

# The FREETHINKER

FOUNDED · 1881

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

Vol. LII.—No. 35

SUNDAY, AUGUST 28, 1932

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Ourselves and Others.</i> —The Editor . . . . .	545
<i>Carrying A Corpse.</i> —Mimnermus . . . . .	547
<i>The Roman Catholic Menace.</i> —W. Mann . . . . .	548
<i>Bigamy Established.</i> —W. M. Hewelson . . . . .	549
<i>The Failure of Holism.</i> —G. H. Taylor . . . . .	554
<i>Criticism and the Bible.</i> —W. Craik . . . . .	555

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

## Views and Opinions.

### Ourselves and Others.

THERE is an old saw that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; but, as Bret Harte would say, I rise to remark that this is not true—at least it is not always true. For example. I receive during the course of the year a considerable number of religious tracts. I am not referring to this office, but to my private address. Nearly all of these tracts are pure rubbish, many are packed from beginning to end with the kind of stereotyped lying which is so common in the pulpit and with lay evangelists, and quite a number tell me, by implication, that I am a bad lot, and when I die I am booked for hell. That information, by the way, is not so distressing as would be the information that I was going to the Christian heaven, and so I forget the climatic inconveniences of my eternal home in the pleasanter prospect of the glorious company with whom I may get a chance to mingle. Whenever I have heard a certain type of Christian asserting that he has an unquenchable desire to live for ever, and therefore he will live for ever, I am chiefly struck by the lack of consideration shown for the feelings of other people. After all, if he lives for ever, he must live somewhere, others will have to share his company, and their feelings should receive some consideration.

But to get back to our tracts. I do not, of course, write for them. They come unsolicited, and they mostly depart unread. Some of them that are unusually silly I keep, the rest go to fill my overburdened waste-paper basket. But I do not feel hurt, I do not send for the police, I do not call high heaven to witness the offence of polluting my letter box with these effusions of the godly. And, after all, even though some of us may not see the necessity, these tract writers and tract printers must live somehow, and the existence of the writers of these pious pages do at least serve a useful purpose in providing an extra argument in favour of the sterilization of the mentally unfit.

### Outraging the Godly.

But we are not all built on the same lines, and we are not all so charitably inclined towards those with whom we disagree. And this brings me to a case in which what is sauce for the goose is *not* sauce for the gander. For while it is permissible, even praiseworthy to bombard a Freethinker with Christian tracts, it appears to be a dire offence to send Freethinking tracts to a Christian. Thus, under date of August 15, I received the following letter from Mr. Lynn Howell, Secretary of the Cardiff Branch of the Presbyterian Church of Wales:—

For many weeks past I have been receiving anonymously through the post different kinds of pamphlets and periodicals dealing with the activities of your "Freethinkers" Society. Naturally, I have nothing but supreme contempt for people who habitually propagate their ideas under a convenient cloak of anonymity, and I shall be grateful if you will kindly order your agent, if you are aware of his identity, to cease sending me these scurrilous documents. If they contained one word of constructive criticism, or something other than mere devastating, illogical and destructive and unfounded abuse, one would be more ready to consider their contents.

I break off here to say that I have not the ghost of an idea as to who has been sending Mr. Lynn Howell any of our publications. Certainly we should never think of sending usefully sensible literature to such a quarter. An official of the Welsh Presbyterian Church should be booked for heaven without any possibility of escape or reprieve. Nothing that I could say, nothing that I could do, would be of any avail. Nature probably condemned him to be a Christian from the moment of his conception. I should call it a case of congenital religion. I can almost weep when I picture the good man running to consult a guide book on "How to deal with Unbelievers," and picking out such old friends as devastating, illogical, unfounded abuse, scurrilous, etc. He is not quite blind to reasonable appeals, because if these publications were not what they are he would be ready to consider their contents. As they are what they are he does not need to know or consider their contents to say exactly what they are. I do hope that he will not think my account of him abusive. If he must have some "choice derangement of epitaphs," I suggest he calls it "descriptive."

\* \* \*

### The Crowning Crime.

But though bad begins worse remains behind, and ye who have tears to shed prepare to shed them now.

I received by this morning's post a booklet entitled *The Mother of God*, which I have handed over to the Police Authorities as a document which for obscenity, filth and blasphemy, far exceeds anything which it has been my misfortune to read. If I receive any further communications of any sort from your friends



I shall have no hesitation whatever in placing the matter in my solicitor's hands, as I greatly object to being pestered in this way.

This is really serious! Not only has some ill-advised individual wasted twopence, plus the cost of postage, in sending this pamphlet to Mr. Lynn Howell, but he has incidentally caused Mr. Howell to attack the purity of the police authorities and the virgin innocence of his solicitor by asking them to read the said filthy and obscene booklet. The police of so Christian a city as Cardiff, and a solicitor practising in so godly and so good an area will have run grave moral risk in reading through such a production. Suppose that the solicitor and the police authorities are attracted by the *Mother of God*, and send for more of our productions? Suppose, as a result of Mr. Howell's action they were to send for copies of the *Freethinker* and were to become converted? What answer would Mr. Howell have to make to God Almighty on the day of judgment when he is accused in putting into the hands of such innocent men writings of this character? Mr. Howell should have acted with greater discretion.

But in case the Presbyterians of Mr. Howell's circuit should learn through his indiscretion that we publish an obscene and filthy pamphlet, and in case these good Christians should send for copies—which they are very likely to do if they think it actually is obscene and filthy, I hasten to explain that the pamphlet is really neither filthy nor obscene. The title is one that is used by the Roman Catholic Church, and there is surely nothing either filthy or obscene in saying that Jesus—who was God—had a mother. Who was his father has been questioned, but there has never been a question about his mother. For the rest, the pamphlet is written by a man who wielded one of the best pens of his generation, and is packed with the digested scholarship of which he was a master. So I warn these Presbyterians of the Cardiff district who may read or hear their Secretary's description of the *Mother of God*, and write for copies in the expectation that they will be getting something "spicy," to rest assured that they will be getting nothing of *that* kind. They will be getting a better written and a more sensible essay than they are in the habit of getting, but not what their Secretary would lead them to expect. And I would advise the anonymous donor of the pamphlet not to send any more to Mr. Howell. He will do more good sending them to the members of Mr. Howell's congregation. Some people are immune to common-sense as others are immune to infective disorders.

\* \* \*

#### Christian Blackguardism.

I have been dealing with something that while psychologically interesting is wholly ridiculous. There is one other recent happening which is of a different and a graver kind, but which also helps to illustrate the attitude of the more ignorant type of Christians when brought up against non-Christians.

A Kentish miner, Mr. C. Crane, was drowned at Sandwich Bay while bathing on August 6. An inquest was duly held, the Coroner being a Mr. A. K. Mowll. The father of the dead man was asked to give evidence of identification, and on being asked to take the oath replied that he "did not believe in the Bible and did not want to take an oath on it."

The Coroner—We do not want to call anyone who does not believe in the Bible.

A brother-in-law of the dead man was next called, but he also did not wish to take the oath.

The Coroner—This is a nice state of affairs.

Eventually a fellow workman proved identification

and the case was proceeded with, the general intelligence of the Coroner being indicated by his saying it was an extraordinary thing that most of the drowning fatalities were people who could only swim a little. Presumably the intelligence of this gentleman would be astounded that most of these fatalities occurred in the sea or in a river. Later the following occurred:—

The Coroner said that was all the evidence he proposed to call. It was not very much good calling people who did not believe in the Bible as they did not know whether they were speaking the truth.

The Father—Is not my word as good as theirs?

The Coroner—Please do not interfere. Some of us were brought up to believe in the Bible and are glad we were.

Presumably the Coroner was within his legal rights—in the circumstances—in accepting identification from a friend instead of from the father, but that does not excuse either the Coroner's offensiveness or his bigotry, and his open defiance of the law. The Oath's Amendment Act has been in force since 1888. That gives a person the right to affirm on every occasion where an oath is ordinarily required. The Affirmation is administered in every Court in the Kingdom, even in Parliament itself, as a matter of course and without comment. And it will be noted that whenever there is any trouble about the Affirmation it occurs in some footling Coroner's Court, or one over which some petty justice presides. Then these men in the strength of their illimitable bigotry and general ignorance take it upon themselves to insult witnesses and set the law on one side by refusing to act as the law directs.

It is time that this religious ruffianism on the part of men such as the Coroner in question was stopped. I am quite sure that if some Freethinking Coroner could be found who was ignorant enough and bigoted enough to refuse to permit a man to give evidence unless he affirmed, something would be done. The offender would be removed from his position. But when a man acts in the manner described, in the name of Christianity, he becomes a chartered law-breaker.

Many years ago I had the experience of a Coroner who raised an objection to my taking the oath. He ordered me to stand down, but to remain in court till the inquest was concluded. I acted in such a way that he threatened me with punishment for contempt of court. I laughed at his threat and walked out of the court despite his order to stay. That Coroner did nothing, and permitted his order to be treated with calculated contempt. He is still performing his duties; he has learned his lesson and has never since raised any difficulty in the way of anyone making an affirmation. Now I seriously suggest that something of this kind should be done in every instance. When a man who objects to the oath is about to go before a court he should make himself acquainted with the terms of the Act beforehand. Then when he does come before the court he should insist on his rights and if these are denied he should so act as to either make the Justice or the Coroner an object of contempt in his own court, or get himself committed for contempt of court. On that last issue the question may be raised elsewhere and before a judge with a proper sense of responsibility. But the conduct of men such as Mr. A. K. Mowll is at present an insult to English Courts and an outrage on common decency.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

"The first guarantee of the worth of a man  
Is—the worst that he does is the best that he can."

Walt Mason.



## Carrying A Corpse.

"Nought may endure but mutability."—*Shelley*.

"Many things which appear to be incontrovertible are such for their age only."—*Landor*.

"By the irresistible maturing of the general mind the Christian Traditions have lost their hold."

*Emerson*.

"There is no darkness but ignorance."—*Shakespeare*.

VOLTAIRE said, laughingly, that "England has a hundred religions, but only one sauce." The hundred religions here vary from Catholicism to Christadelphianism, from Methodism to Mormonism, but the most respectable, both in finance and numbers, is the English State Church. Yet in the newspapers one reads that members of that most respected church recently engaged in a miniature war. Some London Churchmen, armed with crowbars, went to a Cornish place of worship, imprisoned the priest, and removed by force a statue of a Madonna, a large crucifix, some out-size candles, and other articles. Which means that, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, some of the members of a most respectable church are more interested in Christianity than in civilization itself.

British tourists abroad, deceived by the immense number of large crucifixes and well-fed clerics, sometimes imagine that all Continental countries are priest-ridden, whilst their own innocent island is free from the domination of the Black Army. The bare fact remains that at home there are 40,000 priests of all denominations, and the whole country from John O'Groats to Land's End is mapped out into ecclesiastical areas. Over £3,000,000 is collected annually in sacred tithes from hard-pressed farmers; mining royalties are collected; and State Church Bishops sit in Parliament to further the interests of their sacred body. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners are large-scale landlords, and have a reputation for extracting the last shilling. The State Church alone possesses property worth £100,000,000, rising in value.

In spite of this huge State Church the numerous Free Churches, and other fancy religious bodies, with their thousands of places of worship and tens of thousands of priests, this country of ours is only partially civilized. Theoretically, on paper, England is a democracy. Actually, it is governed by a handful of elderly Mandarins in Whitehall. Socially, England is progressive in appearance. Even the world-war, which seemed to change Europe like a Kaleidoscope has not altered this dominance. How far priestly influence can carry a two thousand years' old tradition is brilliantly illustrated by the pantomime of the English Sunday. This weekly holiday is organized on the apparent theory that those who do not attend a place of worship, or a public house, should stop at home and count their rosaries. This! In 1932!

A test of culture is education. Owing to children leaving school at fourteen years of age, the bulk of the nation is undeveloped. This was proved at the time of the late war, when soldiers' and sailors' letters were censored. Among books, those that can claim the title of "best sellers" are, as a rule, the cheapest and trashiest fiction. In hundreds of towns and villages literature is represented by a few paper-backed novels in newsagents' shops.

A test of civilization is regard for law. In order to promote huge circulations, the powerful newspaper editors of this country foster gambling on horses and dogs, and flout the law. Papers are full of squalid details of crime and vice, and murderers receive as much advertisement as film stars or pugilists. Putting haloes around murderers' heads is not the way to

promote regard for the law, but the Press Gang must have its pound of flesh.

The comparative immunity of this country from Preistcraft at its worst is due to the fact that we possess a hundred religions, one only of which has the support of the Government. One has only to look at Abyssinia to see what happens to a country when the priests have real power. Human slavery there is a more flourishing industry than brewing in England. Abyssinia has enjoyed the full benefit of the Christian Religion for a much longer period than England. And the hatred which a priest-directed civilization justly arouses against itself may be seen in Russia; where slavery was flourishing within living memory. The pogroms in the old Russia of the Czars were a scandal to humanity. "Suffering is the badge of all their tribe," wrote Shakespeare of the Jews. And it is the Jew, conscious of the yoke of centuries, of the ghettos, of the ravishment of his women, who alone can recognize the awful hypocrisy of the pretence of Christians loving their enemies.

A powerful clerical caste is an anachronism in any country pretending to real civilization. Priests perpetuate ancient ignorance, promote mental and moral confusion, and hinder the wheels of progress. A clerical caste is a survival from the Dark Ages, and as such is opposed to the spirit of Liberty which animates the progressive peoples of the world. Reverence for a savage survival may be carried too far, particularly when it is only too evident that decomposition has set in.

If there were not far too many two-job men in the Labour Movement, this matter of the State Church would receive attention. In the last century the old Radicals, who thought of other things than their banking accounts, conducted a vigorous campaign for the disestablishment and disendowment of this Anglican Church, and actually secured a big backing from the Nonconformists. To-day there are no longer any Radicals, and Free Churchmen are fighting for self-preservation, not ideals.

This Anglican Church, by law established, should be a purely Protestant Body. For fifty years it has grown slowly and almost imperceptibly to the leprous likeness of mere Popery. The Protestant Reformed Church which the British Parliament made is dead, but unburied, and its place has been taken by an outpost of Rome. This present Anglican Church does not even represent its own principle on the purely religious side. It is obtaining money by false pretences.

As for the Romish Body, from Bolivia to Bermondsey, from Stockholm to the South Seas, it is the deadliest of all enemies of Democracy. What constitutes the obstructive character of Popery is the abyss that now separates it from the highest intelligence around it, the live, alert brains of the "intellectuals," and the leaden, moveless stereotype of dogma. To carry such a Church is but to carry a corpse, and the sooner it is buried the better. Such a proceeding would be a bad day for the Black Army of Priests, but it would be a good day for Britain, for it would give honest men and women a chance of working out their own salvation on purely secular lines.

Two shipwrecked men were on a raft in mid-ocean. One of them became hysterical, and started a prayer: "Oh, Lord, deliver me from this awful peril and I will ——" Then his companion interrupted, hastily: "Hold hard! Don't be silly! I can see a sail." The priest's opportunity is always man's distress, but a self-reliant manhood means the beginning of the end of priestly domination.

MIMNERMUS.



## The Roman Catholic Menace.

BERTRAND RUSSELL is of the opinion that Catholicism is bound to win, through sheer weight of numbers, because the Church with all the force of its authority has condemned birth-control, and declines to countenance any limitation of family. Therefore it will increase more rapidly than its wiser, and more moral opponents, who limit their families to the means for their decent support and happiness. Another glaring instance of the utter cruelty and disregard for human well-being and happiness when it is a question of the interests of religion.

This condemnation of birth-control by the Church of Rome would have confirmed Charles Bradlaugh in his frequently expressed opinion, that the last battle would be fought, not between Protestantism and Catholicism, or between Protestantism and Atheism; but between Atheism and Catholicism. Protestantism being absorbed between the two during the conflict.

We believe this forecast to be as true to-day as when Bradlaugh uttered it fifty years ago. In fact, the menace is nearer and more threatening now than it was then. The Romish Church has increased enormously, both in numbers and prestige since that time. Churches have sprung up all over the land, and a vast new Cathedral, built at enormous expense, has just been finished at Liverpool. The Catholics themselves boast that while the Protestant congregations are decreasing, the Catholics are increasing.

But greater than all this is the fear and hatred of Popery, which so largely inspired Protestants during the Victorian era, when they regarded Catholics as aliens, foreigners owing allegiance only to the Pope, and which culminated in the Kensit crusade, during which Kensit himself was murdered at Birkenhead, by Catholic fanatics, while conducting his crusade. This feeling has almost entirely passed away, and is largely confined to the aged survivors of that period. November was a particularly trying month for Catholics, when we used to parade the streets with effigies of the Pope which were afterwards burnt to the accompaniment of a display of fireworks. As soon as the present writer could read he was given Foxe's Book of Martyrs, containing illustrations of Protestant martyrs on the rack, and being burnt alive. Doubtless, hatred has been succeeded by indifference to-day, nonetheless it is a great gain to Catholicism and removes an obstacle from its path.

To the Freethinker, the conflict between Catholic and Protestant partakes much of the unreality of a sham fight. Neither party can strike a fatal blow, because they both hold the same fundamental beliefs as to God, the Soul, Jesus Christ, and a future life of reward or punishment—although the more advanced Protestants to-day, use the soft pedal as regards punishments. The minor points upon which they disagree are too contemptible to interest the man who rejects Christianity altogether.

The Catholics run several weekly papers, the most popular being *The Universe*, which is much better edited, and much more lively than of its dull Protestant rivals, it abounds in illustrations, and the most interesting of the worlds' religious news is given in paragraphs of varying lengths according to their importance. Besides this there are columns devoted to sport, to drama, to the films, to the new books, and not merely to Catholic books. The latest novels are reviewed and appraised by competent writers. There is also a serial story, generally by one of the popular lady Catholic novelists, of whom there are several catering for the public now; and, in truth, the Catholics are much more indulgent, now-a-

days, at any rate, in the matter of sports and amusements than the Protestants. They have made concessions to the spirit of the times, especially in regard to Sunday. They say, if you come to early Mass, you can amuse yourself for the rest of the day by any legitimate amusement. This is why the "Continental Sunday"—which the Nonconformist regards as an invention of Satan, and never mentions without a shudder—is so much brighter than ours, and a Sunday in England is a purgatory and an abomination to foreigners, and gives them the impression that we "take our pleasures sadly."

Although the Catholic Church holds that the life of Jesus, and the renunciation of the world is the ideal to be followed, and the lives of the Saints who have renounced the pomps and vanities of the world are held up for our admiration, yet they recognize that owing to the difficulty of carrying out, rigorously, all the precepts and examples of Christ, which indeed would disrupt civilization; they make some allowance for what they term "the weakness of human nature." They say: "If you wish to withdraw from the vanities and temptations of the world, you can take up the religious life and retire to a monastery, or if a woman, to a convent." To the rest they advise conforming as best they can to the contending interests of the secular and religious life.

In the popular advocates of their faith the Catholics completely outrage the Protestants. In Mr. G. K. Chesterton; Mr. Hilaire Belloc; and Father Knox, the three theological Musketeers, the Catholics have three advocates, with whom, as regards literary ability, the Protestants have no one to compare. Of these, perhaps the best known, in the newspaper sense, is Mr. Chesterton, through his social activities, his weekly paper, and his fantastic novels, full of grotesque and unreal characters and occurrences. Mr. Chesterton is a master of paradox, or rather it would be nearer the truth to say that paradox is the master of him. He will play innumerable variations upon such a theme, say, as the relation between a horse chestnut, and a chestnut horse. But it is extremely doubtful if he ever converted a single person by his paradoxes; and we may add, that any one who was capable of being converted by such methods, could be converted to anything, and are not worth converting. However, he serves the same purpose as the buffoon outside the Fair Booth, who keeps the crowd in good humour, or the conjuror who keeps the balls in the air, and leads the audience to think what good sports these fellows are, and what a good time they must be having inside. Which is probably the result aimed at.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc is the thunderer of the combination who supplies the heavy artillery. He is the most versatile of the trio, he has written many books, consisting of essays, biography, history, military criticism, theology, and novels; he is best known to the public by the latter. By the way, Mr. Belloc and Mr. Chesterton, in his weekly paper, are continually girding at our Parliament and doing all they can to discredit it, perhaps with the idea of fishing in the troubled waters, on behalf of the Faith, which would ensue upon its break up.

Mr. Belloc has written much in defence of Catholicism, and in attacks on Protestantism and Freethought, he has publicly disputed with Mr. H. G. Wells. Mr. Belloc's style is the very antipodes of that of Mr. Chesterton, or indeed of his own novels. It is dogmatic, bullying, and arrogant, and therefore likely to impress those unacquainted with theological controversy. According to him all our histories are quite false and untrustworthy, and likewise most of our science. The only true history and science is



that expounded by Catholic historians and scientists. That far from the Church persecuting scientists, it was rather the other way about. He scarcely ever gives any reference or authorities for his statements, he is his own authority, and it would be an impertinence to ask him for verification.

W. MANN.

(To be concluded.)

## Bigamy Established.

"If ye have tears prepare to shed them now."

ANOTHER salty draught from the ancient river of woe is wrung from these drooping eyes. It has happened as I foreshadowed in the issues of June 12 and 19, "A Marriage has been Arranged." England! Oh my England! Polygamy stalketh abroad in the High Places, in Puritan Protestant England. Yea! even in the noble leaders of the medical profession. For details see below.

FROM THE CELEBRATION OF THE CENTEN-  
ARY OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

Sunday, July 24th, 1932.

IN WORCESTER CATHEDRAL.

ORDER OF SERVICE.

Psalm CIII.

Praise the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me praise his holy Name.

Praise the Lord, O my soul: and forget not all his benefits.

Who forgiveth all thy sin: and healeth all thine infirmities.

Who saveth thy life from destruction: and crowneth thee with mercy and loving-kindness.

Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things: making thee young and lusty as an eagle.

Lesson from Ecclesiasticus xxxviii.

Read by the President: LORD DAWSON OF PENN.

Honour a physician with the honour due unto him for the uses ye may have of him: for the Lord hath created him.

For of the most High cometh healing, and he shall receive (has received) honour of the King.

The skill of the physician shall lift up his head: and in the sight of great men he shall be in admiration.

The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them.

And he hath given men skill, that he might be honoured in his marvellous works.

With such doth he heal men, and taketh away their pains.

My son, in thy sickness be not negligent: but pray unto the Lord, and he will make thee whole.

Then give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him: let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him.

On Tuesday, July 26, thus Lord Dawson again:—

Not the least advantage of education would be to dissipate belief in the magical, with its false gods, and to inculcate a belief in the reign of law and its close pursuance as the only way:

Spells? Mistrust them.

Mind is the only spell which governs earth and heaven.

I was going to italicize certain combinations of words in the latter quotation, but if you have any gold printing Mr. Editor, please use it for the whole,

as it is one of the finest freethinking statements you could find.

The Official Oration in the Queen's Hall, from which this is an extract, was a wonderful effort in many different ways. Its setting forth of the present and past history of medicine was indeed a rich one, in scientific command of its many branches and in its literary qualities. The figure of our President for the Great Centenary Year is that of a fine robust physique, while an acute mind occupies the top story. The meetings throughout the week were on a very high level. So much so, that while no magic was talked, only pure rationalism (with the exception of the Bishop of Chichester who was allowed into one discussion), it bore a spiritual message to all who experienced it. That is all the elevation I want in mind or spirit. Let me not be mistaken here by readers. I mean the effort on behalf of improving the lot of one's fellows was sincere and unmistakable. It was indeed encouraging. And my impression is that it must be fruitful of much good.

But, and here I have to pinch myself to see if I am really seeing and thinking sanely, how in the name of sanity can two such opposite attitudes be adopted by the head of the profession? Are they not opposites and of a most decisive nature, intellectually and in philosophy?

When writing previously I did so very carefully and on a prospective event. To find that this contradictory attitude has been so avowedly adopted rather staggers me, I must frankly admit. Are they not aware of the contradiction in thought? Impossible to believe that with such mental alertness.

One must here note how frequently our professors when instructing us as students and when addressing us as qualified medical men, repeat their injunctions to absolute honesty of thought in order to arrive at truth in our investigations and our scientific work. Without it nothing; as Lord Dawson says; "the only way."

A result of this Dualism is that the good intentions which I have noted will be robbed, right at their origin of most of their effectiveness. That is where my objection lies to this dualism. I have no desire to adjust the views of others, but when publicity occurs and public and social welfare is at stake, then one is amply justified in calling attention to, what must be designated as hypocrisy in high places.

The worst of such hypocrisy is that it does little harm to people who adopt this with such alert minds, capable of seeing both ways at once. Though here again I confess I do not know how that is accomplished, but its disastrous effects is on millions of those who cannot do this trick. It keeps up the institution which teaches all this magic to the emerging mind of childhood and youth. It compels them to go through terrible mental conflicts before the great question of their individual beliefs is settled and they are able to get on with their life work in singlemindedness.

Many accomplish this no doubt. Others become the victims of Schizo-phrenia—split-mindedness—and become inmates of asylums. The great body of the public is beaten by this contradiction, and, with the rush of modern life and its many attractions and distractions, never reaches any finality of conviction in its mind, and so drifts on without settled conviction about anything. Many suffer misery in so doing. Every phase of their life is affected disastrously. Their business acumen is weakened, their home life is unhappy, and their private lives is rendered nugatory in objective. I mean their reading and hobbies and intellectual advance, the progenitor of all other activities.

This is a national splitmindedness in fact. To it I



attribute the capture of most of our sporting trophies by other nations, in tennis, golf, cricket and many other spheres. At the Oxford v. Cambridge match, which I saw for the first time this year, the highest scorer for Oxford was an Australian, 161, the next highest, 67, a South African, who had done most of the bowling the previous day. The captain was a South African too. Before 3.15 p.m. on the first day when I came away, partly in disgust, I had twice seen the ball slip through the hands of two fieldsmen in succession on a perfect pitch, not a bumpy village green, where the ball may jump at your face as you grab at it, but on a perfect pitch like Lords. This is a crime which is almost incredible in such supposedly class cricket: unpardonable in my understanding of the game.

Wellington said that Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, but if this is the way we are going about our cricket these days, in the best circles, how can we expect to be conquerors in life's battle? That—is my point in the discussion of this Dualism and what it leads to in the national mind, showing in its work and play in all departments of life.

From the pulpit of the *Freethinker* I put this tremendously important aspect forward with all the sincerity that I possess. You cannot love one on Sunday and go and denounce her on Tuesday without some serious thing happening somewhere. Every word that I said in the previous article, and they were quite clear I believe, has been justified. Medicine has done great things, and will do more for mankind. *But it will not be forwarded* by a split belief or its sequel, "splitmindedness." If things arise which political or intellectual leaders deplore in the nation, as I deplore the poor fielding of Oxford at cricket, then they know where to look for its real cause.

As I strolled about the grounds during this match I saw parsons in their grey and black by the hundred, and Bishops at least a dozen; come down to watch their old varsities do battle, I wondered if they reflected what was happening and did they not feel a tinge of shame at the spectacle of the university which stands at the head of English universities having the honours taken away by young men from outside her shores. I don't suppose they noticed it. And by the same token the presence of these black and grey clerical garbs (they seemed like flies on a window to me), dotted all over the ground so thickly, does it not give the explanation of the whole issue without looking further afield?

As a minor point I may add that I was present at the Worcester ceremony. I had referred in my previous article, speaking symbolically, to this "miserable" window. Literally, and being in an expectant and suggestible atmosphere I expected to see something quite nice when the sheet was withdrawn by Lord Dawson. For a minute or so I gazed and then it dawned on me that the principal figure in the centre panel had a look of extreme agony. I remarked to that effect to a Doctor Boyd from Manchester sitting next to me. "Yes! do you think he has got colic?" he replied. There is the old association by which the medieval mind unite holiness and misery: the time when they who were most holy regarded the torments of the louse on their bodies as a help towards heaven. So that besides symbolically it is literally a "miserable window."

"Mind is the only spell which governs earth and heaven." Yes! why? Because there are no such separate entities earth and heaven; the earth is part of the unity of the cosmos. Everyone of average education knows this. The old conception,

"heaven," lingers on, at the back of the mind. It has some convenience as a term comprising "the rest of the universe." In the above obviously this is what is indicated.

W. M. HEWETSON.

---

### Man and Nature.

---

Because these natural powers have what we cannot imitate, enormous might, and overawe us by that one attribute, it would be a great error to infer that their other attributes are such as we ought to emulate, or that we should be justified in using our small powers after the example Nature sets us with her vast forces. For how stands the fact? That, next to the greatness of these cosmic forces, the quality which strikes everyone who does not avert his eyes from it is their perfect and absolute recklessness. They go straight to their end without regarding what or whom they may crush on the road. Optimists, in their attempts to prove that "whatever is, is right" are obliged to maintain, not that Nature ever turns one step from her path to avoid trampling us to destruction, but that it would be very unreasonable in us to expect that she should. Pope's "shall gravitation cease when you go by?" may be a just rebuke to anyone who is so silly as to expect human morality from Nature.—*John Stuart Mill.*

---

### Acid Drops.

---

Oh, to see ourselves as others see us! The Roman Catholic Dean of Cashel recently delivered a speech attacking the policy of Mr. De Valera. His phrasing was peculiar. Thus:—

"Our present Government," he said, "invite the country to go on a Will o' the Wisp chase in search of markets that do not exist. Is it not an insane policy to bar our way to the only market that we have and then to go in search of one you know can never be found?"

We are not concerned with the political implications of the speech, but the sentiment sounds rather strange from the mouth of a Christian priest. Suppose some of his own followers had the wit to translate his sentiments in this way:—

The Church invites us to go on a Will-o'-the-Wisp chase of a country that does not exist. Is it not an insane policy to forego the only world we know, and the only world that is of any use to us, to go in search of another world that cannot be found.

The Dean should be careful. He can never be quite sure that some of his followers may not be seized with an attack of common-sense. He is running grave risks.

The Lords' Day Society is urging the pious who are ratepayers of Hornsey to register immediately their vote against the proposal to allow games in the park on Sunday, and the extension of hours of opening for the swimming pool. To allow such monstrous things on Sundays would, the pious are told (1) contribute to the breaking down of the sacred character of the Lord's Day in the Hornsey district; (2) seriously interfere with the work of the churches and Sunday schools; and (3) greatly increase Sunday trading and labour in the locality. Now, of course, Number (3) reason is merely a "make-weight" to help bolster up a case which merely rests on a superstitious taboo. Number (2) is the all-important reason, and is best stated candidly thus: "Sunday games are objectionable because they interfere with, or may interfere with, the parson's Sunday business." You will notice that there is no attempt to explain why it is supposed to be right, on the part of the pious, to prevent people who are not pious from enjoying the wholesome recreation they prefer. When the Sabbatarian is on the warpath, he has no use for the "Golden Rule" which the founder of his religion is alleged to have invented.



The sub-editor of the *Daily Express* who, a week or so back, allowed an article to slip into its columns dealing with our empty churches, has been called to task (as we expected) very severely by a number of correspondents. While St. Pauls, Westminster Abbey, and similar churches might be empty, they mention a number of others packed to suffocation by the working-classes every Sunday. Which is quite likely. The whole point is that the Churches do not attract most people on Sundays who have motor-cars or who prefer playing golf or who can get away easily to the country or seaside, or who are educated enough to see through the fraud of religion. The "working classes" as a rule have no motor-cars. They can't play golf or get away for a week-end. And they have always swallowed wholesale the yarn about Jesus being their Saviour. Still, can anyone truthfully maintain that church-going nowadays is as strong as in the grand old ages of faith? We trow not.

That the B.B.C. is, in its religious operations, nothing more or less than a Christian Evidence Society is further illustrated by its latest performance. It is announced that beginning on the first Sunday in September there are to be six "talks" by leaders of various churches on "Christ in the Changing World." Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Baptists, Wesleyans and Presbyterians are all to have a say. A pious contemporary naively observes that "once more the B.B.C. has shown its appreciation of the importance of religion in these difficult days." Yet despite the fact that none of the changes of "the changing world" is more significant than its changing attitude to religion, not a single representative of any body of scientific opinion, critical learning, or independent thought is to be given a hearing. The B.B.C. will conduct an all-denominational mission and, by the abuse of the powers granted it by Parliament, will provide the missionaries with a medium and an audience otherwise beyond their joint or several reach. In the Headquarters of the B.B.C. "all things work together for good to those who love God."

"Quex," the Gossip writer (late of the *Evening News*, and now of the *News-Chronicle*) in an interview with the *World's Press News* gives further evidence that, like other contributors to the journal to which he now writes, he hardly shares its editorial piety. Writing of the merit of gossip paragraphs he says:—

Imagine the value to history if there had been gossip-writers in the days of Christ. We should not then have had to gather our impressions of the man from the bare, though beautiful statements in the Bible. We don't really know to this day if He was bearded or how tall He was; and though I don't suggest that that has any religious significance, it might have helped us better to picture the man.

The "bare though beautiful" feature of the Bible's account of Christ applies to more than his height and personal appearance. It is all in fact hardly as well authenticated as a really good gossip "par" must be.

High Wycombe, "one of those famous things called Boroughs," as Cobbett called it, has a Chief of Police who is very concerned about "good" behaviour on the Lord's Day. He has discovered the existence of numbers of scoundrels who frequent licensed premises of a Sunday and actually play darts, skittles, dominoes, shov' halfpenny or cards. (Billiards and bagatelle are forbidden by statute in licensed premises on Sunday). The Public House keepers have had a letter from the Chief Constable prohibiting Sunday games henceforth on their premises. Clubs, road houses, places where the "better" classes can do more or less what they like at any hour of the day or night, these do not come under the ban. It is only the working man's games that involve "misbehaviour" or at all events behaviour which, in the Chief Constable's sensitive judgment, is unbecoming upon Sundays. There are enough restrictions, legal restrictions, on Sunday recreations already, and we hope that

in the interests, not of the inn-keepers, but of their own liberties, there may be found among the citizens of High Wycombe persons who will ask and insist on being informed on what authority other than his own the Chief Constable has sent out this letter. The police in this country are the servants, not the dictators of public policy.

The Bishop of Worcester tells some home truths to some of his clergy who have been objecting to his criticisms of the practice of compulsory fasting communion. He says:—

It is strange that the Church should ever have so far forgotten our Lord's teaching on such matters. His struggle against ceremonial rules was a central part of His teaching, and it was this that in large measure brought Him to the cross. He broke caste by eating with publicans and sinners; He refused to be bound by the Sabbath regulations; He did not fast, and did not expect His disciples to fast. Is anything clearer than His declaration that food regulations have nothing to do with true religion? . . . To crown all, and as if to set His seal on this interpretation of His attitude, He instituted this great Sacrament "after supper."

So far from fasting, the records of many parishes show that in the early days of the Establishment when it did not pretend to "celebrate mass," they had a "supper" in real earnest. For instance at Thame on one Sunday (in 1565) three gallons of wine and twenty-six loaves were consumed by the "communicants." "The Bread of Life," says the Bishop, "should be fed to the people by their clergy at times most convenient to the people." In this matter, at least, secular duties (the Sunday joint, for example) have priority over religious obligations. It is not every Bishop, however, who has the courage and common-sense to recognize facts. We have it on good authority that early services and fasting communion are frequent occasions of matrimonial quarrels.

The Catholic Social Guild which has just been holding its summer meetings at Oxford, has discovered what is the main cause of unemployment. The Rev. J. Ryan says "it is the lack of a proper distribution of purchasing power; wages and salaries are too low." Something like this conclusion has been a common-place of economics for the last fifty years, but the great Catholic "Priest Professors" are only just finding it out—without, of course, a ghost of an idea as to any solution of the problem. "Shorten the hours of labour" is one "remedy." Another is "economic planning. We must plan ahead, consider how much will be needed and produce accordingly." How these things are to be done all over the world we are not told which is a pity. What a feather in the cap of the Holy Ghost it would be had this vague member of the Trinity inspired his special teachers to give us a remedy for the world troubles which really would end them!

There are something like 10,000,000 people out of work in the United States with all its consequent misery. But money is always forthcoming for religious purposes. A wing has just been added to the Convent of the Sacred Heart in New York for novices at a cost of £75,000. If that does not prove how the Virgin looks after her own, what does?

Pity the Editor sometimes. The *Universe* had this poser presented for solution, and it is such a gem, we give it in its entirety:—

I understand that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is (a) everywhere present as God, (b) present as God and Man in Heaven and in the Blessed Sacrament. I take this to mean that while God is everywhere present, the Godhead is present only in Heaven and in the Blessed Sacrament. What is the difference between the Universal presence of God and the presence of the Godhead as above stated?



This would have knocked us out, but the solution is as easy as A.B.C. to any Catholic—at least so he thinks. Here is a portion of the reply: "God was once on this earth as Man. Now as Man He is in Heaven with a local and spatial presence. In addition he is present according to the same Manhood in the Blessed Sacrament—not in a spatial or "local" but in a spiritual manner beyond our ken." Could anything be clearer? And should we not be grateful now for all the beautiful mysteries and consolations of Holy Religion even if they are "beyond our ken?"

The Rev. James Mackay has been amusing himself by "glimpsing the invisible in the visible." He has been noting various things, such as the phenomena of Nature, that happen to please his sense organs, and he thinks they are for preparing our minds "for glories that none of our imaginations can hope to reach." That, he declares, is the only belief that gives any real meaning to the universe and to life. "We must strive to take hold of Paul's belief that all things are for our sakes. It is a staggering belief in face of some of the things modern science has to tell us; but Jesus came to help us to believe staggering things." The reverend gent. apparently hasn't observed that modern science has nothing of evidence to confirm the Christian in his egoistic notion of a geocentric universe. If Jesus came to help man to believe staggering things, then all priests and parsons, whatever their denominational label may be, are true disciples. They, without exception, are all purveyors of staggering fairy-tales.

Over two hundred thousand pounds have already been spent on the official history of the "Great" War. We would suggest that, even in these days of national "economy," a few pounds might well be spent on an extra volume revealing how the Christian parsons saved the British nation, and giving verbatim reports of their speeches. A history of a colossal folly would not be complete unless it included an account of the foolishness of the God-inspired. Apart from that, however, such a volume would furnish useful inspiration to a new generation of parsons when the next war happens, especially as it is sure to be a "righteous" war.

Father Keating, the editor of the *Month*, has discovered that the Great War was really inspired by the Spirit of lofty Christian idealism to end war for ever. Had the Christian nations not hated war as much as they did, there would have been no Great War! This leaves us guessing, but the learned and logical Father adds that "the war ended many things, but it did not end the war spirit!" After which, we give up guessing and sorrowfully wonder why religion should play such havoc with ordinary intelligence.

From a verse in *Songs of a Kinema Church* :—

Sickness, care and sorrow,  
Gracious Lord, abate,  
And to dark foreboding  
Close sweet slumber's gate.

The Lord would be more "gracious" still if he would prevent, not merely "abate," sickness, care, and sorrow, and would prevent them without waiting to be begged to do so.

A parson passes on a suggestion from the Secretary of the Ross Institute for tropical Diseases that "it would be a tremendous help to missionaries in the tropics of they had some practical knowledge of the control of malaria." This seems another way of saying that Western science is of more value to the native than is the mumbo-jumbo and prayer of the Christian ju-ju man. Needless to say, the missionaries will be only too pleased to help the native with Western science—it may attract new ad-

herents to the one and only Christ, who taught the Western world to believe in faith-healing and to rely on prayer for the cure of disease.

The Rev. A. E. Whitham has been explaining the *Genius of Christianity*, of which the following is a sample: "Despite the cruel things that have been perpetrated in the name of Christianity, the religion of Christ in principle and purpose is very humane, just because it is so human. And because it is so human it can be very simple. It may not be comprehended by the mind of man, but it may be apprehended by a child." After wading through a couple of columns of this stuff, one is tempted to reply that the reverend gentleman is "so human" because he is "very simple," but that would be hardly fair to the many human beings who are not Christian simpletons. If the religion of Christ in principle and purpose is very humane, how peculiar it is that this religion should have inspired the cruel and bestial deeds that it has perpetrated during a period of many centuries. If the Christian religion may be apprehended by a child and may not be comprehended by a man—then one may rightly assume that it has more affinity with the immature intelligence than anything else. We should be the last to deny.

A woman reader of a pious paper wonders whether dancing is expedient in connexion with Nonconformist chapels. She complains that in the little country town where she lives a lot of money has been raised through holding dances. These never fail to attract the crowd, but when Sunday comes round the pews are empty. Alas, for the parsons' little schemes! "Dances have been organized for the purpose of retaining the young people within the churches. It really is too bad of the young folk to enjoy the dances but stay away from the churches on the parson's market day. The moral to be drawn is, of course, that the younger generation are sadly lacking in moral principle.

The Archbishop of York says, "what is wanted is not toleration but mutual appreciation—toleration is a useless thing," but that is not why Christians have been so slow to practise it.

In an overwhelmingly Nonconformist country it is natural that a national organization should be preponderately of the same complexion. But the *Christian World*, referring to the number of Welsh ministers who figured at the recent National Bisteddfoedd, says: "Take the Church leaders out of the "National," and who are left?" Only all but the leaders.

## Fifty Years Ago.

If we do our own thinking in religion we shall do it in everything else. We reject authority and act for ourselves. Spiritual and temporal power are brought under the same rule. They must justify themselves or go. The Freethinker is thus a politician and a social reformer. What a Christian may be he must be. Freethinkers are naturally Radicals. They are almost to a man on the side of justice, freedom and progress. The Tories know this, and hence they seek to suppress us by the violence of unjust law. They see that we are a growing danger to every kind of privilege, a menace to all the idle classes who live in luxury on the sweat and labour of others—the devouring drones who live on the working bees.

The "Freethinker," August 27, 1882.



## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

W. WATSON.—There is no need whatever to apologise for writing. We are pleased to be of use in such directions.

T. DUXBURY.—Glad to know that your first experience of Mr. Clayton's lecturing was so agreeable, but one must expect bad behaviour from a body of Christians who have been brought up in the narrow environment of many of our villages and small towns.

G. ROGOINSKI (Victoria).—Birth control as a cure for poverty may be right or wrong, but why is it "filthy?" Why is controlling birth more "filthy" than procuring birth? Man has become civilized by his control of nature, and we see no justification for excepting birth control from that generalization.

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

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

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

Letters for the Editor of the "Freethinker" should be addressed to 61 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, R. H. Rosetti, giving as long notice as possible.

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

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.

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.

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.

## Sugar Plums.

We very much regret that quite unintentionally we killed Mr. Algernon Ashton in a recent issue of the *Freethinker*. Either Mr. Ashton or his ghost now writes:—

In the current issue of your esteemed and common-sense journal I notice a paragraph beginning thus: "There is a Mr. J. W. Poynter who bids fair to rival the late Algernon Ashton as a writer of letters to the press." I beg, however, to inform you that I am fortunately still very much alive, and hope to write many another letter to the newspapers before I am finished.

We are very pleased indeed to know that this well-known corrector of the press is still with us, and that our statement of his death was "very much exaggerated." There are quite a number of men we could name who figure largely in the papers, and whom we could much better spare than Mr. Algernon Ashton.

The figures given officially in connexion with the Union of the three Methodist Churches provide yet one more evidence of the care and accuracy of the figures in Mr. Alan Handsacre's *Revenues of Religion*. Church members of the Primitive Wesleyan, and United Methodists are now given as 1,000,000. Mr. Handsacre gives the figure for all Methodists (including the minor denominations) as 1,095,662. As to the Church of England Mr. Handsacre (taking nominal as well as communicating members into account) gave the Establishment

7,000,000. But the *Church of England Official Year Book* only gives 6,500,000; and Sir Lewis Dibden in his recent book, significantly published just after *The Revenues of Religion*, gives adult members as 3,500,000. Not a single fact or figure in *The Revenues of Religion* has been challenged, a tribute to Mr. Handsacre's scrupulous, and indeed generous handling of controversial statistics.

Mr. Arnold Lunn, with reference to his desire to collect and publish accounts of the intolerance of scientists, asks us to make public the fact that he has mislaid a letter from "a miner," a regular reader of the *Freethinker*, to which he would like to reply on his return from abroad. Will the writer please send his address to Mr. Lunn.

Congratulations to our old friend, J. G. Bartram, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, who celebrated his seventieth anniversary on August 18. Our acquaintance with Mr. Bartram dates back nearly forty years, and during that time he has been a constant worker on Tyneside for the Freethought cause. Occasionally, very occasionally, he has contributed some of his reminiscences of past years to these columns, and always, we are sure, they have been read with interest and pleasure. Freethought has no more devoted servant, and we hope to be able to offer him many more congratulations before he takes his place as a memory of a brave and unwearied fighter on behalf of the Best of Causes.

The Manchester and Liverpool Branches N.S.S. have arranged for to-day (August 28) for an excursion to Edale, and Stockport members are also invited to join the party. Each member of the party must bring his, or her, own provisions. Those joining at Manchester are asked to be at the Central Station at 10 o'clock, and those joining at Liverpool will leave the Central Station at 10.10. The return fare from Liverpool will be 4s. That from Manchester is not stated. Some of the members hope to climb Kinderscout. Given fine weather the excursion should prove a very enjoyable one.

Messrs. Watts announce for publication on October 3 a new and enlarged edition of Dennis Hird's *Picture Book of Evolution*, with numerous illustrations, and revised throughout by Surgeon Rear-Admiral Beadnell. The published price of the book is 10s. 6d., but reduced to those ordering before publication to 7s. 6d.

In a letter to the Times (August 9), apropos of flogging as a punishment for crimes of violence, we read, "I feel sure the time is rapidly coming when we shall not have to think so much of the feelings or even of the health of the man convicted." Anyone who commits this crime be so punished "whatever may be the state of his own health." This humane suggestion is prefaced by the statement that the writer (Rev. W. L. Tudor) "Has been in Orders many years." We should have suspected it if he had not mentioned it.

Some time ago we published a letter from an Edinburgh reader concerning a curious inscription on the tomb of David Hume. Another reader would be pleased to get any information possible concerning the origin of the inscription. We shall be pleased to hear from anyone who has the necessary information at their disposal.

On the last Friday night of the Keswick Convention 3,500 people sat through a more than three hours missionary meeting, and not a soul looked bored. But the soul is notoriously invisible!



## The Failure of Holism.

CURRENT holistic theory has dropped the "Vital Force" and uses "Holistic Factor" or "Organic Impulse." Already it has been cast in various forms, *i.e.* :—

(1) Holism is universally operative, and proportionately to the stage of complexity reached; thus more and more rendering the mechanistic account *scientifically* inadequate. As we proceed from dead matter to the living man, holism is ever gaining a surer foothold, and abolishes the hard and fast determinism of the scientist.

(2) Its operations are reserved for great landmarks, such as life and mind. At these "creative levels" the evolutionary process is given an extra "lift."

(3) It endorses the mechanistic account, but supplements it with final cause. Teleology—purpose—is thus thrown in at every point where a new synthesis of parts is manifested.

Some of the crudities of Vitalism are thus avoided. Especially in the third case, Holism is empirically shielded from future mechanistic successes in the scientific realm, and becomes vulnerable chiefly on account of its faulty reasoning. In the first and second instances, however, another hole in its armour will be the mechanistic explanation of how the result may be predicted.

Let us take the three forms of Holism in order :—

(1) If we are to reject this holistic assumption we must ask, can science offer any alternative way of dealing with wholes, without introducing an unknown factor? The very straightforward proposition, so often insisted on in *Materialism Re-stated*, that when things are different they cannot be the same, would seem to illustrate the simplicity of what the Holist has sophisticated with his "Organic Impulse to Unity." No scientist is surprised when he finds in synthesis that which was not in the separate parts. But as a scientist he does not say, "Some other ingredient has got in while I wasn't looking." He proceeds on the assumption that :—

"Scientific generalizations are attempts to show how the characteristics of complex systems can be inferred from the properties of their constituent parts. This means more specifically, when the problem can be reduced to mathematical symbolism, that an equation which defines the four dimensional relations of any system will contain no terms that are not present in some or other of the equations which determine the space-time relations of the constituents of the system." (Prof. Hogben.)

Or, from the language of the scientist to that of everyday life :—

"We can tell what sort of a pudding it is going to be from the ingredients, and if we could re-collect all the bits of the pudding together we should find nothing more than what was originally used."

This procedure was admitted by Forsyth, himself of the holistic persuasion, to be "very largely justified in principle and by results," and he said "there is no sphere that is not in any degree susceptible of the application to it of the terms and categories of mechanism." (Paper to Brit. Ass'n., 1929).

Nor is there any *fundamental* change in the *behaviour* of the parts :—

"The whole development of physiology, from the time when Haller first made an isolated muscle preparation and Spallanzani produced animal light by moistening a desiccated powder of luminescent jellyfishes, bears witness to the conclusion that the

separated constituents of a living whole do not at any level of complexity behave differently from the way in which they behave as parts of a more complex order." (Prof. Hogben.)

Herein the analogy with the machine holds. If we remove the magneto from a car we can keep it in tact. "There exists an idea that the living organism differs from a mechanical system in that the parts cannot persist without the whole. Behind this illusion of common sense the holistic concept of adaptation [of parts to whole] stands securely entrenched." The Holist interprets the parts from the whole, instead of the whole from the parts, but "we have seen that the ultimate non-biological constituents of living matter do not behave differently when united to form a living system." (*Ibid.*)

\* \* \*

(2) Leaving the Smutsian form of Holism, let us consider Haldane's. Proceeding from the assumption that "a biologist interprets his observations in a different manner from a physicist" (Gifford lectures), Haldane commits himself to the implication of a new procedure for each department of science, a peculiar terminology, a new logic, thus introducing the concept of Holism, and "creative levels."

Physiology, says Haldane, "is impossible apart from the assumption of holism." We have wasted time, he assures us, in trying to understand the *mechanism* of kidney secretion, when we ought to be finding how the kidneys "engage in their function." But whatever Haldane may say on the platform, (opines Hogben) he will tackle the problem as a mechanist, whether he calls himself one or not. "He will not first postulate a wholeness of the non-colloidal constituents of the blood inexplicable in terms of the constituents themselves." "Physiology began when biologists undertook the task of interpreting the behaviour of the organism as a whole by studying methodically the behaviour of its constituent parts. If it be suggested that there is any other physiology, there is no trace of its existence." (Hogben.) We are not told by Haldane precisely how the biologist introduces a method foreign to the physicist; we are not told how to invent a new and equally successful logic; we are not shown why the mechanistic procedure is intrinsically limited to one branch of science; we are only left with the negative advice that an impasse in scientific enquiry is due to the appearance of "creative entities," which defy analysis.

As Forsyth himself says :—

"The question is not that of a division of spheres or levels of existence, some of which are capable of complete explanation on mechanistic principles, while others are incapable . . . for there is no sphere which is not susceptible"

to mechanistic treatment.

(3) And finally we have Forsyth's presentation of Holism, wherein mechanism is the mode of operation of the Synthesising Factor. As this does not question the scientific efficacy of mechanism, it does not admit of refutation by experiment. On the other hand, it must remain baseless dogma. The "impulse to organic unity" adds nothing to what is already known. If impersonal, it becomes, as Santayana would call it, a "poetic synonym for the actual fertility of matter." If personal, it takes its place with the obsolete "Argument from Design," rendering itself open to the same objections and difficulties.

\* \* \*

Whatever advantages holism may have over vitalism, they are unanimous in supposing that the inven-



tion of a new word will solve the problem. "The history of human thought again and again proves that people will always fall back on the language of magic when the language of science provides them with no vocabulary in which to discuss the things that interest them most." (Prof. L. Hogben.) At various levels of complexity properties emerge which cannot at present be deduced from a knowledge of simpler systems. "Holism seems to imply that such qualities will never be interpreted in this way." (*Ibidem*). This appeal to ignorance is thus a continuance of the game played by vitalists, and history exposes it as bombastic and unscientific.

"The important advances of biological science during the last hundred years have not only involved continual abandonment of teleological concepts, but have consistently been made in the teeth of opposition of the vitalists, organicists and holists of their time." (*Ibid.*)

In 1827, for example, the chemist Henry wrote, concerning organic compounds, "It is not probable that we shall ever attain the power of imitating nature in these operations. For in the functions of a living plant a directing principle appears to be concerned peculiar to animated bodies and superior to and differing from the cause which has been termed chemical affinity." With the reduction of organic chemistry to the chemistry of the carbon compounds Henry's position becomes obsolete. Instances could, of course, be multiplied. Six years before the determination by Helmholtz in 1851 of the velocity of the nervous impulse, Johannes Müller had declared that to measure the propagation of that "imponderable psychical principle" was a theoretical absurdity; while the researches of Hill and Meyerhof on the chemical mechanics of muscle represent an advance in the reduction of vital processes to physical chemistry. Pavlov's mechanistic procedure in dealing with conscious behaviour are an even more striking example.

Holism is most dogmatic where nothing is known. As Henderson remarks in his *Fitness of the Environment*, if we wish to indulge in teleological phantasies we can find as much scope in physics and chemistry as in the more complex branches of science. The Holist may logically be expected to show that a better understanding of how to drive a motor-car may be gained by assuming that at every level of complexity between an isolated atom and the newly-licensed automobile there is an ever increasing urge to a wholeness *indefinably different from the interaction of the parts.*

The principle of mechanism, which is the main scientific tenet in the philosophy of Materialism, seems immune from damage at the hands of the Holists. As against holism, it asserts that *a complex system is interpretable only by reference to the properties of its constituent parts.* It proceeds by analysis, not by the assumption of unrelated unknowns. "What is analysable is complex, and what is complex consists of interrelated parts which together constitute a whole." (Hogben.)

Has holism, then, no use whatever as a term? It is a generally accepted proposition that whatever happens in any part of the whole is partly determined by the internal nature of the whole (cf. especially Gestalt psychology). In this sense, then, has the term holism any chance of utility? I do not know. I conceive its possibility, but doubt its likelihood.

G. H. TAYLOR.

## Criticism and the Bible.

(Concluded from page 539.)

### III.

WHEN does a nation first begin to develop? When several tribes have permanently settled down on the land and, either through mutual alliances for defence or attack, or through the forceful subjugation of one or more tribes by one or more of the other tribes, a sort of State is formed, with a common administration over the whole of the occupied territory. However, the forces of territory and private property acquired the upper hand over the old kinship basis of organization more or less slowly in ancient times, and consequently the cult of a national god only gradually evolves out of the old ancestor-worship of the kinship groups, of the households, gentes and tribes. That it was no peaceful growth in the case of Israel but a long and protracted struggle between the new god and the old gods, that for long even the people were prone to "halt between two opinions," the Books of Judges, Kings, Chronicles and of the Prophets, bear eloquent and undeniable witness. "The tradition of past generations weighed like an alp on the brain" of the Hebrew people, and the new religious ideology only overcame this tradition, to the extent that the new economic relations acquired stability, and the new and political organization became consolidated.

The way in which the national god comes to power, depends on the way in which the nation arises out of the old kinship groups. There are two characteristic ways of development. Either the national god arises through the gradual identification of the analogous tribal gods with one another, *i.e.*, through thinking of them as one and the same god-like being, attributing to this being all the different special qualities which hitherto attached to the tribal gods; or when one tribe succeeds in establishing its leadership and rule over other tribes, the god of this tribe becomes the ruling head-god.

Still, as we have stated, the process of religious evolution takes place gradually and from stage to stage. We know many peoples of antiquity, as well as of more modern times, who had already become nations but as yet had no national god. At the time when they were discovered, many closely related tribes of the North American Indians had already joined together into "nations" and "leagues" the six tribes of the Iroquois formed the Iroquois nation, the six tribes of the Creeks and, later, the Natchez, formed the league of the Creeks. Upon the tableland of the Anahuac in modern Mexico, the three Nahuatlac tribes of Aztecs, Tlacopans and Tezcucans, united in an Aztec league, which was the ancient kingdom of Mexico for the old Spanish chroniclers. Yet in all those examples, one would seek in vain for the cult of a national god.

We come across the formation of a kind of national god-cult, among the Old Peruvians—the cult of Viracotsha. Originally, he was only a tribal god, the creator of the Cetshua tribes. In the individual tribes he was worshipped as a god with different attributes and under different names. After those tribes, through alliance and conquest, had become closely welded with the Inca tribe, and had begun to look upon themselves, in contrast with the other and conquered tribes, as the really original people of the kingdom, the notion acquired force, as we can see from the myths and the invocation rhymes, that Viracotsha was the *one* creator-god of all the Cetshua tribes; and that he had in times past only manifested himself differently in the different tribes. The

Of all mankind, each loves himself the best.

Terence.



different attributes and titles of honour with which he had been endowed and acclaimed in the different localities, were now concentrated and centralized in him as a single god. He became simultaneously the creator of the tribes and the nation, "the first cause of all things," "the maker of all," "the director of the earth," "the all-permeating one," etc., etc., who had made the other gods, the gods of the gentes and households, and assigned to them their functions.

Just as in the case of the four head gentile gods of the Incas, so also to the Viracotsha or Patshacamac, temples were built and temple lands allotted by all the tribes which the Incas had brought under their rule. He became not only, in the words of the hymn, "Caylla Viracotsha," the "omnipresent" creator of all, but he had his places of worship in all the tribal districts of the kingdom; and his sacrificial rites were placed in charge of a particular Inca gens or Ayllu (the equivalent of the Hebrew *mispacha*); just as in Israel the priestly office was vested in the Levites.

At the same time, the Incas endeavoured to centralize the leading cult in Cuzco, the capital of the kingdom, where also the great festival to the Creator, with its numerous human sacrifices, was held.

In Egypt, evolution followed a similar course. In the earlier times each tribal kingdom had its particular tribal and local gods, its Ammon-Ra, Atmu-Ra, Osiri-Ra, Sebak-Ra, Hor-Ra, Tut-Ra, etc. With the rise of the three chief empires of Thais, Memphis, and Thebes, the leadership in the world of the gods passes over to the three national deities, Osiris-Ra, Ptah-Ra, and Ammon-Ra, with their consorts, Isis, Secht, and Mut.

In Babylon, we find Marduk, in the beginning, only as a tribal and local god, the god of the urban district of Babylon. However, with the victory of the tribe living there, Marduk gradually rises to the position and dignity of god of the Babylonian kingdom.

In India, the great and mighty Indra first of all appears as the protector-god of a tribe. His progress to wider dominion and higher rank, his contest with the god Varuna, so glowingly described in the different hymns of the *Rig Veda*,<sup>22</sup> a struggle of rivals which finally leads to the victory of Indra over the greater part of the land, was the ideological reflex of the conquering progress and ascendancy of his tribe over others.

Wherever we look, we see that only *after* the formation of nations and the consolidation of kingdoms, does the national god arise and overshadow his rivals. Was Israel an exception to this general law? Did the course of evolution there, run in an opposite direction to what it did elsewhere? Are we to assume that in Israel, first of all a national god had arisen and only after that, the nation? That is precisely what the higher critics like Wellhausen and Smend, among others, have asked us to believe. Wellhausen, in his work on the history of Israel and Judah, has stated in all seriousness that the political unity of Israel was the result of the preliminary work of religion, that it was as the people of Yahwe that they became the people of Israel. Professor Smend was still more specific in his affirmation of the same thesis. After declaring at the beginning of his *Manual of the Religious History of the Old Testament*, that the religion of the Israelites was a national religion which signified a relation between God and the nation, he proceeds to show that Israel arose with the exodus from Egypt, and with the rise of this people their religion was also there. According to Smend's view, the Israelite nation was not the sequel

to a long historical process of development, but simply came to be at that moment when Moses gave it a god. "The tribes became Israel through Yahwe becoming the God of Israel."

This is typical theo-logic. It only needs to complete the picture, the assurance that before there were tribes, the Hebrew federation of tribes already existed! Truly God moves, or at least the minds of his representatives move "in a mysterious way," in a way which is contradicted by all the facts of experience. First, there was the god of Israel, then arose the religion of Israel, and, last of all Israel itself! O! "criticism," where is thy criticism? Peradventure, where Professor Smend found the proofs for his curious order of events! And where was that? In a nightmare in the Books of Moses!<sup>23</sup> Because that is how the Yahwist has presented the course of development, therefore it is so! Amen!

If the professors of theology, instead of limiting themselves solely to the study of the history of the religion of the Israelites, would take up the study of the general history of religion, and if they, furthermore, would try to understand the religious history of every people in the context of the social and economic conditions of their existence, instead of merely out of the contents of the religious consciousness of the people, in other words, if they would come down from the "higher" world of theological air-castles to the lower but soberer world of ethnological facts, they would at once realize that the appeal to the statements of the Yahwist scribes is utterly valueless; for in such religious reports, the subsequent is always represented as the antecedent; the practices and outlooks of later times are made to appear as if they were the practices and outlooks of much earlier times. Even although it is demonstrated that among a people the cult of the national god has only arisen at a late moment in their history, yet we almost always find that in the traditions of this lately-arisen national cult, its national god is placed at the beginning of all things. He had always been there. He had created the people. He had multiplied them and given them prosperity. He had allotted to them their habitat and announced to them his laws. From the very outset, from time immemorial, he had protected his chosen people and punished them for their sins. That is the picture which recurs again and again in almost all the religious traditions which have remained preserved for us, however differently their external features may be composed and bedecked.

We have not yet done with Israel's theological historians. They have something more to contribute in the way of critical enlightenment. Not only, we are told by them, did the Hebrews in the wilderness worship Yahwe as a national god. This Yahwe was also the *sole* god who tolerated no other gods beside him. The Hebrews were, while in the desert, therefore already avowed monotheists.

This assertion about the monotheistic Yahwe is just as unfounded as the previous one about the nationalistic Yahwe. It is in contradiction to all experiences among other peoples, nomads and agriculturists. On a culturally much higher level than the Hebrew hordes of the desert who burst into Canaan, stood the old civilized and semi-civilized peoples of Asia, Africa, America, and around the eastern basin of the Mediterranean; yet none of them attained to monotheism. They had their so-called national gods. Yet these did not have the field of veneration to themselves. Those peoples worshipped also a larger

<sup>22</sup> *Rig Veda*, Book IV., Hymn 42.

<sup>23</sup> "Out of the historical life of the religion of the Old Testament alone, we recognize its historical truth, and it proves itself to be a religion given by God." (*Manual of the Religious History of the Old Testament*).



or smaller crowd of subordinate gods.

How, then, do the learned gentlemen of the theological faculty dispose of this difficulty? Nothing easier! Difficulties were not made for the theologian but the theologian for the difficulties! *The Hebrews had a quite singular, emotional disposition for monotheism, a sort of special monotheistic instinct.* "When the concept is absent, there comes at the right time the word!" (Goethe)

But let us assume for a moment that this brilliant discovery of the theological Columbus is really dry land and not another mirage, that the Hebrews had this special endowment for monotheism, and that already in the desert they had worshipped Yahwe as the one god. Then, if one does not assume that before this time, under the wise dispensation of Yahwe, they had even on the lowest stages been monotheists, they must before they settled in Canaan have absolutely finished with their earlier polytheism, which, from the example of other nomadic tribes, could only have been a kind of ancestorism or animism. They must have already abandoned the earlier ancestor-worship. But let us move over the Jordan into Northern Canaan and observe the religious behaviour of those intruding Hebrew hordes. What do we find? We find that despite this special monotheistic temperament and its victory over ancestor-worship, the intruders at once take up the worship of Baal, teraphim and household gods, in vogue among the conquered native population and, what is more, in a relatively crude and backward form. The remarkable fact has to be recognized and acknowledged, that this ancestor worship was so firmly entrenched in the monotheistic temperament of the Israelites, that all the vehement declamations of the prophets against it could not suppress it, and it maintained its hold until after the exile in Babylon.

What is one to think of this celebrated, special monotheistic instinct, which not only collapses at once and all along the line at the first contact with the cults of a beaten foe, but turns into its precise opposite—polytheism? One could say with a far greater show of truth, that the Hebrews had an instinct for polytheism. The fact is that those assertions of the "Higher Critics," do not belong to historical criticism but to theological soothsaying.

W. CRAIK.

## Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

### SCIENCE AND INTOLERANCE.

SIR,—In reply to Mr. Lunn's letter, I think it is sufficient to bring out more clearly one point as an addition to the strictly anthropological treatment you gave it in your excellent article.

The Christian as such has the best of reasons for intolerance. Unbelief and heresy or wrong belief are obviously against the will of his God, and therefore sinful. (Let Mr. Lunn ask a Christian whether he believes in tolerating sin!)

Most Christians may be more generous than Christian and repudiate such an interpretation by putting unbelief and wrong belief in a different category to theft and murder, but although their reason for doing so is obvious that is quite apart from the question as to whether they are justified by their principles in doing so. In practice and in this part of the world, Christianity may have adjusted itself to liberal and democratic ideas but not by the authority of Christ. "Lack of faith," etc., was by him strongly denounced as a sin, and of course if a Christian Church obtained sufficient power over a community, and settled the question of what should be

orthodox, it would if it were true to its principles, denounce as "sin" unbelief and wrong belief and proceed against the same accordingly. *This is what has actually happened in the past.*

Mr. Lunn gives no reason why the scientist as such should be intolerant.

J. A. DAVIES.

### BUDDHISM.

SIR,—My attention has been directed to a reference, in the article "Materpieces of Freethought" (*Freethinker*, July 24), to a passage in my husband's *Manual of Buddhism* of 1878. It would appear that, in translating a verse of Buddhist scripture:—

"A wise man should avoid married life as if it were a burning pit of live coals."

The author, in a later impression, changed "married life" to "in chastity."

I am not concerned with the special object of this reference, and I have no longer by me the earlier impressions of the *Manual*. I write only because it may be of interest to the reader to learn why the author should have wavered in his rendering (assuming that he did waver).

The word in the original has an interesting history. It is *a-brahmachariya*. This means literally "the not God-living." The positive form was a very central term in original Buddhism, since the object of this was to teach men, that the only way to become that which man potentially is, was to live the divine life, viz., the best he could conceive. But as the growing monasticism of that day in India got the upper hand, the way of the monk became the ideal living, and celibacy became the chief feature in such living. So "God-living" became "celibacy." And since most of the teaching became intended for monks rather than for laymen, the simile used is less forced than it looks. The reader will find no such worthy word in Buddhist literature for the fellowship of man and woman as "marriage." The quotation is from verses concerning the lay life, nevertheless the wedded state finds no name. The monkish simile occurs, and then: "one who cannot live in *brahmachariya* should not transgress with the wife of another." (*Sutta Nipata*, 395.)

We have much to learn, but our language reveals in this matter worthier values than that particular old-world had come to hold.

(Mrs.) C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

### CONDITIONS IN AUSTRALIA.

SIR,—The cleric of the Cathedral of the City of Glasgow, christened as the infant Lauchlan Maclean Watt, and now bearing the proud title of Doctor of Divinity, on his return from a visit to Australia, gave an address on the above heading.

Two remarkable pronouncements of this address were:—

1. The Universities of Australia and New Zealand give degrees for practically anything but religion, and "If you made a weather-cock for a tower there, I believe you would get a degree."

2. No degrees in Divinity are given and "a nation that excludes God from its curriculum of education is not rearing its children or its men and women to be good citizens."

My letter of protest to the Editor of the *Glasgow Herald*, enquiring what had come over my "poet beloved," with the very charitable suggestion that the Divine Doctor after his sea voyage might be merely recovering from a severe attack of spiritual mal de mer, was rejected for publication.

A protest from "M.D." Glasgow, more fortunate than mine, appeared in the *Herald* of July 22, and the Divine reply in explanation duly followed on July 23. There is not a single expression of regret from beginning to end, evidence of considerable annoyance with, and some unfair vituperation of M.D., and generally a determined retreat cuttle-fish-wise amidst a confusion of spilled ink. Hence the reply is more remarkable than the original offensive statements.

With magnificent courage, as becomes a Cathedral



Cleric he baldly states, "When I mean a thing I say it," and "I am not such a fool as to think or to imply that the teaching or the level of it in Australia is poorer than anywhere else."

The above explanation and the original offensive statements may at first sight appear to be contradictory, but in order to understand their complete harmony you have simply to recall the fact that to the cathedral mind "one" is not really "one," but "three" and "three" are not actually "three," but in reality "one." The offensive statements and the explanation then become in body and in substance one and the same thing.

The Divine Doctor further states the visit to Australia may be termed "short" in that "it did not extend over a year. It was not an excursion trip. I stayed three months with the Melbourne Club as my home where I met and talked with the leading people of the City and the State, merchants, bankers, judges and lawyers, teachers and politicians and even M.Ds.—in fact, people who count in the life and work of the Country."

This visit to Australia was a strenuous business. "It was not an excursion trip." The foxes had holes, the birds of the air had nests, but the Cathedral Cleric had not where to lay his head . . . save on the downy pillow of the best Club in Melbourne. The cleric's time was wholly or mainly taken up with "people who count." Thus is his Master outvied by the *humble* disciple.

After this exacting and strenuous round, and return to the poverty and slums of Cathedral life, with its pretty christenings, its pompous funerals, and sumptuous wedding feasts one is hardly surprised by the final cleric declaration that he has no time for more tournaments, viz., "I do not intend in this to enter a correspondence tournament as I have hardly time for my ordinary business between the daylight and the dark."

From such a busy cleric with a literary bent a new "Vie de Jesus" may be expected any time. The labour pains are already upon him. The life will of course treat of Jesus exclusively in relation to "people who count." Judges will be represented by the chapter "Pleasant parleys with Pontius Pilate," Bankers by that on "The Divine necessity of Money-Changers in the Temple," Politicians by "The mild martyrdom of Barabbas," whilst the Merchants will be represented by the full details of Jesus dining at the house of the rich Zacchaus in recognition of whose splendid hospitality a few humorous remarks will doubtless be added regarding his hosts' bantam stature and low grade mentality.

I await with interest the result of the labour pains.

"LANCET."

[Several letters are held over till next week.—ED.]

### THE INSPIRATION OF LAZINESS.

It may sound like nonsensical paradox, and yet we may seriously maintain that laziness is the motive power of all human progress. Man has always sought to supply his wants by the least labour. He desires to travel, and, being too lazy to walk, he compels some beast to carry him; and at length, feeling this to be very slow and tiresome, he harnesses steam, and lounges in a palace car while spinning along at fifty miles an hour. And what are the telephone, the telegraph, and all the manifold machinery of modern life but the results of sheer laziness! If men were not at bottom an animal who cunningly devises means to save himself trouble, civilization would never have been born.

But man is not only physically, but mentally lazy. As his aversion to muscular toil has led him to material invention, so his distaste for intellectual toil has led him to intellectual inventions, to the discovery and perfection of language and style.

H. M. Stanley ("Essays on Literary Art.")

For forms of faith let graceless zealots fight;  
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

A. Pope.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

### LONDON.

#### OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 3.15, Mr. F. P. Corrigan.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead): 11.30, Sunday, August 28, Mr. B. A. Le Maine. Monday, August 29, South Hill Park, Hampstead, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury. Thursday, September 1, Leighton Road, Kentish Town, 8.0, Mr. C. Tuson.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 6.30, Sunday, August 28, Mr. L. Ebury. Wednesday, August 31, Cock Pond, Clapham Old Town, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (outside Technical College, Romford Road, Stratford, E.): 7.0, Mr. B. A. Le Maine.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): Wednesday, August 24, at 7.30, Messrs. Tuson and Wood. Thursday, August 25, at 7.30, Mr. E. C. Saphin. Friday, August 26, at 7.30, Messrs. Bryant and Le Maine. Sunday, August 28, at 12.0, Mr. B. A. Le Maine. 3.30, Platform No. 1, Messrs. Bryant and Wood; Platform No. 2, Messrs. B. A. Le Maine and Tuson. 6.30, Platform No. 1, Messrs. Wood, Tuson and Bryant; Platform No. 2, Messrs. Hyatt and Saphin.

### COUNTRY.

#### INDOOR.

BIRKENHEAD (Wirral) Branch N.S.S. General Members Meeting, Bakers' Hall, Claughton Road, Birkenhead. Sunday, August 28, at 7.0.

#### OUTDOOR.

BISHOP AUCKLAND (Market Place): 7.0, Wednesday, August 31, Messrs. Robson and J. T. Brighton.

CARDIFF BRANCH N.S.S. (Pentyrch Street, Cathays): 7.30, Mr. G. Whitehead will lecture each evening, August 29 to September 2.

CHESTER-LE-STREET (Bridge End): 7.30, Friday, September 2, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

CRAWSHAWBOOTH, 7.30, Monday August 29, Mr. J. Clayton.

DARLINGTON (Market Steps): 7.0, Tuesday, August 30, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

DARWEN MARKET, 3.30 and 7.0, Sunday, August 28, Mr. J. Clayton.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside BRANCH N.S.S. (Queen's Drive opposite Walton Baths): 8.0, Sunday, August 28, Messrs. H. Little and D. Robinson. Tuesday, August 30, Edge Hill Lamp, 8.0, Messrs. H. Little and P. Sherwin. Thursday, September 1, corner of High Park Street and Park Road, 8.0, Messrs. A. Jackson and J. V. Shortt. Current *Freethinkers* on sale at all meetings.

LIVERPOOL (Merseyside) Branch N.S.S.—Sunday, August 28. Excursion to Edale in conjunction with Manchester Branch. Train leaves Liverpool Central Station at 10.10 a.m. Return fare 4s. Good rally of members and friends expected. Outing offers opportunity to climb Kinder Scout for all interested.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE BRANCH N.S.S. (Bigg Market): 7.30, Sunday, August 28, Mr. Robson. A Members meeting will be held at 3.0.

READ, 7.30, Thursday, September 1, Mr. J. Clayton.

SUNDERLAND (Lambton Street): 7.0, Sunday, August 28, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

## 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 HALF A CENTURY.

Continuous Performance 2-11. Sundays 6-11.  
Prices 1s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. 500 Seats at 1s. 6d.



## Pamphlets.

By G. W. FOOTE.

### The Philosophy of Secularism.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

### Bible and Beer.

Price 2d., postage ½d.

### Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary.

Vol. I., 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.

### 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.

Five Leaflets by Chapman Cohen.

## WHAT IS SECULARISM?

6d. per 100.

## DO YOU WANT THE TRUTH?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

## THE BELIEFS OF UNBELIEVERS.

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

## DOES MAN DESIRE GOD?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

## ARE CHRISTIANS INFERIOR TO FREETHINKERS?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

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

## The Secular Society, Ltd.

CHAIRMAN—CHAPMAN COHEN.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

Secretary: R. H. ROSETTI.

THIS Society was formed in 1893 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 1917, 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, R. H. ROSETTI, 62 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

### ACADEMY CINEMA, Oxford Street

(OPPOSITE WARING & GILLOWS). Ger. 2981.

Second Week.

Pabst's

"THE WHITE HELL OF PITZ PALU."

Also Rene Clair's

"AN ITALIAN STRAW HAT."

Last days Pabst's

"WESTFRONT 1918."

### CAMBRIDGE CINEMA.

The most Luxurious Cinema in London.

(CAMBRIDGE CIRCUS). Temple Bar 6056.

Sixth Week.

Richard Oswald's Brilliant German Comedy

"DER HAUPTMANN VON KOEPENICK."

Also

Famous Drama

"THE OUTSIDER."



THE  
**"Freethinker" Endowment Trust**  
 A Great Scheme for a Great Purpose

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

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

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

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

The address of the *Freethinker* Endowment Trust is 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

SECOND EDITION.

# Mother Of God

By  
**G. W. FOOTE.**

WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTE

By  
**CHAPMAN COHEN.**

Now that the Roman Catholic question is much discussed this useful and racy pamphlet should be widely read and circulated.

Post Free - - - 2½d.

A Devastating Document.

## ROME OR REASON?

A Reply to Cardinal Manning

By Robert G. INGERSOLL

— WITH —

Introductory Preface by H. Cutner.

THIS is one of the most comprehensive dis-proofs of the Roman Catholic Church ever issued. Manning, one of the best Catholic controversialists of his day, stated the official case for his Church. It is here completely and finally demolished.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Sixty-four pages in coloured wrapper.

Price 3d., by Post 4d.

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

## OPINIONS

Random Reflections and Wayside Sayings

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

(With Portrait of Author)

Cloth Gilt - - - - - 3s. 6d.

Superior Edition bound in Full Calf 5s. 0d.

Postage 3d.

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

## SELECTED HERESIES

An Anthology from the Writings of

Chapman Cohen

Cloth Gilt - 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d. extra.

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