or make a show of defence. Knowing that Freethought is growing in importance, and afraid to resist it, they bend before it rather than break.

One of the popular series of reference books is the "Home University Library," which includes, among many volumes, a work on the *Victorian Age of Literature*. This particular work has been entrusted to the versatile Gilbert K. Chesterton, whose peculiar piety is so notorious that the editors actually apologise for his exuberance. They may well do this, for Mr. Chesterton uses his talents tyrannously in the service of Orthodoxy. Indeed, he has nothing but insults for the great "intellectuals." Ignoring a shelf-full of masterpieces that have come from a great English novelist, Chesterton says of Thomas Hardy, that he was "a sort of village Atheist brooding and blaspheming over the villiage idiot." Swinburne, a poet among poets, who has enlarged the boundaries of song, is accused of composing an "indecent parody on the Litany of the Blessed Virgin"—surely an ironical suggestion in a Protestant country. In speaking of *Songs Before Sunrise*, Chesterton tries to belittle those superb lyrics by saying that they were songs before a sunrise which never happened. Many great Victorian authors get censured, and are dubbed, spitefully, "lame giants." Even women writers who show any independence of thought are mocked. Emily Bronte, the shy genius, who gave us *Wuthering Heights*, is described as being as "unsociable as a storm at midnight." The only Freethinker to whom Chesterton is ordinarily civil

is James Thomson, the author of *The City of Dreadful Night*, who, he informs us, pontifically, "knew how to be democratic in the dark." As Chesterton considers Democracy the abomination of desolation, and as he spells the poet's name with a "p," the compliment is a very doubtful one, after all. Gilbert Chesterton is the man, be it remembered, who challenges the dogmatism of the Freethinker; convicts science of irrationality; and who professes to find liberty in the Romish Church.

Another work of reference, *A Short Biographical Dictionary of English Literature*, by J. W. Cousins, issued in "Dent's Everyman Library," is open to similar objections. The following passage, for example, relates to Shelley's opinions, which are tolerably well known:—

The charge of Atheism rests chiefly on "Mab," the work of a boy, printed by him for private circulation, and to some extent repudiated as a personal opinion.

James Thomson is again pilloried. This time the poet is introduced as an awful warning, for we are told his "views resulted in depression which led to dipsomania." In the case of "George Eliot," the information is given that "her general view of life is pessimistic," despite the fact that this gifted woman coined the word, "meliorism," in order to show her own attitude with regard to the extremes of optimism and pessimism. Robert Buchanan's iconoclastic views are slurred over by the grudging admission that *The Outcast* and *The Wandering Jew* were "directed against certain aspects of Christianity."

Still another reference-book, *Chambers' Encyclopaedia*, in an edition issued some years ago, is full of bias against Freethinkers. Thomas Paine is the subject of a diatribe. Robert Ingersoll is said to have attracted more attention than he deserved; and readers are referred for information concerning Charles Bradlaugh to the libellous "life" by "MacKay," a work which Bradlaugh himself proceeded against and had destroyed. Even the once-popular novelist, "Ouida" is accused of "muscular heathenry" and "encyclopaedic ignorance." So, one can go on quoting.

This is the latest form of an infamous literary tradition, which may be traced back through the centuries to Lucretius, and even earlier. The fortunes of really great writers such as Shelley, Meredith, and Swinburne, have been adversely influenced by this frigid and calculated misconception. Freethought invariably incurs the hatred of the orthodox, and no enmity is more unscrupulous, more relentless, or more venomous. This garbage is thrown at Freethinkers of set design and purpose. It is meant to discredit the characters and wordings of men and women who offer no allegiance to the Christian superstition. Freethought has wrested so many positions from Christianity, that in order to support the tottering edifice of superstition, believers will hesitate at nothing to buttress the wavering allegiance of their luke-warm fellow-Christians. Priests will never rebuke their faithful followers for "lying for the glory of God." Formerly, priests used scaffolds, stakes, prisons, and torture chambers. Now, they rely more and more on lies, libels, and misrepresentations.

In a certain Thameside resort frogs are found in considerable numbers. One day a boy ran home excitedly to his mother saying: "Oh, mother, Jack and me found a frog, and we bashed it with our sticks until," seeing the look of displeasure on his mother's face, he swallowed hastily and concluded piously—"until God called it to Him."

With a little tuition that boyish barbarian would make a first-class Christian apologist.

MIMNERMUS.

Masterpieces of Freethought.

VIII.—THE PROPHET OF NAZARETH.

By EVAN POWELL MEREDITH.

I.

RENAN'S and Strauss' two lives of Jesus have always been considered as perhaps the ablest put forward from the Anti-Christian side. They have, of course, both been bitterly attacked by orthodox critics, and they have also been criticized by Freethinkers. Renan's work, however, is so beautifully written and is so fascinating, that taken merely as a romance, it must hold the attention of all lovers of literature. With the passing of time and the deeper investigations of modern scholarship, it is largely discredited, and few people would go to Renan for any facts in the life of Jesus. When he is quoted, the passage chosen is his wonderful testimony to Jesus as the greatest of the sons of men, a passage quoted as by a Freethinker, most often against Freethinkers. It forms one of a number written by eminent Freethinkers in praise of Jesus which crop up in countless articles by Christians as showing what our own great men think of the matchless superiority of Christ, over everybody who was ever born on this planet, and possibly on all the other planets as well. Renan said some hard things also, but I have never heard anyone quoting *them* nor anything else from the *Vie de Jesus*. I hope, however, to deal more fully with the Renan in a future article. The work of Strauss is of far greater importance, though its size and generally difficult style have made it less read than the Frenchman's. It is a marvellous book for a man of twenty-seven to have written anyway, and the English translation by George Eliot is almost as wonderful for a woman of twenty-seven to make. Strauss' testimony to Jesus, is like Renan's, often quoted by the orthodox Christian who ignores the sledge-hammer arguments of the German; but his lynx-eye for a word in praise of "Our Saviour" could not miss it. I must deal also more fully with Strauss in a subsequent article.

Here in England no Freethinker seems to have caught the popular appeal in the same way as Strauss and Renan. Thomas Scott's *English Life of Jesus*, which, by the way, was possibly written by the Rev. Sir George W. Cox, is a fine and able work, and should be reprinted one of these days; and we have many small pamphlets and essays on the same subject. But the one work which stands almost alone as a veritable masterpiece of analysis dealing with the "prophetical, intellectual and moral character of Jesus Christ," seems to have fallen almost completely flat. Who reads Evan Powell Meredith now? Who ever quotes him? Now and then one can pick up from an old book shop a second-hand copy for 6d. or 1s.; one glances aghast at the 636 solid pages of reading matter with its voluminous notes, and turns away to something lighter or more thrilling, to Edgar Wallace or Sapper.

Yet *The Prophet of Nazareth* is a genuine masterpiece, and in my opinion, immeasurably greater than Renan's famous work and quite equal to Strauss'. It may be heresy to say so, but I am a heretic.

Who was the author? I have been unable to find out much about him. He has not quite four lines given to him by our indefatigable Wheeler, who evidently repented this small notice, for he added seven more in the supplement to the indispensable *Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers*. Mr. J. M. Robertson gives him and his work four lines and a half in his *Short History of Freethought*, and about the same in his latest masterly *History of Free-*

thought in the Nineteenth Century. Mr. Joseph McCabe only adds one more fact in his own *Biographical Dictionary*.

From all these I gather Meredith was born in 1811, educated at Pontypool College, became a Baptist minister and a most eloquent preacher in the Welsh tongue—into which language, by the way, he translated the Bible. Then, convinced it was not true, at the age of thirty-three, he withdrew from his ministry and entered a competition for the best essay on the following:—

Did Christ predict the Last Day of Judgment and Destruction of the World as events inevitable during the then existing Generation of Men? and if so, what inferences, theistical or the reverse are fairly deducible from the non-fulfilment of that Prophecy, so dreaded by them, having been, as alleged, extensively and impressively inculcated by His apostles as promotive of Christianity in its earliest ages.

I doubt whether many writers, in these days, Christians or not, would care to tackle such a subject for a prize of "Ten Sovereigns," or "an appropriate medal of equal value." But last century cannot be compared to this, and one can quite understand how a learned scholar with plenty of time on his hands and possibly the means to spend years on a book should quietly and methodically work it out and publish it in the hope of influencing his fellow men on what was, to him, a great subject. He tells us himself in his Preface, that the subject suited his taste though he had no intention of writing, at first, so big a book. It must have taken him about seven years to complete and, needless to say, he won the prize. So well did Meredith do that part of the work "devoted exclusively to the advocacy of Christianity"—that is, an interpretation of the prophecies from the purely Christian standpoint, that he adds the following note:—

The writer knows of no other argument of any weight than what has already been advanced in proof of the fulfilment of Christ's predictions, treated of in this chapter. After making the foregoing portion of this note, it is gratifying to the Essayist—now as he prepares his work for the press—to find the following remark made by the Adjudicator in regard to this part of it—"I, with pleasure, confess that the author has, in this chapter, pleaded the Christian side of his subject very fully and faithfully—indeed more so than I, at present, remember to have seen from any other pen."

This is high praise indeed, for Meredith was able to supply the answer to his argument—an answer extremely damaging to the orthodox case.

It should be stated that Meredith was a Deist and he seems to have so remained all his life. In addition, as Mr. McCabe notes, he was caught up in the wave of Spiritualism which spread across the country in the final decades of the nineteenth century, and he died, almost forgotten, in 1889.

The *Prophet of Nazareth* was published, at the author's expense, in 1864, and some clergyman violently assailed the blasphemous work. One of these gentlemen, the Rev. J. Francklin, tried conclusions with him, and Meredith calmly and suavely, literally pulverized him. In fact, I have never come across any controversial correspondence so interesting. It was published together with the correspondence with the Bishop of Llandaff, under the title of *Amphilogia*, and I simply cannot understand why such a little masterpiece did not have an enormous circulation. Or rather I ought to say, when I think of the year 1865, and what Christians and Atheists were thought of in those far-off days, I can quite understand why it fell, like its big brother,

almost flat. *The Reasoner*, in its review of *The Prophet of Nazareth*, could hardly praise it enough, and the notice from the presumably orthodox *Public Opinion*, is delightful in its obvious bewilderment:—

Doubtless the arguments against Christianity are novel and unanswerable, and only need to be considered to enable the fortunate reader to throw off orthodox trammels.

The first thing one notices in Meredith's work is his knowledge of Christian literature. Obviously a master of Greek, and Latin and Hebrew, he was just the man to compare the orthodox commentaries and apologetics with the actual or supposed original texts in the light of pagan history as far as he could know it. His was not the day of the scholarly research of *The Golden Bough*, but for his purpose, it was not altogether necessary. Nor was he concerned as to whether the Gospels were actually authentic; I have a shrewd idea he not only knew they were not, but he actually questioned the historicity of Jesus himself. But he had set himself the task of examining the records as published "In this work, all words which the gospels attributed to Jesus are taken as if they had really been spoken by him" and the result was devastating. He did not see behind the Gospel account, a wonderful figure, the greatest the world has ever known, a Communist and a Poet, a Business Man and an Orator, a Super-Organizer and a Prohibitionist. Either Jesus was as presented to us in "Holy Writ," or he was not. No other view is possible, for outside the Gospels, Jesus is absolutely unknown.

How Meredith dealt with the recorded words of Jesus will be shown in the following article.

H. CUTNER.

(To be concluded.)

How an Entity is Evolved.

A LA JOAD.

An alternative title would be, "Life as an Entity." Life is defined as the capacity of animal or plant for self-preservation and growth by the processes of assimilation and excretion, the permanent cessation of which constitutes death. Or we might designate it as the hypothetical cause or principle of such capacity.

It is not inherent in all forms of matter like inertia or gravity. Indeed, it is not an attribute of any one form of matter singly. The outstanding fact about life is that it is the offspring of a four-fold material alliance. It comes into being as the result of a synthetic union between carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen. This is a cardinal fact, and one of paramount importance in the study of the principle that animates living things; yet it is seldom, if ever, referred to as such.

That each of these four elements contains potential factors of the vital principle which conjointly become actual under the influence of chemical synthesis, cannot be doubted. My own belief is that the instability of the compound molecule as it became more and more complex gave the "kick-off" to the stream of life, just as stability of chemical and physical products would become the corner stones of the solid framework which served as the body.

Ever since science has opened man's mental eyes, he has been goaded by a national curiosity to find causes for our stock experience and common sensations such as sound, light, heat, taste, smell, and weight. And did not rest till he found them. Indeed, the words sound, light, and heat now more often stand for the external causes than for the sensa-

tions themselves—an unfortunate ambiguity. Materialists have never thought that such an investigation was necessary in connexion with the phenomenon of life as they considered that its source of power was inherent in living tissue. Anti-materialists, however, have made many an attempt to find it elsewhere; and Mr. Joad has now joined them.

His aim and method, however, is as far removed from that of science as the poles are asunder.

His objective is akin to Hegel's dictum that "nothing is an entity"; and his method of getting his result is certainly as sophistic as Hegel's. An entity that has never given the least indication of its existence must be most assuredly metaphysical, if there be such existences. And Mr. Joad has made no attempt to offer even shadowy shadow of evidence in support of such an existence. Let us then see how he sets about to transmute the term life into an entity.

I.—In the discharge of his metamorphic task he relies mainly, if not exclusively, upon the resources of language. That is, upon the intrinsic potency of speech to engender belief quite apart from the verity of its contents.

How then does speech serve Mr. Joad to gain his end? In the first place he avoids with apparent care such phrases as "the phenomenon of life"; "the manifestations of life," or "the characteristics of living substance," which would be the honestly correct way of referring to vital phenomena. No, he invariably uses the term "life," and in such a way as if it stood for something that existed independently of material bodies. And the frequency with which the little monosyllable is repeated leaves the impression that Mr. Joad is not unmindful of the hypnotic effect of constant repetition. The very existence of a word, if it be a substantive, implies that it stands for some reality. It is felt to be a kind image of some external object or substance limned upon the plate of the mind. And each time it is uttered it deepens that impression especially when the phrase or sentence has no meaning unless it be an entity or causal principle. And generally Mr. Joad's sentences and phrases are such; e.g., "Creation of life"; "reception of life"; "that life enters into and animates," are all nonsense unless life has an independent existence. In fact each one is a question-begging phrase—assuming it to be an entity in order to create the belief that it is.

He knows full well that few readers will stop and reflect long enough to discover the subtle device.

In order to avail himself of that expedient he will even change or reverse the ordinary wording of a stock expression: take the trite proposition that "life is known only in association with matter"—a more correct and explicit a statement of fact was never uttered. But just see what becomes of it after passing through the Joad Mill: "It just happens that whenever there is life, there also does there happen to be matter"! It is difficult even to identify it: It is as unrecognisable as the cut up fragments of a murdered victim when packed away in a sack.

Moreover language serves Mr. Joad otherwise, in a way that is quite novel. He has developed a logical method of his own. It might be called "staircase logic." It usually consists of some three or four steps or rungs by which through being alert and full of vigour he can reach the desired stage in a trice.

A notable example of this new method is provided on page 25 of *Meaning of Life*.

1. A fair inference that life exists only in association with matter.
2. But not a necessary one.
3. "The inference is not justified in arguing from life that we know to life that we do not"!
4. It is not true; therefore matter and life are two distinct entities.

What magic! I do not know whether the resourcefulness of the logic or the skill in handling it is the more wonderful.

Compared with this Aristotelian logic is a poor do—so tackless that it would denounce one for arguing from the unknown, especially when the unknown is a gratuitous figment without an apology of evidence to support it.

II.—The next stage in the evolutionary process is to show that matter is dead and should have been buried. The way he accomplishes this feat is quite Joadic. He first sets about to show that some forty years ago, *i.e.*, before the eureka made by modern science had begun to astound the world, Materialism was quite a plausible theory! Its plausibility was made by the fact that it was something concrete, fixed and definite; something that lay out in space, hard and tangible—the very attributes that impugned it as a theory to account for life and mind.

What then made it a rational hypothesis was the invariable association between matter and life: no life was known except in association with matter. It was the sole cardinal fact upon which the theory rested, yet Mr. Joad, true to himself, never mentions it! While lifting into prominence not only irrelevant properties but those that are in direct conflict with it; as grounds of plausibility.

When, however, he comes to discuss matter in the noon-day light of modern knowledge he turns his telescope round and looks through the objective lens and matter recedes far away to the distance; it is so minute, that it is hardly seen—a mere speck. Indeed, its very existence is in doubt and to that effect he quotes, with evident delight, an authoritative! remark that the atom is fiction—a hint quite sufficient for Mr. Joad with his staircase logic to treat it as nonexistent. Why he does not do so is a bit surprising, but he prefers to leave it shrouded in doubt.

Our present knowledge of matter is oceanic as compared with what it was forty years ago. It has not only deepened and widened our insight into nature's material elements, but has revealed the fact that matter is of a nature consistent with the idea that the living world was evolved out of it. It is not hard marbles occupying space that could act as ultimates in a theory of life and mind.

Matter has at last been resolved into its ultimate constituent—the atom of hydrogen. And that again in its turn has been reduced to a dynamic system of electrons and protons. And even that is not the limit of our present knowledge. "Physicists are finding out that matter and radiation are, up to a point, interchangeable, both aspects of a single physical reality." And again, to quote that acme of modern publications, *The Science of Life*, "Let us remember that the state of not-living matter which we meet in our Earth's Crust is altogether exceptional." It is almost self-evident that matter could not exist in the form of atoms as we know them, "in the unbelievably hot interiors of stars whose appalling temperatures are in the neighbourhood of forty million degrees centigrade." Indeed, Prof. Eddington happily calls them "unclothed atoms," with their rings of electrons stripped off.

What in brief are the main results of recent discoveries?

(1) That matter is not merely associated with energy, but is the very focus of it and is, on this earth, Nature's vast receptacle of it.

Mr. Joad calls this change derogatorily, a "disintegration." It is a disintegration which Materialists have impatiently expected for years.

(2) It has made the stability of the atom kinetic and not static—the very stability demanded by the theory of Materialism. It is the permanency of

living things. The stability of an inert mass such as Mr. Joad lauds is the very negation of such a theory.

(3) It has made intelligible the meaning of chemical affinity by enabling us to envisage the why and the how of chemical combination. And knowing what a vast metamorphic change in properties is effected by chemical synthesis—a progressive change as the molecule becomes more and more complex—it has opened out a vista of infinite possibilities of properties, attributes, and powers available for constructing and operating the living machine.

The next passage I must epitomise with the promise to substantiate them if challenged.

To say that we do not know what matter is, is a gross untruth.

To say that we do not know what a piece of matter is "in itself" is haply true through being intrinsically impossible.

To state that "we do not know any of its intrinsic properties," is a rare bit of truly risible burlesque.

Such is Mr. Joad's anxiety to prove that matter is a vacuum to make way for his gratuitous will-o'-the-wisp entity, that his book consists in the main of extravaganzas.

THE CLIMAX.

III.—Now comes the clinching stroke in his creative effort—he abolishes the difference between organic and inorganic, notwithstanding the fact that the difference is, that one is living and the other lifeless—a chasm that is quite abysmal. Yet with a few words of sophistic incantation and a wave of his verbal wand, which takes the form of his notable stairway logic, the chasm disappears.

The treads of the escalator are as follows:—

(1) "It is possible—it may even be probable—that matter nowhere exists except in association with life." Please note the sophistic *inversion* of this preliminary admission.

(2) "The present state of our knowledge does not permit us definitely to affirm that it is so."

(3) "There are strong indications in favour of the view that the distinction between organic and inorganic is an unreal one."

(4) "... the gulf between the living and the non-living is continually closing."

(5) "Thus those who maintain a radical distinction between living and non-living matter are fighting a losing battle." Hence

(6) "Matter and life as we have asserted in the preceding pages, are too distinct and ultimately irreducible principles."

Q.E.D.

Till the last tread was reached one could fancy that he was championing the theory of Materialism!

Be it observed that this attempt to abolish the difference between the living and lifeless has no analogy or kinship to the transition stage when living matter was slowly emerging from the lifeless. Things were then on the borderland between dead and alive. Living and lifeless matter are to-day as separate and distinct as are the sun and its planets.

To abolish the difference between living and lifeless was most necessary for a successful metamorphosis of the abstract term life into an entity. To empty matter of all power and potency and thus to reduce it to a mere husk with no contents, was no mean achievement by way of dialectics, yet it was not enough to enable the new entity to emerge into being.

If there is one lesson more insistently taught than another by the study of biology, it is, that Nature's *modus operandi* in evolving living forms, from first to last; from lowest to highest—is organization.

The term, organism, which is usually and cor-

rectly ascribed to every living thing, is testimony sufficiently emphatic of that truth.

It is therefore amusing to see Mr. Joad while pretending to find a difference between living and lifeless that would have universal application, wasting his space over particular or even trumpery differences when the very terms he uses declare with unmistakable directness and clarity what that fundamental difference is—the living is *organized*, the lifeless is *not*.

The co-ordination between the progressive standard of efficiency and capacity as it mounts higher and higher towards perfection in the hierarchy of living things on the one hand, and the degree and complexity of *material* organization corresponding to it, on the other, is absolute and universal.

This bedrock fact upon which Materialism rests is so palpably obvious that no hidebound sophist can deny it or whittle it away. All he can do is to keep it out of sight; or obscure it with sophistic devices.

So having emptied matter of all effective contents and dangling it before our eyes as a mere husk; and having also abolished the chasm between the living and the lifeless, lo and behold the abstract term life stands forth as an entity with potency enough to operate the living world, as "monarch of all it surveys."

KERIDON.

"Critters."

A CRAB is a wonderful critter,
A natural born go-gitter;
If she loses a claw,
She don't run to maw,
But grows on a new one to fit 'er.
But when a man loses his leg,
There's no use the Almighty to beg;
He can earnestly pray
Till resurrection day,
And still stump around on a peg.

* * *

This seems to be a case of "Faith without works," in the case of the human critter, and "Works without faith," in the case of the crab. The crab gets a new claw without faith, while the man has faith but gets no new leg.

"The early bird catches the worm." The fool worm probably depends on faith to keep from being caught, while the bird gets up "early" and uses his noodle—depends on himself. One is a Christian, the other a Rationalist.

Christians claim that the doctrines of Jesus replace those of the Old Testament. In Sunday School they teach children to "Be as the lilies of the field, which toil not, neither do they spin"; but when they get the kids back home they quote Solomon's advice to "Go to the ant thou sluggard!" And if the little "lilies" refuse to become "ants," they "spare not the rod." This may not be hypocrisy, but it's inconsistent to say the Solomon wasn't half as wise as he thought he was, but he had brains enough to know that a fig tree will not bear fruit out of season.

BOB LYLE.

One of the lessons that history teaches is that nothing so surely kills an absurdity as laughing at it. Laughter is the symbol of liberation and the condition of progress. The comic muse flourishes best amongst a progressive people, and if the wits are not always on the side of progress, progress is always on the side of the wits. Aristophanes in Greece, Lucian in Rome, Erasmus in medieval Europe, Voltaire in the Eighteenth century—these are among the world's greatest liberators. They freed people's minds by teaching them to laugh at superstition, and superstition hated them with an intensity born of the conviction that here was an enemy with whom no compromise was possible. The laugh of the liberated mind is the death knell of injustice and superstition.—Chapman Cohen, "Essays in Freethinking."

Acid Drops.

The latest person to recall how his life was saved during the war is Mr. Oliver Baldwin, son of the late Prime Minister. He explains that he was sitting on the roadside with another man, when he heard a voice telling him to rejoin his company. The other man did not hear the voice, but a shell landed where he had been sitting, and the other man was killed. Naturally spirit voices could not bother with an ordinary man, but with the son of a leading Conservative statesman—well, that is quite another matter. We are not going to put forward any explanation of this latest spirit yarn, except the highly probable, but commonplace one, that it may be an ordinary commonplace lie. It is curious that this simple explanation of the wonderful yarns one hears is not oftener adopted. But when anyone can get a little notoriety by the simple method of telling some wonderful story, the temptation to depart from the truth must be very strong.

The B.B.C. does occasionally—quite occasionally, of course—get a letter criticizing the dullness of the Sunday programme. And the B.B.C. has no objection to printing it. Hence the following appears in *Radio Times* :—

May I put in a plea for something a little more cheerful for the last hour and a half on Sunday evenings than, for instance, to-day's Mendelssohn's "Hymn of Praise." Surely the serious-minded have been sufficiently catered for in the usual heavy symphony concert in the afternoon, followed by a Bible reading, a Bach's Cantata and Religious Service?

Possibly, this was allowed to appear in order to draw a number of letters from the pious saying they wanted sacred dirges and the rest of the solemn items on Sunday. The B.B.C. will then be able to announce that an overwhelming majority of listeners want no change in the Sunday programme.

Apropos of a Bishop's denouncement of the prevalence of superstitions and beliefs in mascots and charms, the *Daily Mirror* says :—

When an age grows slack—or shall we say undogmatic?—in religious belief, it takes to taboos and subordinate rites of observance and aversion.

Our contemporary is wrong in inferring that indifference to the Christian religion leads to the adoption of beliefs in mascots and in minor superstitions. In the Age of Faith this belief was far commoner than it is to-day. And there need be no surprise at that, for the Christian Bible and Christian teaching encourages the frame of mind which makes such a belief possible. Feeding the minds of people with Biblical accounts of spirits and demons, miraculous happenings and supernatural intervention cannot help but result in the prevalence of irrational beliefs. Nevertheless, there are still some stupid persons who think that forcing the Christian Bible upon children in the schools is essential to "education"!

Mr. A. T. Mayhew, lately Director of Public Instruction, Central Provinces, India, has been praising the "literature" produced by the Religious Tract Society nowadays. He thinks it has a healthy tone. In his youth, he says, R.T.S. tracts were always saying "don't," and not "do." They were concerned with penalties rather than rewards. Now, however, there is an appeal to love and not to fear; what is stressed is the joy to be obtained from service to others, and not relief from anxiety and fear to be attained by one's own salvation. What Mr. Mayhew might have mentioned is that the improvement is directly due to Freethought criticism and ridicule. This criticism undermined the old brutal hell-fire doctrine. It made Christian preachers and writers realize that what they were teaching was essentially a religion of fear and of selfish concern in personal safety. If there is a healthier tone to R.T.S.

tracts, it is because Freethinkers have forced Christian writers—anyway, the more intelligent among them—to be ashamed of the brutality and selfishness of what former tract-writers used to teach. Still, Christians being what they are, Freethinkers need expect no expressions of gratitude from Christians for this service rendered to the immutable religion of Jesus.

This is a tale of Bournemouth. A hare, one of the most timid and harmless of creatures, strayed from the fields into the main streets of Bournemouth. Immediately some citizens started to chase it, kicking it or hitting it with sticks or umbrellas. Eventually, the poor creature was rendered unconscious, and a kinder-hearted citizen killed it to put it out of its misery. Christian missionaries go to India to convert and improve the "heathen," and to confer upon them the results of Christian civilization. If they hear of the Bournemouth episode, the "heathen" may be pardoned for wondering whether it would not be better to send Indian missions to Bournemouth to teach the Christian citizens how to act humanely.

There seems little doubt that it was pious "temperance" fanatics who forced Prohibition upon the majority of people in America. These fanatics declare that it was a splendid Christian reform carried through with divine aid. Apparently God omitted to inform all his special representatives that this was the fact. For Archdeacon Dodshon (of U.S.A.) declares that: "Prohibition is the most damnable thing ever introduced into the United States." And we are left speculating as to whether His Satanic Majesty has scored another point over God—with the help of the pious!

Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., declares that the present system of emptying the slums is the most extravagant, costly, unscientific hopeless, "wishwasy," sentimental, and meaningless ever adopted. No doubt it is. The explanation is that the system has the approval of the Churches, and C.O.P.E.C., and of most of the politicians, whose ideas of "reform" are based on the Nazarenic inspiration.

The Rev. Austin Lee plaintively wishes people would treat parsons as human beings. Come, now. That is rather too much to expect. The parson wears an antique dress designed to mark him off from ordinary mortals. He claims to be a special confidant of God. His divine appointment indicates that he is not as other men. And he styles himself "reverend." How absurd it is for a parson to expect to be treated as a human being! Why, even in the "savage society of Central Africa the medicine-man is regarded as something apart from ordinary mortals. In a more advanced civilization, it is surely as necessary that the distinction should be observed. Why, a parson's spiritual influence wouldn't be worth tuppence, if an ordinary man could slap the parson on the back and say: "Hullo! old man; come have a bitter!"

The church-hall at Weymouth is used by the local working-men's club. The Rev. W. Hobson, the rector, has objected to the men playing skittles. Quite right, too. No one ever heard of Jesus playing skittles. And how can a rector approve of men playing a game in a church-hall, if Jesus didn't commend it? Still, we should advise the men to find a hall where they can amuse themselves as they please, and without having to study the whims of a Christian cleric.

Mr. Angus Watson lugubriously announces that two shillings in every pound earned in this country are spent on alcoholic drink. Shocking! Worse still, ever

so many more shillings are spent on cigarettes, chocolates, cinema shows, theatres, silk stockings, and Sunday pleasure—none of which, according to the puritan point of view, are really necessary. Money spent on alcoholic liquor is not worse spent than that on any other pleasure. Then, why single it out for censure and condemnation? Just because a small proportion of drinkers spend more than they ought. But as the same thing happens with other kinds of pleasures, there's no call for the temperance fanatic to make a special bogey of drink.

A religious weekly mentions the serious plight of the farmers, and the poor outlook in the farming industry, as a result of the long draught. Well, it is too late in the day to mention this to God now. All the Harvest Festival services have told God how pleased his humble people are for blessings bestowed. And if God is told that the farming industry is in a terrible plight, he will suspect that the Harvest Festivals were organized sarcasm.

Dame Katherine Furse declares that "we are losing our sense of adventure." Seemingly she hasn't noticed our dare-devil Modernists, adventuring into the deserts of Holy Writ, and bringing back all sorts of new-interpretation trophies. Their exploits are thrilling the whole Christian world.

A pious weekly says:—

Leaders of the Christian forces throughout the world, in the home lands as well as in the mission field, are urgent in their declaration that the moral and spiritual life of humanity is being undermined by secularism far more than by Agnosticism, Atheism, or the continued acceptance of inadequate (of partly true) faiths such as Hinduism, Buddhism, or Islam.

You have, of course, to understand by this that the Secularism mentioned has no possible connection with Agnosticism or Atheism. It is merely an odd coincidence that scepticism towards religious beliefs should be so strong a feature in it.

The Rev. Dr. Gillie says that the hall-mark of Christian morality is that "you pay more attention to your duties than to your rights." And "part of one's duty is to be brotherly to the man with an over-scrupulous conscience." We suggest that the most brotherly thing that could be done to such a man would be to turn him loose among Freethinkers, so that he might acquire a less morbid kind of conscience.

Canon A. T. Lacey has broken out. He told the Worcester Conference that it was impossible for him to speak of either the Old or the New Testament as the Word of God." He found in the Bible a broken record of men blindly seeking after God. It was impossible for him to keep silence. Canon Lacey has far less control than large numbers of his brother parsons. They do not manage to keep silence. And we should like to know for how long Canon Lacey has kept silence, and whether he finds it advisable to thank Freethinkers for having made it possible for him to be a little more honest than he would have been without their work. Why not go the whole hog and advise his hearers to read the *Freethinker* regularly?

And every offence the Church could forgive save that of independent thought. It could take the thief and the adulterer to its bosom, and could find a way to glory for the murderer whose hands were red with the blood of his victims; but for the man who doubted the gods, and who was honest enough to say so, there was no forgiveness. It was the one unforgivable sin.—Chapman Cohen
"Four Lectures on Freethought and Life."

Testimonial to Mr. Chapman Cohen.

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—SECOND LIST.

	£	s.	d.
Anon	1	0	0
V. Wilson	0	2	6
Joseph Crompton	10	0	0
J. G. Dobson	0	10	0
C. Lambert	0	12	6
H. Holt	1	1	0
J. Kilpatrick	5	5	0
Mr. & Mrs. M. Quinton	2	2	0
Mr. & Mrs. J. Bazell	0	5	0
G. H. Wood	5	0	0
T. F. Greenall	0	10	0
John Wright	0	5	0
Mrs. Niven & Dr. Annie R. Niven	2	2	0
Dr. C. M. Beadnell	1	1	0
R. Daniell	1	0	0
A. Phillips	0	2	6
C de B.	0	10	6
E. C. Saphin	2	2	0
S. H. Waite	2	2	0
Charles A. Watts	1	1	0
J.G.B.	0	5	0
John Peacock	0	5	0
Mrs. M. Roberts	0	2	6
E. Pariente	3	0	0
William Morris	1	0	0
S. H. Laycock	2	2	0
Mr. & Mrs. Thompson	2	2	0
J.B.W.	0	5	0
T. C. Riglin	0	5	0
C. Bentley	0	10	6
A. H. Deacon	1	0	0
C. Henriksen	1	0	0
Miss E. L. Ward	1	0	0
H. Murphy	0	5	0
Charles Bush	25	0	0
A. H. Millward	0	10	6
J. S. Buckle	2	10	0
A. G. Lye	2	2	0
Exors. W. A. Griffis, per H. Black	2	2	0
H. Black	2	2	0
Fredk. Lee	5	0	0
Greevz Fysher	7	0	0
A Mather	0	10	0
"Sine Cere"	10	10	0
J. R. Lickford	0	5	0
W. G. Walter	1	1	0
J. Jacobs	0	10	6
C. S. Fraser	2	0	0
W. Ernst	1	0	0
A. W. Coleman	5	5	0
Miss Coleman	5	5	0
Wm. Wearing	0	10	0
E. Egerton Stafford	1	0	0
Arthur Bonner	3	3	0
Mrs. H. Bradlaugh Bonner	2	2	0
C. W. Scholfield	0	5	0
Miss E. Vance	1	0	0
Miss K. B. Kough	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
West Ham Branch N.S.S. per Mrs. Rosetti	5	5	0
H. Silvester	2	0	0

Donations received up to October 21, 1929.

"FREETHINKER" readers will be interested in the following from subscribers to the above Fund:—

From Mr. J. SUMNER:—"Realizing, as I do, the vast public services secured by the turning of the great talents of Mr. Cohen into the channel of Free-thought advocacy, to his own material disadvantage, it gives me the greatest pleasure to hand the enclosed cheque towards his testimonial."

MR. S. GIMSON:—"I am delighted that a testimonial is to be raised to Mr. Chapman Cohen. For his great ability, for the inestimable value of the work he has done and is doing, and because of the fact that such pioneer work is shockingly rewarded, few people in our country, if any, deserve it more."

MR. W. WRIGHT:—"I am much obliged to you for the opportunity of contributing a mite to this deserving testimonial. All Freethinkers have a warm regard and a high appreciation of the value of Mr. Cohen's services."

MR. A. D. CORRICK:—"It is very good of you and the Committee to undertake this splendid action . . . I was reading again to-day the masterly essay written by Mr. Cohen on G.K.C., and I can only marvel that after writing, lecturing, and literally spending himself for forty years in the Free-thought Cause, Mr. Cohen can still write so freshly, incisively, scientifically, and enthusiastically."

MR. M. STEINBERGER:—"Permit me to express to you and to the Committee my great appreciation for giving us all a chance to do what we so gladly do. The measure of your success will indicate the progress of humanity. If Freethinkers pay what they can for true value received your Fund will be overflowing."

R. DANIELL:—"I am sure that many will thank your Committee for giving them the opportunity of giving a testimonial to Mr. Cohen."

Letters of praise of Mr. Cohen's work have accompanied nearly every post, but I am afraid the editor would blue pencil them if sent.

So I confine myself this week to say how much the Committee appreciate the kind and sympathetic letters I have received (with and without donations) from our poorer friends. As true Freethinkers, we consider first the mind and will behind the deed. As I write, I have been called by the postman, and I give extracts from the first three letters opened from such friends:—

1. "I wanted to send you what I possibly could; this is the reason of the delay."
2. "I never parted with money with greater pleasure before than with this, and only wish it was more."
3. "If my purse was as deep as my admiration my sub. would be increased a thousand fold."

I hope to have the Editor's permission to quote again (next week) from more of the letters to hand.

W.J.W.E.

The Penguins had the finest army in the world. So had the Porpoises. And it was the same with the other Nations of Europe. The smallest amount of thought will prevent any surprise at this. For all armies are the finest in the world. The second finest army, if one could exist, would be in an inferior position; it would be certain to be beaten. It ought to be disbanded at once. Therefore all armies are the finest in the World.

- Penguin Island. Anatole France.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. AVIS.—We are glad to have so good an impression from an "outsider" of Mr. Clayton's debate with the Rev. Priestly. We have a very high opinion of Mr. Clayton's native ability.

H. MARSHALL.—If we can do anything to help the movement in Dewsbury, let us know. A supply of specimen copies have been sent you. We appreciate the work you have done.

G. S. STEARMAN.—Thanks for letter from an old Freethinker confirming what we have said. Perhaps the silly legend of the N.S.S. running round to outsiders for a President will now be allowed to die. Only those who know nothing of the Society would credit such a tale.

"FIFTY YEARS A FREETHINKER."—See reply above to G. S. Stearmail. You make us blush. Perhaps the reply owes its "terrific strength" to the weakness of the case it had to meet.

T. T. BERRY.—Shall be interested in seeing the book when it appears.

H. REEVE.—We do not think Leo Taxil's *La Bible Amusante* is worth more than three of four shillings.

H.B. & A.H.—There seems no justifiable reason why your letters were not inserted. It is part of the policy of the Press to protect Christianity from criticism, even of the implied order.

T. W. LAMONT.—We are afraid that our readers would not follow your letter as it refers to something that occurred outside our columns. But you must not take Mr. James Douglas too seriously. Perhaps he is not quite as silly as he appears.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums.

To-day (October 27) Mr. Chapman Cohen will lecture in the Picton Hall, Liverpool, at 7.30. His subject will be "What are We Fighting For," and the address will commence at 7.30. During November Mr. Chapman Cohen will be debating at the Picton Hall, in Liverpool. Next Sunday (November 3) Mr. Cohen delivers the first of four lectures on the "New Materialism," at the Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate, Leicester. If these meetings are as successful as the course delivered last November, the Committee will be quite satisfied.

The Manchester Branch made a good start with its winter meetings on Sunday last with two lectures from Mr. Chapman Cohen. In the afternoon the Choriton Town Hall was well filled, and in the evening there were many who could find only standing room. Mr. Beresford occupied the chair on both occasions, and made a good appeal for members and work on behalf of the Branch. It should bring good results. There was a good sale of literature, all copies of the *Freethinker* and of Mr. Cohen's books being sold. That may be taken as an indication of the interest excited by the lectures. Altogether a capital day's work.

The *Accrington Observer* gives a column and a half report of Mr. J. Clayton's debate with the Rev. F. Priestly. It notes that the King's Hall was crowded, and from the report one gathers that Mr. Clayton both stated and defended his case with ability.

A proposal to form a Branch of the N.S.S. at Bradford is being tackled with energy. A meeting will be held in the Bradford Moor Council Schools, Killinghall Road, on Sunday evening, October 27, at 7 p.m., for that purpose. Will local Freethinkers willing to help please attend. Thornbury Tram Cars pass Killinghall Road. Mr. T. W. Green, 28 Dalby Avenue, Bradford, will answer all inquiries.

Some figures compiled from Somerset House by a *Daily Express* man, shows that Church wedding ceremonies in "the populous districts of London," only exceed those performed at Registry Offices in June by 37%. In 1899 the number of civil marriages was only 39,403. In 1924 the number had advanced to 70,604. Meanwhile the number of Church of England marriages had decreased from 177,896 to 164,902. Consider the difference this would make to the income of the parsons!

A new, the seventh edition, of Mr. F. A. Hornibrook's *The Culture of the Abdomen* has just been issued. There is no need to praise Mr. Hornibrook's work in the direction of establishing a scientific system of physical culture, it is by now very well known. He has a genuinely scientific understanding of his subject, which is a very different, a far rarer thing, than merely knowing a subject, but it is the man who is above the average who understands it. It need only be added that this new edition is much enlarged, and with extra plates. The work is published by Messrs. Heinemann & Co. at 6s.

Readers will remember the very scholarly articles written by Mr. C. C. Dove in these columns on "The Conduct of Marcus Aurelius Towards the Christians." These were part of a book which will shortly be published by Messrs. Watts & Co. We consider the work of some importance, judging from what we published, and commend it to our readers.

Judge Woodcock, in the Leeds County Court, informed a man before him that there was only one definition of a wife. This was a person legally bound by service of Church and Chapel, or in a Registry Office. Judge Woodcock should acquire a better knowledge of the fundamentals of law. Church and Chapel add nothing to the marriage contract save a meaningless religious service. He would have been more exact had he said that a wife was one who had been married to a man according to a marriage contract laid down by the State, the State leaving it open to the persons involved to have the contract drawn up in one of several places.

Tolstoy.

EXCESS is a purely relative phrase, and it is determined in every case by the particular standard of measurement. Hence, for example, as regards appetites in general and the sexual appetite in particular, what is, or would be, gross excess in one person is not so in another person, simply because of their being differently constituted. Tolstoy was a man of massive build and prodigious strength. The mere fact that he retained his vigour up to an advanced age proves that he had not wasted it in his earlier years. Naturally such a man must have been greatly inclined to venery, and this strong inclination would just as naturally dispose him to think often and to speak much upon venereal matters. As sincerity and candour appear to have been prominent elements of his character he would be likely to use extreme plainness and directness of speech when conversing upon these points. It should also be remembered that in Russia as late as the end of the seventeenth century, the upper classes were barbarians, and the lower classes, savages. In Tolstoy's youth, even the aristocracy of his people had only an exotic and artificial civilization, whilst the rest were still in the barbarous state. Taking all these facts into account, I do not see how Tolstoy is blamable for either his sexual indulgence, or his manner of discussing sexual topics. In these two respects he is after all nothing more than a brilliant example of a type which *mutatis mutandis* occurs at all times and places. The truly interesting point of his case is the disgust excited in him by his conduct. The fact that he was turned fifty before he expressed this sentiment in his works, and was over sixty when he put it into his most remarkable production, has led the ingenious into various speculations.

I. There is, or under slightly different circumstances there might have been the Christian explanation. Good Dr. Leighton, sometime Archbishop of Glasgow, declares that "the decree [of election] may for a part of a man's life, run (as it were) underground." In this case could Tolstoy have said in the words of an exquisite poet:—

The Shepherd sought His sheep,
The Father sought His child,
They followed me o'er vale and hill,
O'er deserts waste and wild;
They found me nigh to death,
Famished, and faint, and lone;
They bound me with the hands of love,
They saved the wondering one.

or again in the language of a profounder and no less touching master of spiritual song, he might have exclaimed:—

Ich lief verirrt und war verblendet,
Ich suchte dich und fand dich nicht;
Ich hatte mich von dir gewendet,
Und liebte das geschaffne Licht:
Nun aber ists durch dich geschehn,
Dass ich dich endlich hab erschn.

But apart from the fact that in all cases of turning to God after a wild life the devil may slyly whisper that the Almighty exemplifies his goodness by permitting the convert to make the best of both worlds, it does not appear that Tolstoy ever did repent *unto salvation*, or, like the serpent-bitten Israelite raise the eye of faith to the vicarious efficacy of the sacrifice upon the Cross.

II. There is the naturalistic explanation. According to this Tolstoy on feeling that his tremendous virility was beginning to fail, sought consolation by trying to persuade himself that it was a base thing unworthy of a rational being. Such a view is opposed by the following facts. It is natural for a man to regret his loss of any kind of power; but is very unnatural for him to regret his having exercised that

power in the past. Indeed the chief concern of most men is to discover how they can prolong the exercise of their powers with safety when these are weakening. As regards Tolstoy, his great strength, and his affluent circumstances would promise him a respectable amount of sexual distractions for his declining years. Why then did he condemn his past enjoyments, and refuse the measure of similar ones still at his disposal. To me it seems probable that all his life, Tolstoy, for some reason or other felt both an attraction to and a repulsion from sexual pleasures, but that in his earlier years the attraction was far stronger than the repulsion. The *Kreutzer Sonata* bears every mark of reproducing inward experiences which he himself had had at the age which he attributes to the hero of the book. There is nothing whatever to suggest that the feelings of his hero were feelings which Tolstoy had for the first time as a sexagenarian, but which he thought that he ought to have had as a trentagenarian. The phrase "He said that in anger," is very often wrongly taken to signify that the angry man does not mean what he says, whereas it is ten to one that the thing said expresses what he had thought repeatedly long before he let it out in his wrath. The query why Tolstoy (at no matter what time of his life) had that singular feeling, still remains unanswered. Pride may have been the reason. In this case, it was hateful to him to feel the mastery which he endured from the sexual appetite. Such a feeling would explain his intense hatred of women as being the object that excited the lust by which he was overpowered. A co-operative cause may have been as follows. Everyone who has suddenly remembered a name which he had vainly sought to recall some hours previously, or who has awakened punctually at a desired but unaccustomed time in the morning, will have no difficulty in admitting the reality of unconscious cerebration. This occurs with no less potency in regard to our troubles, and is the reason why we are sad even when not consciously thinking about those dismal experiences. If it be considered how largely early instruction affects people all their life, and how readily this instruction is recalled by the associative faculty which is the most active of all our mental powers, it will not be denied that we are extremely liable to be subconsciously influenced by what was taught us in our immaturity. Hence even though he was not aware of it, the Christian teaching about the uncleanness of sexual relations may have obscurely recurred to Tolstoy in the plenitude of his virility, and then afterwards have become clearer and clearer as his sexual appetite diminished. . . . Both Goethe and Tolstoy were remarkable in an equal degree for physical and intellectual strength. Both attained a great age, and both were mighty lovers before the Lord. Tolstoy repented: Goethe did not repent—he kept on to the end! There were other differences. The appearance of Goethe was noble and majestic; the features strikingly handsome; the expression urbane and serene; the figure massive but supple; the bearing full of grace and dignity. Tolstoy looked what he was, a robust barbarian coarse, rugged traits; an inquiet, confused air; huge ungainly limbs; an impliant and clumsy pose. The narrow and primitive mentality of Tolstoy could not but debar him from perceiving and enjoying many delightful peculiarities in the character of woman, and this alone would have sufficed to make him form an unjust estimate of the fair sex. As *Wilhelm Meister*, and several of his other writings show, Goethe possessed a most sensitive responsiveness to the manifold and often contrary attractions of women. This, I suppose, is why he never got tired of them, much less came to regard them as emissaries of the unfathomed pit.

The real antithesis of Tolstoy was Anacreon. Quoth he:—

Oft am I by the woman told,
 Poor Anacreon grow'st old!
 Look how thy hairs are falling all;
 Poor Anacreon, how they of all!
 Whether I grow old or no,
 By th' effects I do not know,
 This I know, without being told
 'Tis time to live if I grow old,
 'Tis time short pleasures now to take
 Of little life the best to make,
 And manage wicly the last stake.

(Cowle.)

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

Dolet.

(Continued from page 653.)

HE was also very fond of swimming in the river. Altogether his tastes were healthy, and bespoke a sound and even fine nature.

On the last day of December, 1536, a painter named Campaign tried to assassinate Dolet, who in defending himself killed his adversary. As he had already made himself obnoxious to some persons in authority, he dreaded being tried there, and by the assistance of his friends he escaped before daylight from the city. He fled to Paris, where, before his arrival, his friends had procured for him the royal pardon. But when he returned to Lyons the authorities disregarded it and threw him into prison. He remained there until the 21st of April, when he was provisionally set at liberty, on giving security to appear for judgment when called upon.

Early in 1538 Dolet married, and we see by his works, that the union was one of affection and a source of great happiness. His wife's name has not come down to us, but Mr. Christie supposes her to have been related to Nicole Paris, a printer of Troyes. One son, Claude, was the fruit of this marriage. What became of him and the widow after Dolet's martyrdom is uncertain. M. Boulmier concludes that "his mother perhaps sought an asylum far from the city which gave him birth, where they could live together in retirement, unknown, and sheltered from the persecutions of the devotees and too zealous defenders of the Catholic religion." But Mr. Christie thinks he has traced the unfortunate Claude back to Troyes, the supposed native town of his mother, where he became a flourishing citizen, and was elected as sheriff at the age of forty-seven.

Soon after his marriage Dolet, very wisely resolving not to trust to the slender and precarious income of a man of letters, decided to engage in business as a printer; and on the 6th of March, 1538, he obtained the privilege of a licence from the King. Before the end of the year his press was set up, and at least one book printed on it. Printers then could not be louts; they were obliged to be scholars, and their profession was held in high esteem. Even booksellers had to know something of the insides of the articles they sold, unlike the present tribe who often, as George Eliot remarks, trade in books just as a provision dealer may trade in tinned stuffs without knowing or caring whether they contain rottenness or nutriment.

Dolet printed for Marot, Rabelais, and other writers, as well as works from his own pen. Yet he seems to have quarrelled with both these great men. The quarrels of authors, however, are proverbial, and we need not, at this remote period, concern ourselves to allot their respective shares of blame. Dolet's editions of Marot and Rabelais are much sought after; they have for many years fetched enormous prices,

and they will perhaps hereafter be still more highly valued.

Printers were then a suspected class. Their sympathies were naturally with the party of progress, and the Church regarded them with a jealous eye. By joining their ranks, Dolet, whose orthodoxy had long been doubted, soon laid himself open to the charge of irreligion and even Atheism. Some of his published epigrams were full of bitter sneers at the monks, his Commentaries sharply attacked the Sorbonne for attempting to suppress the art of printing, and he had in his letters referred to the bosom friend and trusted counsellor of the First President of the Parliament of Paris, as "that beast Beda." His character was beyond suspicion; he was a good husband, a good father, a good citizen, but he disregarded Mass, and it was whispered that he ate flesh during Lent. The natural result was that the first two books issued from his press, in 1538, were denounced as heretical, and he was cited to appear before the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Lyons. Some trumpery charges were made against the *Calo-Christianus*, and a more serious one against the *Carmina*, in which he was alleged to have used the word *fatum* in a Pagan, and not in a Christian sense. But it is probable that a poem in the work addressed to Melanethon gave still greater offence. Mr. Christie translates it thus from the Latin:—

"Many a tribe of fools and dolts supplies me with abundant matter for laughter, but there is absolutely nothing I more enjoy laughing at than the insanity of those who, as though they were kindred of the gods, and sharers with them of Jove's heaven, are always discoursing concerning the gods, and teach you how you may be able to arrive at heaven, or how you may be sunk down into the darkness of the black realm. Foolish and intolerable race of men! No doubt they have sat down at the table of Jove and the gods, in order that they may in such wise dispense to us the celestial decrees."

This thinly-veiled satire reminds us of Matthew Arnold's saying that some theologians talk familiarly about God as though he were a man in the next street! Such insinuated scorn of the religious doctors was indeed perilous in an age like that.

Dolet was ordered to withdraw these books from sale, and to give a written undertaking not to reprint them without permission. He, of course, obeyed the order of the law. Those three years were the most happy and prosperous period of his life. He had a wife and son whom he dearly loved, constant and profitable literary work, a high reputation as a scholar, and the society of all the men of letters at Lyons. This interval of repose, was, however, terminated by his arrest in July, 1542, and the rest of his life, with the exception of a very few months, was spent in prison.

He had removed to the Rue Merciere, the Pater-noster Row of Lyons, where he had printed the poems of Margot and the Gargantua of Rabelais. That was bad enough, but he did still worse. He printed the *Manuel du Chavalier Chrestien*, by poor Louis Berquin, who got burnt to death for heresy. He even printed the New Testament in French, and several other religious works which were all filled, as the sentence on their printer and editor declared, with "damnable and pernicious heresies." All the incriminated books issued from his press in the first half of 1542, which shows an extraordinary lack of caution. As Mr. Christie says, "he rushed into the lion's mouth with his eyes open." His prosecution on the capital charge of heresy was decided on, "to make his conviction and destruction more sure, the aid of the most terrible tribunal which the world has seen was invoked, and the court which assembled for his trial was presided over by the Inquisitor-General."

The Inquisition had practised infinite cruelty in France as well as in Spain. The vilest fiends could not have excelled the ingenuous tortures it devised and inflicted on heretics. We have already described the terrible strappado; but we must find room for a few more delicacies from its hellish menu. The official code of the Inquisition, the fifth edition of which appeared in 1730, states that it is for the soul's health of the victim that his feet should not only be burnt, but first well speeped in lard. Another volume by the Inquisitor at Pavia and Piacenza, published at Venice in 1583, adds a new torture to the old tickling of the heretic's feet. Salt is to be first rubbed in, and then the feet are to be licked by a goat, in order to render the torment more exquisite! Dolet could expect little mercy from devils like these.

The Inquisition's public prosecutor collected matter for his indictment, and after his house and shop had been ransacked and his books seized, he was formally charged with heresy. The old offences for which he had been previously condemned were again cited, a long list of books he had published containing heretical passages was drawn up; and it was alleged that "he had eaten flesh in Lent and other prohibited times, that he had walked about during the mass, and lastly, that in his writings he seemed to doubt the immorality of the soul."

The trial lasted until October. All kinds of hearsay evidence was received against him, and he was himself submitted to examination. He defended himself as an obedient son of the Church, but it was of no avail, and on the 2nd of October, he was condemned as a heretic, and sentenced to be burnt at the stake.

Dolet at once appealed to the Parliament of Paris. On the 7th of October the King remitted the case to the Grand Council, and the effect of this was to ensure a delay. In the month of June, 1543, the appeal was again remitted to the Parliament, and Dolet was brought from his prison at Lyons to another at Paris. Fortunately he had a friend in Pierre Duchâtel, the King's reader, who personally and warmly urged his cause, and succeeded in procuring the royal pardon. After some further delay Dolet was liberated. Duchâtel was censured by the Cardinal de Touron, the most powerful man in France, for his interference on behalf of "an Atheist"; but he proudly retorted "in accusing me of forgetting my duty as a bishop, it is you whom forget your own. I have spoken as a bishop, you are acting as an executioner."

Released from prison, Dolet returned to the bosom of his family and to his avocations. He fancied all was well. But his enemies were still on his track. Early in January, 1544, they put his name on two large packets of prohibited books. The ruse succeeded. The matter was brought before the Parliament, and on the 6th of the same month he was arrested in the midst of his family and friends. Three days after he escaped from prison and fled to Piedmont, where he remained concealed for some months. In his absence a grand *auto-da-fé* was made of his books at Notre Dame, the great bell tolling, and the trumpet proclaiming that the printers of all such works would be punished as heretics.

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be continued.)

The whole faculties of men must be exerted in order to nobler energies, and he, who is not earnestly sincere lives but in half his being—self-mutilated, self-proscribed.—Coleridge.

Propaganda Work (!) in Poland.

IN one of his letters to me, Mr. L. Corinna asks me to write for the benefit of the readers of the *Freethinker* something about the propaganda methods in Poland. A question would certainly be very justly put—and the answer no less interesting—if it were but put to any other land than Poland. For example, U.S.S.R., Germany or America. Unfortunately, Poland is one of those sparsely populated, little countries in which the question is—to put it delicately—out of place. It would be far more correct to ask whether the Freethought Movement here has the necessary minimum condition of right of existence, is it tolerated by the Government, and are not Atheists tortured, as in the middle-ages, for missing Mass or thinking for themselves.

Yes, dear reader, speaking of Poland, one must first put other questions. Those which would find a ready answer elsewhere in the more cultured and civilized countries where governments, at least on the surface, are tolerant and recognise the fact that to suppress Freethought by force is impossible, will not apply to Poland.

This country is a land of White Terror, where nothing in the least progressive is tolerated. Marshal Pilsudski, who is the mailed-fist in the land now does his best to imitate the bandit Mussolini.

Up to 1929 we had here two anti-religious organizations, the Proletariat Association of Freethinkers and a neutral (non-political) body. This year, thinking that the Proletariat Association was growing too dangerous for the present Polish social order, the Government put down its mailed-fist and squeezed the association out of action. The neutral association bent its knee and continues to exist by the fact of its being innocuous. It fights the Church and priests by words only, and having its membership among the small middle-classes becomes more and more respectable and "dodge the issue"ists. However, even individuals are not free from persecution. The Government is a good servant of the Church, and its iron hand comes down heavily on individuals, making any work impossible to fulfil. Even reading circles are forbidden, and when they are held despite the ban, the arrest of the person concerned is sure to follow.

Another factor is that there are only one or two publishers in Poland who care to be progressive. The best of these is the Co-operative Book Publishing Company, called "Book" in Warsaw, but even this one cannot function without interference. The "food for thought" of the Poles is very often confiscated, and papers and journals are, of course, rigidly censored. That fine Christian cure for infidelity, imprisonment, is still popular with our King Canutes, and not seldom is torture used.

Therefore, instead of asking what are the methods of propagating Freethought in Poland, you should ask what are we doing to change the social and political conditions. Our watchword is now: Change the conditions to those that will allow freedom of thought and liberty of movement. Besides no work is effective without a good organization behind. In that way only can the work be regulated and expanded. Individual, separate attempts may have some effect in your land, but here it is almost impossible. We have an irregularly appearing journal for Proletariat-Freethinkers and the neutral association has a small monthly.

H. HALPER (Englished L. Corinna.)

Warsaw.

"The playboy to the end, divided between rage and pity, cheerful in his self-contempt, an illusionist in the midst of his disillusion, he is the symbol of the reactive life in a country where 'by the goodness of God, we have these three unspeakably precious things: freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to practice either of them.'—*The Ordeal of Mark Twain*.

Society News.

Mr. G. WHITEHEAD addressed a series of meetings at Walham Green. With the exception of the Sunday evening, when rain prevented a start, all the meetings were well attended and created a very favourable impression in the district. A large crop of questions came up each evening, but except for a local member of the Church Army, who interrupted pretty freely at one meeting, there was no acrimony displayed, but instead a considerable amount of sympathy. Mr. Mathie as secretary, with several keen members were enthusiastic in their help.

Mr. Whitehead finishes the outdoor campaign for this season at Liverpool, where he will be lecturing until Friday, October 25.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY.

THE weekly meeting was in every way the best for a long time. Mr. Christie is a Theist, and this was his first appearance on a Secular platform. His address was provocative. Tolstoi and Russia each make for debate, and the combination gave us plenty. Questions were numerous and the discussion prolonged. But to the present writer the opposition was weak. Marxian formulæ sounded too like "Cauld Kail Het again." But it was a harmonious meeting, and the speaker thoroughly deserved the vote of thanks so cordially accorded. Sunday, October 27, Mr. J. P. Whyte, "Is the Government Governing?"—E.H.

Obituary.

MR. FRANK HILL PERRY-COSTE.

ON October 13, 1929, at Liskeard, following an operation, Frank Hill Perry-Coste, B.Sc., J.P., of Polperro, aged sixty-four years. He lived and died a consistent Agnostic. Cremation at Arnos Vale Crematorium, Bristol, To-day (Monday), 21st inst., at 2.30 p.m. No flowers or mourning, by his request. Indian and Australian papers please copy.

Western Morning News, October 29.

Men fear death as children fear to go in the dark : and as that natural fear in children is increased with tales, so is the other.—Bacon.

CHEST DISEASES

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

Dr. Sechehaye in the "Swiss Medical Review."

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

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

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

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

UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

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

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

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 LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): Free Sunday lectures—October 27, 7.0, Mr. G. F. Holland—"The Kinema, a Successful Failure."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, C. Delisle Burns, M.A., D.Lit.—"Diplomacy and Finance."

HAMPSTEAD ETHICAL INSTITUTE (The Studio Theatre, 59 Pinchley Road, N.W. 8, near Marlborough Road Station): 11.15, Mr. R. Dimsdale Stocker—"Habits, Manners, and Morals."

THE NON-POLITICAL METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (The Orange Tree, Euston Road, N.W.1): 7.30, Debate—"Does God Exist?" Affir: Mr. H. Everett. Neg.: Mr. C. F. Ratcliffe.

OUTDOOR.

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

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.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S.—Picton Hall, Liverpool. Mr. Chapman Cohen (London). President National Secular Society and Editor of the *Freethinker*, will lecture at 7.30—"What are We Fighting For? The Aims and Objects of the National Secular Society." Admission Free. Reserved seats, One Shilling.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S.—A Social will be held on Saturday, October 26, at 7.30 p.m., in the Dance Room, Royal Buildings, 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. Ticket, including refreshments, 1s. each.

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N.S.S. (4 Swilley Road, Devonport): Will Plymouth members please meet at this address on Tuesday, October 29, at 7.30 p.m. Other members meetings will be held on Tuesday, November 19, and Thursday, January 2.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Mr. George Whitehead—"Science, not Religion, the Saviour of Humanity."

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE BRANCH N.S.S.—Members meeting at Arcade, Pilgrim Socialist Club Room, at 3 p.m.

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S. (No. 2 Room, A Door, City Hall, Albion Street): 6.30, Mr. J. P. Whyte will speak on "Is the Government Governing?"

OUTDOOR.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) BRANCH N.S.S.—Mr. George Whitehead will lecture as follows: Thursday, October 24, corner of High Park Street and Park Road; Friday, October 25, Islington Square; both meetings at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW BRANCH N.S.S.—Ramble to the Pot o'Gartness. Meet at Cathedral Street at 11.0 prompt. 'Bus to Strathblane.

YOU WANT ONE.



N.S.S. BADGER.—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.

Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

Christianity and Progress.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

The Philosophy of Secularism.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

Who Was the Father of Jesus?

Price 1d., postage ½d.

Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary.

Vol. 1., 128 pp., with Fine Cover Portrait, and Preface by CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price 6d., postage 1d.

The Jewish Life of Christ.

Being the Sepher Toldoth Jeshu, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. With an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes. By G. W. FOOTE and J. M. WHEELER.

Price 6d., postage ½d.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Christianity and Slavery.

With a Chapter on Christianity and the Labour Movement.

Price 1s., postage 1d.

God and Man.

An Essay in Common Sense and Natural Morality.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

Woman and Christianity.

The Subjection and Exploitation of a Sex.

Price 1s., postage 1d.

Socialism and the Churches.

Price 3d., postage ½d.

Creed and Character.

The Influence of Religion on Racial Life.

Price 4d., postage 1d. Published at 6d.

Blasphemy.

A Plea for Religious Equality.

Price 3d., postage 1d.

Does Man Survive Death?

Is the Belief Reasonable? Verbatim Report of a Discussion between HORACE LEAF and CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price 4d., postage ½d. Published at 7d.

By J. T. LLOYD.

God-Eating.

A Study in Christianity and Cannibalism.

Price 3d., postage ½d.

By A. D. McLAREN.

The Christian's Sunday.

Its History and its Fruits.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

By H. G. FARMER.

Heresy in Art.

The Religious Opinions of Famous Artists and Musicians.

Price 1d., postage ½d.

By MIMNERMUS.

Freethought and Literature.

Price 1d., postage ½d.

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

The Secular Society, Ltd.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 62 Farringdon 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.

FOUR LECTURES on

FREETHOUGHT and LIFE

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

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

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

Price - One Shilling. Postage 1½d.

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

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.

TABOO AND GENETICS

A Study of the Biological, Sociological, and Psychological Foundation of the Family; a Treatise showing the previous Unscientific Treatment of the Sex Problem in Social Relationships.

By M. M. KNIGHT, Ph.D.; PHYLLIS BLANCHARD, Ph.D. and IYA LOWTHER PETERS, Ph.D.

Part I.—The New Biology and the Sex Problem in Society.

Part II.—The Institutionalized Sex Taboo.

Part III.—The Sex Problem in the Light of Modern Psychology.

Published at 10s. 6d. net.

Price 4s.

(Postage 5½d.)

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY

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

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

—o—

Price ONE SHILLING. Postage 1d.

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

The Case for Secular Education

(Issued by the Secular Education League.)

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

PRICE SEVENPENCE

Postage 1d.

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

Bargains in Books!

HUMAN BEHAVIOUR in relation to the Study of Educational, Social, and Ethical Problems. By STEWART PATON, M.D. (Lecturer in Neuro-Biology at Princeton University).

Published 1921 at 21/-. PRICE 7/- Postage 9d.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND HERESY IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By F. W. BUSSELL. Contains elaborate studies of Religion and Heresy in Hindustan and Further Asia, and Islam, its Sects and Philosophy. 873 pp.

Published 1918 at 21/-. PRICE 6/6.

Postage 9d. (home); 1/2 (abroad).

ROBERT BUCHANAN (The Poet of Revolt). Complete Poetical Works, Two Vols. Contains the author's remarkable and lengthy Freethinking poems, "The Devil's Case," "The Wandering Jew."

Published at 15/-. PRICE 6/6. Postage 9d.

FREUD'S THEORIES OF THE NEUROSES. By Dr. H. HITSCHMANN. With an Introduction by ERNEST JONES, M.D., M.R.C.P. An English edition of this well-known book, which heretofore has been obtainable only in the imported American edition. It provides a summary and a sympathetic presentation of the Freudian theory.

Published at 12/6. PRICE 3/6. Postage 5d.

THE ETHIC OF FREETHOUGHT. By KARL PEARSON, F.R.S.

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

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

PRICE 3/6. Postage 4½d.

KAPIR SOCIALISM AND THE DAWN OF INDIVIDUALISM. By DUDLEY KIDD.

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

THE PIONEER PRESS, 61 FARRINGTON STREET, 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.

A Book every Freethinker should have—

BUDDHA The Atheist

By "UPASAKA"

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price ONE SHILLING. Postage 1d.

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