

THE FREETHINKER

▪ EDITED *by* CHAPMAN COHEN ▪

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIII.—No. 53

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1933

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Religion in Germany.—The Editor</i> - - - - -	841
<i>Deo Volente.—Mimmermus</i> - - - - -	842
<i>The Truth about Russia.—W. Mann</i> - - - - -	843
<i>"Powder and Shot."—G.F.G.</i> - - - - -	845
<i>A Fundamentalist Dream.—J. Reeves</i> - - - - -	846
<i>Priestly Amenities.—Frank Hill</i> - - - - -	847
<i>Prof. Flügel and Psycho-analysis.—G. H. Taylor</i> - - - - -	850
<i>Thug-ism—E. Egerton Stafford</i> - - - - -	851
<i>Religion and Health.—J. M. Stuart-Young</i> - - - - -	853
<i>Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.</i>	

Views and Opinions.

Religion in Germany.

THERE is one aspect of the reign of terror in Germany which has not hitherto been noticed, and which is not likely to receive notice in any other journal than the *Freethinker*. Hitlerism that movement of which Hitler is the mere mouthpiece, has successfully established itself. How long it will remain established none can tell. If it can give a measure of prosperity, or even of national satisfaction to Germany, it may endure for a moderately lengthy period. The obstacles to this are two-fold. One, that in Germany, as distinct from Italy and Russia, there are other Richmonds in the field, and at any time one of these may make a jump for power, and in achieving it offer to the German people a measure of mental dignity and freedom which they do not at present possess. The other is the discontent which although unable to find a public voice still exists. That it is not publicly vocal does not give much guide as to its extent or its strength. The Russian people had no voice under the Czar, but that did not prevent plots which ultimately overthrew Czarism. The German people are not so isolated from the currents of liberal European thought as were the Russians, and their chances of a revolt are therefore greater.

But up to the present only one power has been able to withstand the Nazi movement, and that is the Church—first the Roman Church, and then one section of the Protestant Church in Germany. In this respect Hitler has had the same experience as Mussolini, although the latter faced only the Roman Church, and was forced to give way to its claims. Hitler first tried to dominate the Catholic Church in Germany, but was forced by the opposition of the papacy to come to terms with it. Then limiting his attention to the Protestants he aimed at bringing into existence a new German Church, with a revised Bible, a half-hearted recognition of the old German

Gods, the abolition of all preachers with Jewish blood in their veins, and complete obedience to the Goebels and Goerings who at present hold power in Germany. But the stand made by a section of the Protestant Church, the open avowal of a couple of thousand clergymen that they would, so far as their religion was concerned, take orders from no one but God, brought Hitler to his knees. Again he was beaten; and the victory has been written up by some of the papers in this country as proof of the attachment of Protestantism to the cause of civil and religious liberty. As a matter of fact what happened in the case of both the Roman and the Protestant Churches is what has always happened. Each was ready to support the Government of the day, whatever its character, so long as the Government of the day supported the Church. And each was ready to fight the Government of the day when it threatened the power of the Church. The abstract question of liberty of thought and speech did not arise.

* * *

Liberty and the Churches.

A couple of thousand clergymen made a resolute stand against Hitler—and won. The Roman Church stood against Hitler, and forced a climb down. The "Christian conscience" was outraged, and made an effective protest. So far, good. But this same Christian sentiment made no effective protest against the wholesale brutalities inflicted upon men, women, and children for the crime of being Jews, or Communists, or Socialists, or on anyone or anything that was anti-Hitler. The Churches by standing apart from Hitlerism, could have opposed a very effective check to the brutality of that regime. They could, had they possessed the innate decency to have done so, have taken up the position that they really did believe in the brotherhood of man, really did believe in freedom of speech, of opinion, or worship, and that it was their duty, because these things were being trampled under foot, to preach them the more energetically. But the Church acted exactly as it did in the war. It evinces no interest larger than a sectarian one, and even though it operates in more than one country, even though it may send missionaries all over the world, it still remains a sectarian interest. And if its ideal were to be realized, and all men were gathered into one Church, the energies of that Church would then be given to maintain a form of terrorism such as existed in the European world when the one Church ruled supreme.

So, unless I were a Christian and had complete confidence in the short-sightedness of my followers, I would not press upon the notice of the world the fact that the only stand that has been effectively made against Hitler was made by the Christian Church in Germany. Otherwise the people might remember that the stand was not made against the barbarities of the

Hitler regime, against its daily torture of little children in the schools, and its brutalities to men and women outside the schools; its protest, its effective protest, was on behalf of its own sectarian welfare. If Hitler had decreed that all Germans must belong to a particular Church, other Churches might have protested, but the selected one would have hailed him as "a man sent from God"—even though five-sixths of the population were being sent to the devil.

* * *

The Fear of Religion.

The situation is not without its significance to us in this country, and, indeed, to those in every country where the Christian Church exerts power. Drunk as the Nazi party was with success, dependent as it is upon inducing a religious belief in its power to enforce its will, it has been taught that there is one other power in the face of which it must proceed with caution. Our own political groups learned that lesson long ago, and have practiced it assiduously. Socialist, Liberal, Conservative, Nationalist, may attack other powers or parties, the one power before which they all bend, more or less, is that represented by the various religious organizations. If they do venture to criticize them it is in the name of "true religion" or "pure Christianity." If they venture to criticize the mythology of Christianity they swear by its conception of morals; somehow or the other they must escape the stigma of being opposed to religion. When it comes to a repeal of the Blasphemy Laws, as plain a piece of medieval intolerance and ignorance as one could wish to find, it is urged that they have to be maintained in the interests of public order. When it is a question of the maintenance of religion in State schools, the reason is the fantastic one of the stultifying of education by cutting the children off from this "fount of English literature," although it never was a fount of English literature, nor is it ever taught as such in any of the schools in the country. When it comes to a question of a free Sunday, the same fear of the Churches dictates a number of hypocritical excuses about the need for preserving a day of rest, or the fear of inducing a seven-day working week. When the Bradlaugh Centenary Committee tried to get a memorial to Bradlaugh placed in the House of Commons, there were plenty of Members of Parliament who sympathized with the proposal. There were also plenty who were ready to support the proposal—if it were brought forward by others. But to take a lead in proposing a memorial to so notorious an Atheist and Republican as Charles Bradlaugh was too much. So the proposal, for the time, had to be dropped. If the German Nazis had taken a lesson from English politics, Hitler would not have suffered the only rebuff he has had in his later career. Foreign politicians who wish to study the art of camouflaging their real aims ought to devote time to the study of our own political parties. Above all they would learn that the most dangerous of all forces to attack is that of religion. That is why in this country our politicians act as they do when religious interests are concerned. That is also why the real fight against religion has to be carried on by a body of men and women who think little of social prestige or political advancement. The fear of religion is not confined to those who believe in it.

* * *

Can Religion be left Alone?

Under modern conditions the spirit of a medieval nationalism is bad enough, but the spirit of religious corporations, whether these corporations be small or large, national or international, is worse. Religion

has no political principles save the one of helping any form of government that will help it. And when its interests are threatened, then it can tap that underground river of primitive fears and barbaric impulses, the more successfully because it knows so well the art of "rationalizing" and moralizing them. Nearly all our institutions have been fashioned under an influence exerted by religion, with the consequence that no serious reform anywhere can be carried through without attacking religious organizations and religious beliefs. Russia would have liked to have stamped out religion, but could not. Mussolini tried to ignore the Church but could not, Hitler tried to control religion but could not, the United States started with a constitution that practically left God out, but religion has crept in—at least in practice. A reformer who says that he intends to ignore religion, to leave it alone, is like an engineer who says that in building a bridge he will ignore the law of gravitation. Leaving religion alone means only saying nothing about its evils, while often paying lip homage to its imaginary benefits. The reformers who leave religion alone are usually those who are afraid to attack it. But religion does not leave them alone. Sooner or later it stultifies their plans or destroys their work. No statesman can afford to ignore religion, no reformer can leave it alone, no genuinely intelligent person will try to "rationalize" it. History teaches this lesson as clearly as it teaches anything. Recent events only serve as annotations.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Deo Volente.

"Nought may endure but mutability."—Shelley.

"There are makers of empires, and makers of universes, and the hands of the latter are not stained with blood."—Shaw.

How public conceptions of the Christian Religion, for that is the only religion that counts in this country, are changing is illustrated by the disappearance of the old remark, "God willing." Writing of the old Bath Road, Mr. Tristram notes that in the time of Charles the Second the stage-coaches were advertised to do the distance between London and Bath in three days, "if God permit," but in 1780 the time had come down to two days, and the pious saving-clause was omitted. "God permit," according to Grose, the antiquarian, was a regular slang term for the old stage-coach, and readers of Scott will remember what another antiquary said about it. But a contemporary story has come down to us of the village carrier, who, upon being asked when he would be at Aberdeen, replied: "I'll be in on Monday, God willing and weather permitting, and on Tuesday whether or no."

"D.V." are initials that have dropped out of public notices, except in the case of small religious communities that are mere survivals from the past, and they are disappearing rapidly. "Deo Volente" is the proviso, "God willing." But the young men and women of our day do not trouble to put such a cautionary notice in ordinary announcements as to future events, and order their dinners and go journeys without the addition of "Deo Volente." Latin, to so many of these young people, is a dead language, and the words, if they understood them, would represent but a dying idea.

The clergy, of whom there are forty thousand in this country alone, naturally, still insist on the willingness and interference of the Christian God. Some years ago, in a far corner of South Carolina, U.S.A.,

a parson was prompted, in the midst of a very severe drought to offer up lengthy prayers for rain. Shortly after heavy rain fell and lasted some days. The contentment of the inhabitants of South Carolina, however, was not great. A few, it may be, were pleased; the majority was indignant. Certain crops were ruined, and business affairs compromised. In this complicated world nothing ever happens without offending somebody. This rain, supposed to be summoned by a parson's supplication, forced the inhabitants of the town to go to court and get an injunction against him. So the story goes, and it is as true as the four gospels, but not more so.

This yarn shows the resentment men would feel nowadays were the old Bible times to return. For, according to the legends, the prophets and saints were for ever doing things far more troublesome to the mass of men than merely asking for rain and getting it. The prophets foretold the onslaught of Assyria, the triumph of the barbarians from the West, and poked their sacred noses into so many things. Even the Messiah, in the pages of the New Testament, is said to have claimed kingship of the Jews. Statesmen of those far-off times may have been forgiven for supposing that these religious busy-bodies were a public nuisance.

The present-day, however, is the twilight of the gods. Our forty thousand priests no longer call benefits or evil out of the sky, beyond modestly asking for fine or wet weather, or calling blessings on the tenants of Buckingham Palace, or invoking victory to the armed forces of the country. They are alert enough to know that they could never succeed in praying for or prophesying anything that pleased everybody. The majority would restrain them with injunctions, or the minority would have them locked up in prison, or even a lunatic asylum. The old, old conception of a paternal deity has gone for ever, and the majority of men no longer believe in a limited-liability God, and that such a being could be swayed by the sweet smell of sacrifice or the stimulus of entreaty from the howling dervishes of Orthodoxy.

According to the clergy, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the youngest curate, from the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster to Methodist ministers, the three-headed Christian god is still the Lord of Hosts and the God of Battles. Yet these same priests, who consecrate regimental flags and christen battleships, dare to prate that their God is also a loving father and that we are all his children. What absurdity and what hypocrisy! The last great war cost the civilized world the flower of the manhood of one entire generation. Directly and indirectly, twenty millions of people died, and millions more were maimed for life. Billions of money was spent in this wholesale murder, and posterity saddled with a debt that will handicap the happiness of many generations.

Priests everywhere played the same sorry game. Prussian parsons said: "Germany must win, because she ought to win. God cannot desert his own children." Our English State-Church Prayer Book used much the same language, tempered by British patriotism. "Give peace in our time, O Lord," says the preacher. "Because there is none other that fighteth for us but only Thou, O God," responds the supine congregation. The priests of all the nations at war blessed the flag which was to float over scenes of carnage, and invoked their deity for victory. And, as all cannot win, what about God? When the priests fail, God should undergo the same criticism as the priests, for what is this figure but a magnified, non-natural man, this spectre of theirs, this deity of their insolence. If the peoples were wise, this God would be dethroned for ever. Then the people would no

longer require armies of priests. They would find their occupation gone.

The last great war produced horrors and evil enough, but there will have been some compensation if it has led people to realize that Priestcraft is one of the most terrible evils that afflict mankind. The failure of this Christian Religion is too complete to be glossed over by the glamour of false sentiment and spurious heroics. Christians are so immersed in their Oriental theology that they cannot see that in the last war Brute Force had usurped the place of Reason. We, whose fathers built up in generations of suffering and toil, the fair fabric of Western civilization, can no longer rely on the priests of an outworn Oriental superstition. For humanity has outgrown the two-thousand years' old creeds of the Christian Churches, and civilized man is better than the deities of decadent superstitions.

This is not the language of hyper-criticism or exaggeration. Even the priests themselves have been forced to admit the impeachment, and have deleted some of the worst features of their sacred scripture from their prayer-book as being entirely out of harmony with the times in which we now live. It is well to remember such happenings, for there are still so many wrongs to right, so many injustices to remedy. We have a long way to go before we realize the great political ideal: "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." In that pursuit of Liberty it is most unwise for us to look for guidance to priests who imagine that the world's clock struck in Palestine two thousand years ago and has never moved since.

MIMNERMUS.

The Truth about Russia.

At last we have a really dispassionate and unprejudiced account of religion in Russia, both before and after the revolution, in *Religion and Communism. A study of Religion and Atheism in Soviet Russia.* (Chapman & Hall, 8s. 6d.) The author is Dr. Julius F. Hecker, who is a thoroughly competent observer who has lived in Russia for the last fifteen years, and has been an eye-witness of the events he records during that time. His testimony is all the more valuable as his sympathies are on the side of religion; the book, indeed, is dedicated to "John Haynes Holmes, poet and preacher, to whom Truth is God and the witness thereof—Religion." And the last words in the book expresses a hope, or rather, an aspiration, that the Communists are preparing the way "for the development of a spiritual culture never before dreamed of by prophets, sages and poets."

The first ten pages are devoted to definitions of religion, with a discussion of Rudolph Otto's *sensus numinis*, or innate sense of awe and mystery which he regards as the beginning of religion, and which Dr. Hecker evidently favours. Dr. Hecker is very thorough-going, for, after treating of the origin of religion, he observes: "the tragedy of religion in Russia must be studied against its historic background," and he, therefore, sketches "the one thousand years development of Russian Christianity from its inception to the present."

The official date of the conversion of Russia is given as 988, when Vladimir of Kiev, for various reasons, mostly political, adopted Christianity as the religion of the State. Before this, says Dr. Hecker: "The Pagan Slavs had not a very highly developed religion. They worshipped Perun, the thunder-god,

together with many spirits of nature. 'There was a cult of the dead and an ancestor veneration.' There was also a survival of Totemism. To the he-goat, for instance, was ascribed power to scare away bad spirits and to aid in the growth of crops, and even "To this day, in some parts of Russia, village youths dress in goatskins, and with the he-goat as mascot, they wander through the fields singing: 'Where the goat passes, the grain will grow.'"

The newly-imported Byzantine Christianity did not succeed in ousting the old pagan ideas. Like the new Missionary converts of to-day, they simply added the new belief to their own stock. To satisfy the primitive demands of the peasants, says Dr. Hecker, the new priest "functioned similarly to the former magician and medicine-man," and besides was provided with "sacerdotal vestment, equipped with a holy cross, an ikon, sacred ointment, and holy water," all calculated to inspire the ignorant peasant with awe and veneration.

Up to the eighteenth century illiterate village priests were the rule. They had learnt the words of the service by heart, and ever afterwards repeated them automatically without "the least idea of their meaning." Even the bigoted and intolerant Pobyedonostzev, who, says Dr. Hecker, practically ruled Church and State for two generations; with a rod of iron, admitted that: "Our clergy teaches little and seldom. The Bible does not exist for illiterate people. . . . In far off parts of the country the people understand absolutely nothing as to the meaning of the words of the service, not even the Lord's Prayer." (p. 15.)

Under the patronage of the State, the Church grew in wealth and power, and the quaint onion-shaped domes sprang up in all directions. One example will show the wealth the clergy amassed. The Mother Church of Moscow had often been looted by invaders, yet Napoleon, who was the last to loot it, "took as much as 1,300 pounds of silver, 720 pounds of gold, and many precious stones," out of it. The religious fervour with which they later became inspired, caused the people to be "always in search of the miraculous," and "ruling princes frequently undertook raids and besieged towns and monasteries to capture some particularly popular relic or ikon, or, if it proved impossible to get them by force, to obtain these sacred objects by fraud or bribe." (p. 21.) A very celebrated ikon,

The Iberian Virgin, survived the Revolution, and its shrine remained at the gates leading into the Red Square until 1930, when the Soviet Government removed it to make room for a wider street. And even now it still continues to "work its miracles," although in a much quieter place than before, being housed in a small chapel situated in a blind alley, not far from Nikitskaya Street, almost opposite the building of the Conservatory of Music. Although there are no street signs which would indicate the whereabouts of the ikon, thousands of devotees manage to discover her, and the chapel is open from morning until night every day, and many services are conducted there which are specially ordered and paid for by the faithful. (p. 25.)

This does not seem to agree with the perfervid accounts of the suppression of religion, and the slaughter and exile of the priests we have heard so much about. Preachers assure us that it is impossible to be moral without religion. In Russia it seems to be the other way about, for Dr. Hecker tells us that:—

Next to this ikon worship the doctrine of prayer for the dead is of the greatest importance in the practice of the Orthodox Church. We have shown that it fitted in well with the traditional ancestor-worship and the care of the departed. The enormous

wealth of the Church has grown chiefly out of the exploitation of this superstition. Princes and rich men frequently endowed monasteries and churches on condition that daily prayers should be said for their departed souls. The doctrine of retribution for sins committed on earth, and the possibility of being relieved from punishment by the prayers of the Church was a mighty weapon in the possession of the clergy, who exploited it to its utmost capacity. Even to this day the income of the clergy is mostly obtained from this source. . . . These indulgences sold by the Church had, of course, their immoral effect on the people, and largely account for the glaring amorality of Russian Christians. Religion had little to do with shaping the moral code and practices of the Russian people. (p. 33.)

On the contrary, it was responsible for the glaring absence of morality. For, if you can buy pardon for any sin you feel inclined to commit, by payment to a priest, then it is an invitation to commit the sin. "Sin and crime," says Dr. Hecker, "are almost synonymous; but the sinner is not ostracized, he is thought of as "the unfortunate" and rather pitied than despised. Sin is taken as quite inevitable in life: "God alone is without sin," is a much-quoted proverb. "Where there is prohibition, there is sin"; "If you do not sin, you do not repent—if you do not repent, you cannot be saved"; This is the logic of orthodox sinners, and "As there is no fire without smoke, there is no man without sin." "Even the archbishop, when hungry, steals," runs one saying. (p. 35.) The Russian, we are told forgives and forgets quickly, and "The Revolution with all its cruelties has not left the people hateful. The victorious as well as the defeated classes have quickly forgotten and forgiven their mutual grievance." "To say, however, that the Russian has a deep sense of moral responsibility would not conform to the facts," and the categorical imperative of the Protestant peoples is not the ethics of the Russian Orthodox Christians." So that it is possible to be fervently religious without being moral. The pious Russian might say seriously, what the excited Salvationist said inadvertently in his first speech: "Satan told me that I would have to give up smoking, and drinking, and gambling; but I have found out that he is a great liar."

W. MANN.

(To be concluded.)

Death and the Poet.

WHEN I am dead
At last—and done,
There can be but
Oblivion.

I do not care
For foolish fears,
For foolish hopes
To soothe old years.

When I am dead
My heart will rot,
My brain decay—
I shall be not.

And if you swear
This is not so,
I can but laugh
And let you go.

When I am dead
I shall not care
If maidens live
With silken hair.

And if the blow
Come late or soon—
It matters not,
Life is no boon.

HERBERT SHILLEY.

"Powder and Shot."

IF open confession is good for the soul then no soul can have benefited more than that of Bishop Graham. When presiding at the recent Annual Meeting of the Catholic Needlework Guild at Glasgow, he is reported to have confessed as follows:—

It would be a great pity for us Catholics if beggars and the very poor did not exist. . . . When I came from Rome, I said, "Thank God for a beggar," to the first man I met who was asking for alms—much to his surprise, I fear. . . .

We will always have the poor with us. Some people hope to set us on a new path in which poverty and destitution are abolished, but this can never take place until the new heavens are established. If we had not the promise that the poor will always be with us, we would be deprived of those great Catholic corporate works of mercy—clothing the naked and feeding the hungry. (*Universe*, December 1, 1933.)

It is rare that the sharply cynical attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to the poor and destitute is brought so clearly before the public eye. This Church needs the poor and destitute to remain so in order that the "faithful" will be able to practice the Christian virtues as a religious exercise. In fact it becomes the duty of a Christian community to create a class of people whom it can push into the abyss of destitution. By creating poverty Christians are doing God's work, by enabling the poor to fit themselves for places in the "new heavens," through patient endurance of all the wrongs inflicted on them in this world. Then, so long as the poor are with us, it is possible for the wealthier Christians to throw crumbs of Christian charity after their victims thereby saving their own souls and reserving their seat too in the "new heavens," wherever they may be.

We thank Bishop Graham for showing us so clearly the necessity for preserving the present state of rife economic exploitation in order that his Church may continue its age-long task of exploiting its victims in a spiritual sense.

But prepared as we are "to give the devil his due," we question very much whether the few charitable works of the Roman Catholic Church are not outweighed by the price which the poor and indigent who benefit from them have to pay. We believe that the Roman Church, as an institution, only professes to practice the virtues it claims to practice through its creed. It is fortunate, however, in having some people in its ranks who not only profess to have charitable impulses, but try to put them into effect. This fact is the only title which the Catholic Church can claim to possess to justify its repute as a charitable organization. It is used superficially as a reason by Catholic propagandists with which to disarm the critical opponents of their Church and its teachings. It serves to direct a constant stream of wealth from the pockets of rich and poor alike into the coffers of this Holy Church. It acts also as a screen to the real work of the organization which is to plunder the credulous, to deceive the ignorant, and to rob young innocents of their one chance of acquiring a naturally developed mind.

We doubt the sincerity of the Roman Catholic Church because it has given abundant proof on more than one occasion that it not only fails to help the poor in a right way, but actually does all it can to beat them down when they try to assist themselves. In the first place the Pope has instructed the lamb to lie down with the lion by preaching a gospel of closer collaboration of the classes in his encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno" of May 15, 1931. In other words he has told the poor to stomach their troubles, and to be

at peace with their exploiters. It is true that he has asked the exploiters to reciprocate these nice manners, but are they likely to put down so tamely the weapons they use to protect their privileges at the behest of a mere Pope?

Inasmuch as the Pope has told the poor to be content despite their misfortunes because it must be the will of God, he has done his best to maintain that system in which "the poor are always with us."

Secondly, it can be recalled that the Roman Church has rarely supported the working class, except for tactical reasons, in their battles against their economic foes. In many cases it has actually opposed the workers, as for instance, in 1926, during the General Strike. Then Cardinal Bourne called upon all good citizens:—

. . . to uphold and assist the Government, which is the lawfully constituted authority of the country, and represents, therefore in its own appointed sphere, the authority of God Himself. (*Tablet*, January 23, 1932.)

His message of condemnation of the unconstitutional methods of the strikers

. . . rang throughout the country from the broadcasting stations which the Government had taken over; it was printed in the newspaper, which was produced by the Government as a strike measure; it was praised wherever law and order reigned. It very largely ended the strike. (*New York Catholic News*, December 8, 1928.)

Cardinal Bourne condemned the strike, not under the papal seal of infallibility, but as one of the leaders of a world-wide organization, numbering millions of the poor and destitute amongst its followers. It is not the alleged infallibility of the head of the Catholic Church which constitutes the rope that binds those people to the Church. That rope is composed of the subservience to authority, which has been instilled into them so cleverly from their youth up. Bishop Graham has referred to the impossible task which he thinks some people have set themselves in trying to eliminate from the world the appalling poverty which abounds, a task which is the most pressing of problems. What he does not uncover is the fact that his Church is doing as much, if not more, than any other institution to render the earnest endeavours of reformers abortive. And, as we have said, the principal weapon which his Church controls is that of education. By feeding the young on dogma his Church ensures that when grown to manhood and womanhood the people will have been deprived of the critical faculty which would enable them to locate their enemy more readily, and advise the means for overcoming their exploiters. We Freethinkers endeavour to give to all who have come under the influence of the Churches the benefit of a reasoned criticism of the dogmas on which they have been fed. In this way we hope to correct to some degree the great harm, the almost irremediable harm, which has been done to their minds. But we are obliged to go further, and point out how the Churches are retaining their hold on the people, and particularly on the poor at the present day.

There exist, for example, organizations of the working class which have been infiltrated by Roman Catholics, whose aim has been, not to assist those organizations to achieve their aim of abolishing poverty, but to prevent them from harming the interests of the Catholic Church. The Pope has sent his agents of the international Catholic Action into the working-class organizations to further Catholic aims. The English Catholic Social Guild is quite frank in its methods, as will be seen from the following:—

Two railwaymen for instance, talk to their local political party and persuade them of the justice of

our claim for Catholic schools. The party then supports a resolution on this subject in the Borough Council. The resolution is forwarded to the Government and to other towns where other Guild members promote it with varying success. . . A factory hand, thrown out of work by re-organization in his trade, is able to get the needs of his fellows considered by a Joint Industrial Council and, when satisfactory arrangements have been made, he presents every member of the Council with a copy of *Rerum Novarum*. These men get called in to deal with local controversies. . . . One should meet a few such men talking over their plans and their difficulties together, in order to realize . . . how their tactful intervention in daily work and local affairs gains respect for the Catholic Church. (*Catholic Social Action*, by Rev. L. O'Hea, S.J., 1932, pp 8 ff.)

In many big unions there are now established growing Catholic Guilds. The economic teachings of the Roman Catholic Church were formulated last century by Pope Leo XIII. in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. The trade unions have only come into being because the workers have recognized that only by combining could they hope to secure those fundamental changes in the economic system which they recognize are necessary before justice is done.

The Pope, however, could not tolerate changes in the system of a fundamental character without contravening the laws of God. Hence his solution of the economic troubles of the poor cannot be more than palliatives, even if they can be shown to be that. The workers' movement therefore should recognize the necessity of limiting the influence which the Catholic Church has upon it with the ultimate view of purging the movement of these clerical schismatics.

If the workers were only to apply their common-sense attitude to life towards criticizing the activities of the Catholic Church among them, they would be disagreeably surprised. For example, there is one class of people, the Catholic attitude to which requires especial consideration. We have in Britain nearly three million unemployed men and women, who at one time could not be rivalled for their independence and self-possession. Their capacity for producing articles of use and of rare beauty is equal to that of any other group of workers in the world. They form at the moment an entirely unproductive unit in the community because they have at one time or another been compelled to give the money which should have passed into their hands to the owners of capital. If it be admitted that whoever is responsible for the plight of the unemployed they themselves are not, can they understand how their friends could speak of them in the following fashion:—

. . . The Neapolitan lazzaroni were dirty and thriftless enough, but they did not sponge on the industrious and the frugal in the fashion of the British dole-drawers. . . . That they were undesirables is true; but a hundred Neapolitan children of the sun did not take as much out of the community in a month as ten British lazzaroni take in a week.

Those are the kind comments of the Catholic *Tablet*, and in view of all that has been reproduced here, we think we are justified in asking the workers who are in organizations which hope to decrease and abolish poverty and destitution to do something to help themselves against the Catholic Church. We are trying to assist the poor to conquer their poverty when we show them who are their enemies, but we could do considerably more to help them to conquer their clerical enemies if they would only give the National Secular Society their active support for carrying out that work. Is not the time when that help should be forthcoming long overdue?

G.F.G.

A Fundamentalist Dream.

I SEEMED to see about a score of eminent men who were all (save one) seated round a large table. The person standing was evidently concluding a contribution to the discussion that was in progress. His last sentence was, "No, gentlemen, no ugly shambling ape or ignorant savage, tenant of semi-tropic woods, or musty museum case, did God behold and bless when he set Adam in the world as the image of Himself and proclaimed him good."

T. H. H-xl-y: Well, gentlemen, there does not seem to be much to reply to. He who says there is no, or insufficient, evidence for the evolution of man, merely indicates that he has no real acquaintance with the subject, and I should recommend him to make an excursus into comparative anatomy, and observe how closely his structure is related to other members of the vertebrate series.

Ha-ck-l: And into embryology and Von Baer's Law of Recapitulation, which show that, starting essentially as one of the lowest animals, the child before birth passes in outline through the series—as a great English biologist put it, man (like other animals) "climbs up his own genealogical tree."

Br-an: Surely that so-called law was exploded some time ago.

Ha-ck-l: By no means. That mistaken idea was due to rather hurried statements made by one or two biologists who found the recapitulation incomplete, as, of course, it is. But as there are many structures in the human body which are not really human at all, but are present solely because they are inherited from the lower animals, the law stands quite firmly. Indeed Archdall Reid and others have pointed out that it is a necessity of biological thought.

Th-ms-on: Yes, the doubters should study vestigial organs, such as the remnants in man of gill arches, a tail (sometimes movable), a third eyelid, a third (pineal) eye, an appendix, muscles of the ear . . . some biologists count as many as two hundred of these sub-human structures. The human body is "a veritable museum of relics." There is no explanation of these things except the common ancestry of man and the lower animals.

McD-ug-ll: And he should acquaint himself with psychology, which shows that in the mental life of the child there are a variety of features pointing to animal ancestry, including evidence of recapitulation as cogent as that found in structural embryology.

Ge-ki-e: He should also inquire into palaeontology, which will demonstrate to him quite conclusively the general steps in the evolution of the animal series, culminating in man, and also that some nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the earth's history had passed before man appeared at all.

Os-b-ne: Emerging of course as the ape-man *Pithecanthropus*.

Tyl-r: Also into anthropology, which shows just as plainly that civilized man everywhere arose from an uncivilized condition, and that ten thousand years or so ago there were no men in existence who could fairly be called civilized.

Br-an: Well, gentlemen, I prefer to put my trust in the Rock of Ages rather than the Ages of the Rocks, and their contents.

Gl-dst-ne (impressively): "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture . . ."

A Young Anthropologist: A very interesting phallic symbol.

(Here Mr. Gl-dst-ne held up his outspread hand and looked so unhappy that the young man subsided).

Br-an: Well, gentlemen, I refuse to believe that man with his God-like faculties has arisen from a bestial ape. . . .

L-d Be-c-nsf-ld: As it is a question of the apes or the angels, gentlemen, I am on the side of the angels.

The Young Anthropologist to his neighbour (solto voce): Sophisticated rhetoricians inebriated with the exuberance of their own verbosity.

Two Anglican Clergymen, well known to possess more scientific knowledge and a more modern outlook than most of their confrères, expressed full agreement with the principle of evolution and its application to man.

W-t-s-n (the poet): It is evident that some still suppose that human evolution, especially on the mental and moral sides, is too wonderful to be true. On that point perhaps I may presume to quote two lines of my own. They are these:—

"The inverse marvel fronts me daily when
I meet with apes whose ancestors were men."

J. REEVES.

Priestly Amenities.

COMPARED with the barbarities of the past, the sacrifice of five little white girls at Havana, reported in the last issue of *Truth*, was an extremely mild affair.

Among others who may be cited in proof of this statement is H. I. Mencken, who deals with the subject of propitiatory offerings in the *Treatise on the Gods*, a monumental work that must ensure him an ordinary place in the philosophic-religious literature of the world. Says Mr. Mencken (pages 159-161):—

The ingenuities shown by the priests in the despatch of victims often did great credit to their professional resourcefulness and imagination.

Among the early Scandinavians they immersed the elect in bogs, with the water and muck to their necks, and there let them starve to death. At other times, they broke their backs, and turned them adrift into the forests, to fight it out, with the wolves and bears. Cæsar tells us in *De Bello Gallico*, that the Gaulish priests encased their victims in close-fitting basket-work armour, not unlike the coffins of the Egyptian Kings, and then set fire to them. At other times they impaled them on stakes, or hanged them on trees until their limbs rotted off, or thrust them head-first into vats of water, or flayed them to death with thorns.

The Roman writers are full of horrifying accounts of such pious transactions.

But it was in the New World that the technique of sacrifices reached its highest development. When the Spaniards reached the City of Mexico, they found a pyramid of 136,000 skulls beside the chief temple, each representing a sacrificial victim. That was in 1519.

Thirty-three years before this, the great teocalli of Huitzilopochtli, son of the sun-god, was dedicated, and no less than 70,000 victims went to death in his honour.

The Aztec priests told their Spanish colleagues that the procession stretched for two miles, and that butchering the 70,000 was a job they could not soon forget. Their work required a considerable finesse. The victim was bound to a jasper altar, and his heart was cut out deftly and swiftly with a stone knife. If there was any bungling the officiating priest was severely punished.

Once a year a woman was sacrificed to Centeotl, the Aztec Earth Mother. She was first decapitated and then flayed, and the chief priest arrayed himself in her bloody skin, and was borne in procession through the city. Later the skin was cut up and buried at the four corners of the empire, to dissuade foes from invasion.

When there was a drought, hundreds of children were sacrificed to the rain-goddess, Tlaloc. If they wept when the priests bound them to the altar, it was taken as a sign that the goddess was pleased, and would send the needed rain.

Such, then, were the practices of the past—followed, in varying degrees, by members of all tribes and all races.

The universally-impelling fact was the belief that by such means the supernatural powers could be favourably influenced or disposed to those who contrived the sacrifices.

How great, therefore, has been the human advance, viewed in the light of the horror excited to-day by the death of the five little girls in Havana, and the cruelties and slaughters—fiendish and barbaric—that were for so long just the accepted thing in the everyday life of the world!

FRANK HILL.

Sydney, N.S.W.

Acid Drops

There was a meeting announced recently to be held in the Wolverhampton Town Hall, to consider the question of opening Cinemas on Sunday in terms of the Government's Racketeering Act. Among the speakers advertised was Mr. W. Pratt, a well-known figure in Wolverhampton. But when the meeting was held there was no Mr. Pratt. Mr. Pratt had been invited by the local manager of a well-known Cinema in the town to speak, and had consented to do so. But Mr. Pratt did not speak, and the reason given us on reliable authority is as follows. A certain Roman Catholic speaker, who was announced, had said that if Mr. Pratt spoke he would not, and by his absence some amount of support from his fellow-religionists who might support Sunday opening would be lost. So when Mr. Pratt presented himself to speak he was informed that he would not be allowed on the platform. But, asked Mr. Pratt, what explanation can be given to the audience? The reply was, "We will say you were indisposed." And all this to please the prejudice of a Roman Catholic who *declined to stand upon the same platform as an Atheist!* Such incidents are not uncommon, and they should serve as a sharp reminder to those who are not doing all they might do to break the influence of religion in public life.

Public indignation, we are told, has been aroused in South Africa. Blasphemous communications are being written in public places. In one instance a box was found attached to a pole and, by writing conspicuously displayed on the "collection box," travellers were humbly implored "to put a coin in the box as money was urgently needed—to buy Providence a pair of spectacles in order to enable Him to see the havoc wrought by the drought." We are not surprised to find the public incensed by what the South African *Sunday Times* terms a "a nefarious" act. Considering the deity as an irascible old curmudgeon, quick to anger and without humour, they anticipate that the badly-needed water for his children will be now still further delayed by the "loving Father." And to make matters worse, they have the feeling that if the loving Father cannot be relied upon to send rain to the prayerful he might be equally neglectful in failing to visit his wrath upon the blasphemer. So they want to make sure, by attending to the last little duty themselves. *Religion is fear.*

One Pound per year has been bequeathed to the Rector of Throwleigh, on condition that he puts up annually a Requiem Mass for the soul of the late Rector, and the souls of those whose bodies lie in and about the church. It is expected that the everlasting repose of the souls in question will be made in some degree more comfortable by this bequest of Twenty-five Pounds. Until similar cash donations are received the souls of the communicants at, say, Budleigh Salterton, Chipping Sodbury and Much Wenlock, will in perpetuity be visited with a certain restlessness. God will see to this, but in certain circumstances, with which deserts have nothing to do, God can be moved to substitute sweet dreams and quiet breathing.

Those sacred Christian names, "Bethlehem," and "Nazareth" are being banned this Christmastide in Germany. Such great authorities on German Culture, as Hitler, and Goering, have decided that they are not really Christian but Jewish, and the only reason why the ban is not put upon Jesus is that they have also decided, following other German authorities, that Our Lord and Saviour was not a Jew. This must be a sad blow for the large number of Jews all over the world, who—though they do not admit his divinity—insist that Jesus is the greatest Jew that ever lived. All the same, German children are being taught to substitute "Heil Hitler" for "Praise Thee, Jesus," though there does not seem much between these pious salutations. The news, we understand, has cast a damper on the Christian community

everywhere, and we shall not be surprised that many Christians will try to assuage their sorrow in a little more "wet."

Professor Ray Abrams, of Pennsylvania University, has written a devastating condemnation of Christian Jingoism. *Preachers Present Arms*, published by the Round Table Press, New York, is an impeachment of "the Clergy of all denominations," and shows the ease with which our spiritual guides "lose their heads, and join in war hysteria whenever the nation reaches the stage of disputation." Professor Abrams writes of the American clergy, of course, showing "the part the clergy took in spreading war propaganda." He has chapters on the attitude the parsons took as servants of the State; on the activities and fervours with which the clergy contributed to war-time hysteria; and on what happened to the few pacifist clergy.

Only ninety of the 200,000 clergy in the country, according to Dr. Abrams, held aloof from "war-hysteria." Those who have read Mr. Cohen's *War, Civilization and the Churches*, are familiar with the attitude of the clergy in this country during the War, and will be far from surprised to find from the following extracts, that the outstanding preachers in the U.S.A. reacted in precisely the same "lofty" way:—

It is neither a travesty nor exaggeration to call this war on the part of America a truly Holy War.

It is God who has summoned us to this war. It is His war we are fighting . . . This conflict is indeed a crusade.

Think it all through, and, at bottom, the war is religious.

In the last analysis the ultimate issues of the war are moral and religious. It is simply to say that we are in the war because we believe that thereby we are somehow serving God.

The war for righteousness will be won! Let the Church do her part.

A thirty-centimeter gun may voice the edict of God as truly as the notes of a cooing dove. . . . The sword of America is the sword of Jesus.

We will fight pacifism not only because it is contrary to the teachings of Christ, but because its whole tendency is to make a yellow streak where you want a man.

Brigadier-General Crozier knew of what he was speaking, when, in *A Brass Hat in No Man's Land*, he wrote, "The Christian Churches are the finest blood-lust creators which we have." General Crozier wrote of yesterday, but Professor Abrams, after familiarizing himself with the "facts of history, and particularly the record of the institutions of religion during 1914-18," predicts that it will be equally true of to-morrow.

The Middlesbrough and District Motor Club, one of the largest motor clubs in the provinces, has refused to admit to membership a young Jew. An official of the club has explained that "We do not want any more Jews in the Club. We think they are sufficiently represented." It is expected that, as a result of this, the six Jewish members of the club will resign. The resignation of one Gentile, by way of protest, would, we surmise, be more effective. It would as well, bring to the committee's notice certain elements of decency which, up to now, appear to have escaped them.

From an Australian paper we gather the information that when that great commercial magnate, John P. Morgan, of the U.S.A., died, he left in his will precise instructions for his burial arrangements. Amongst these was the direction that the hymn to be sung over his remains was to be, "For all Thy Saints who from their Labours Rest." Morgan had little doubt that he was of the elect. To Dives, that the good are those who make good is one of the most satisfying beliefs, and con-

sequently one extremely difficult to disturb. Jesus, from all accounts, did his best to disturb it by positioning Dives promptly and unceremoniously in Hell. The mere possession of wealth settled that. Dives in turn recognizes Jesus as a tramp, and no one, of course, takes any notice of tramps.

John P. Morgan, he
Said they didn't know everything, down in Judee.

Noting the readiness and heartiness with which one body of Christians dwell upon the absurdities involved in the beliefs of other Christians, it is clear that if they are not prepared to bear each other's burdens, they are remarkably alive to each other's stupidities.

The Bishop of Croydon says that, "Even I found my childhood's Sabbaths incredibly dull." But it is quite probable that but for the dull childhood the Bishop had, he would not find his place in the world so bright as it has been. We remember the present Bishop of London, in a burst of frankness, confessing that the world would not be to him the place it is had Jesus Christ never lived. And we imagine he never quite saw why we agreed with him so readily and so completely.

"The Truth, but Oh! Not all the Truth," writes Sir Max Pemberton. Perhaps not, but it is not in that direction our danger lies.

The Rev. T. E. Edmond, a Hertfordshire vicar, states that a new parson, if unfortunate, goes through four processes by his congregation. He is idolized, criticized, analysed and scandalized. What the congregation, if unfortunate, has to undergo, is often akin to martyrdom.

Fifty Years Ago.

G. W. FOOTE IN PRISON.

LIFE in a cell is dull in the summer, in the winter it is dismal. I have in one sense the worst part of my trouble to encounter. But my spirits are undepressed. My books are a great solace, and I feel a joy in furbishing my armour and sharpening my sword for future battles. While I sit at my fibre-picking (worth about 2d. a day) I weave projects, some of which may be realized before the next November fogs make one long for the fine, dry climate of a place where earthly thermometers are useless. Sometimes also I indulge in whimsical calculations. I reckon, for instance, that I have still to swallow twenty-one gallons of prison tea and twelve prison sermons.

I spent the eve of Ramsey's release, as I dare say he did, pacing my short floor, reviewing the past and dreaming of the future. I could not help feeling softened as I thought of Lord Coleridge's lofty humanity, and the unvarying kindness of the gallant Governor of this gaol. They tempt one to forget the red history of their faith. But I hardened again as my eyes dwelt on the narrow walls of this sarcophagus of a year of my life. I thought of the Christian judge who inflicted my brutal sentence, of the Christian public who tacitly approves it, of the Christian Premier who can "do nothing" since I am not a Bulgarian but only an Englishman, of the Christian official who is allowed to libel imprisoned Free-thinkers behind the safe shelter of his privileged position, and of all the various insults and treacheries our party has of late endured. Then I renewed my "vow of Hannibal," and slept as calm as a child. In the morning I had but one thought—"My friend is going." About nine o'clock I said, "He is gone," and laughed. Was that a shout I heard a little earlier, or only fancy? I cannot say, but it went through my blood like a ring of steel. Three months more and I shall follow. . . .

The "Freethinker," December 30, 1883.

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE.

EDITORIAL

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

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. T. JONES.—Thanks for poem. We are handing it to a Welsh friend. We are afraid that a column in Welsh in the paper would not be practicable, except very occasionally.

C. TRANSON.—The *Bradlaugh and Ingersoll* book embodies all that was contained in the special issues of the *Freethinker*, but one third of the book is new matter.

FREETHINKER ENDOWMENT TRUST.—J. O'CONNOR, £1. FOR ADVERTISING THE "FREETHINKER."—C. S. FRASER, £2 2s.

"LIGMA."—The price of *Jesus the Unknown*, by D. Merezhkovsky is 12s. 6d., and the publisher, Mr. Johnathan Cape.

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

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

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

When the services of the National Secular Society in connexion with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary, 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."

Sugar Plums.

From *Reynold's Illustrated News*:—

Mr. Cohen is an accomplished controversialist in the cause of Freethought, and this short study (*Bradlaugh and Ingersoll*) of the two great Freethinkers, whose centenary we have celebrated this year, should be on everybody's shelves. It is concise and to the point, and gives us a very vivid picture of two very remarkable men.

We live in curious days, and the pains taken to dress despotism as liberty, and self-interest on social service are not the least peculiar features of our time. There is, for example, an article in the *Daily Telegraph* reviewing a book on Communism, by Professor MacMurray of London University. The article is by Professor J. B. Firth, and while we are not concerned with a defence of Communism, we do think that Professor Firth might have taken the trouble to find out what Communism stands for. It certainly is no reply to Prof. MacMurray to argue as if a "Classless society" meant a society without intellectual and moral differences. One might make a very solid criticism of Communism, but it would have to be on better and higher lines than that offered by Professor Firth—that is, if the appeal is to be made to anything but ignorance and prejudice.

But our reason for noticing Professor Firth is not on account of his criticism of Communism, but his bigoted attack on Freedom of thought and speech. He points out that the activities of Professor Harold Laski "are notorious," and now Professor MacMurray, Professor of Mind and Logic, not only expounds the theory of Com-

munist, but "preaches it as a hot gospeller, or at least as hot as becomes a philosopher." And this he thinks ought not to be permitted. He says:—

The chairs at our British Universities have long possessed freedom of speech as one of their most priceless endowments. *Is there no distinction between freedom of speech and freedom of political propaganda? If there is, it is high time it was drawn.*

The italics are ours, and are there to emphasize the quality of the thought of Professor Firth. Communism is a sociological theory, and as such deserves the same freedom of expression as does any other theory. Professor Firth evidently thinks that while Professors should be permitted to advocate any established theory, they should not be permitted to argue, or even state a theory that is not established. So much for the Professor's theory of freedom. It is identical with that of Mussolini, the Soviet, and Hitler. No one who criticizes the established order should be tolerated. It is this theory of the inviolability of established opinion against which Freethinkers have always fought.

Mr. C. Clayton Dove sends us a letter, in which he impresses upon all Freethinkers the need for doing something towards getting the *Freethinker* the circulation it deserves. He advises the judicious distribution of specimen copies of the paper in tramcars, trains, waiting motor-cars, etc. He suggests that this is the kind of work that any Freethinker can do no matter how isolated he is, and with a minimum of effort.

A great many of our friends already act upon the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Dove, and we know it has been the means of introducing it to new-comers. We shall be pleased to supply parcels of back-numbers to anyone who writes for them, and we should like to see a serious and combined effort made in the New Year to effect substantial increase in circulation. There is very little we can afford to do in the way of advertising, and we are thus compelled to fall back upon that voluntary co-operation to which the *Freethinker* owes so much.

We did not get a report of Dr. Carmichael's meeting in Glasgow on the 17th in time for insertion in last week's issue. But we are not surprised to learn that the audience, an unusually large one, was delighted with the address, and hope to have the lecturer amongst them again, and as early as possible. Unfortunately Dr. Carmichael's professional duties does not leave him much time for the delivery of lectures, that means two or three days absence from home. But we hope to see him as busy on the platform as his time will permit.

It may help provincial members and friends in their arrangements for attending the Annual Dinner of the N.S.S. on February 3, to know that the following excursions to London will be run on that day:—

Liverpool (Lime Street) 11.30 a.m. Return fare 10s. 6d.
Return time 12.30 a.m.
Birmingham (New Street) about 8.10 a.m. Return Euston about 12.30 a.m. Return fare 12s.
Leicester, about 10.30 a.m. Return St. Pancras about midnight. Return fare 5s. 6d.
Coventry, about 8.40 a.m. Return about 12.30 a.m. Return fare 10s. 6d.
Bradford (Exchange) 7.25 a.m. Return Kings Cross 11.50 p.m. Return fare 16s.
Bradford (Exchange) 11.10 a.m. Return Kings Cross 11.50 p.m. Return fare 10s. 6d.
Leeds (Central) 7.50 a.m. Return Kings Cross 11.50 p.m. Return fare 15s. 6d.
Sheffield (Victoria) 7.30 a.m. Return Marylebone 11.0 p.m. Return fare 14s.
Nottingham (Victoria) 8.21 a.m. Return Marylebone, 11.0 p.m. Return fare 12s. 6d.

Visitors requiring hotel accommodation in London should communicate their requirements to the General Secretary at 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4. Vegetarians will be looked after as usual, but it will be necessary to notify the Secretary when ordering tickets if the Vegetarian menu is required.

Prof Flügel and Psycho-analysis

WHEN the physical sciences and biology have rendered their quota to the study of mind, there still remains, of course, a valid field of investigation for the psychologist proper. It may be stated, perhaps, that the physical and biological study of mind concerns its possibility, while the psychologist studies it according to its actuality.

Called upon to form new concepts, the psychologist's success will depend on whether these concepts serve a purpose, or whether they are made redundant by subsequent research.

Psycho-analysis is not, strictly speaking, a "system"; nor is it a "moral philosophy"—the work of envisaging mind in its status in the universe may be left to the philosopher. Psycho-analysis, one might say, formulates and practises certain hypotheses relating to the composite phenomenon, mind.

Prof. Flügel's (London Univ.) recent *Introduction*¹ is the mainspring of the following observations.

* * *

The history of psycho-analysis dates from certain observations made by Josef Breuer in Vienna some fifty years ago. While studying a case of hysteria, the symptoms of which referred to forgotten memories, he was in time led to note the curative effect of the patient being made aware of the meaning of his illusions. The date of the first Psycho-analytical Congress was 1908, and an International Psycho-analytical Association was formed in 1910. Adler and Jung then seceded from the Freudian school, whose founder, Dr. Sigmund Freud, who collaborated with Breuer, took the important step of abandoning hypnosis, which, he found, gave capricious results.

Analytical Methods: He developed the procedure known as *free association*, now the chief weapon of the analyst. In "free association" the patient (analysand) is asked to abandon all conscious control of his thoughts. The run of ideas is still, of course, determined, and the term "free" (to which the Determinist propagandist might take exception) merely means free from conscious control. The ideal form of this is the dream.

Another method of attack is the investigation of little slips and forgettings—*parapraxia* is the term used—frequently determined by unconscious mechanism (cf. pathological disturbances).

Yet a third method is *anthropology*. The survival of primitive customs corroborates in theory the conclusions of psycho-analysis. "There is scarcely anywhere," says Flügel, "a religious belief, a ceremonial observance, a social institution or a conventional practice, that does not bear the imprint of the psychological mechanisms discovered by Freud."

Determinism. Flügel again makes it quite clear that determinism is the assumption worked on in psycho-analysis. Causation is operative in mental, as in non-mental, phenomena, and it applies to the unconscious just as it does to the conscious, this being empirically borne out in "free association." If conscious deterministic control goes, then unconscious deterministic control takes its place.

What is the Unconscious? At any given moment consciousness is extremely narrow. Most of the mind-content must wait till occasion brings it to the front. There are, for example, a host of things I am not thinking of at the moment, though I have thought of them at some time or other (*i.e.*, they are part of my mind-content). I shall think of them again, too,

¹ Mr. Geo. Whitehead's *Easy Outline and Psycho-analysis and Art* are eminently readable little works on the same topic.

when the stimulus comes to bring them to the fore. Meanwhile they lie hidden. We call them the *pre-conscious*.

But stay. There are some contents of the mind (thought and memories) which will never, normally, come into consciousness, simply because they are not connected with any external stimulus (awakening force). I shall never, normally, become aware of them, for they are what we call disconnected, or, technically, *dissociated*. No stimulus can avail to awaken them. They are not linked up (associated) with anything in the outer world. They rest, as it were, sheltered from the hammer of experience.

We call this vast reservoir of material the *Unconscious*, and the psycho-analyst claims to have found an avenue of approach to the unconscious (dissociated) by means of his special procedure of "free association," the stimulus being "internal." Let us now differentiate between:—

- (1) The Unconscious;
- (2) The Conscious (pertaining to a given moment), and
- (3) The Pre-Conscious (the multitude of things in our psychic stock of which we are not immediately aware).

* * *

The inquirer may be expected to ask what benefits, apart from the curing of individuals' mental complaints, we are to hope for from psycho-analysis. If, then, it is possible to explore the entire instinctive equipment of man, and control its manifestations, we shall have done something towards making man "master in his own house." It is true that, as man endeavours to understand all things in nature, he understands himself last.

Behaviorism. To this end, then, Behaviorism conceivably renders an important contribution (though this is not explicitly suggested by Flügel.) "It would seem," he remarks, "that man is born with a limited number of hereditarily determined reaction patterns," and Behaviorism, in its study of the conditioned reflex, is concerned with the change in the nature of the stimulus (giving the "conditioned reflex"), while Psycho-analysis is concerned with the wider aspects of the developmental changes, not only those of stimulus, but those of emotion and response.

Instinct Development. We have seen, in chemistry, how elements blend to form a compound. We have now to familiarize ourselves with the idea of instincts blending. Elementary, or, technically, *Component Instincts*, include the anal, oral, genital, visual, and urethral, etc. Distortions give the exhibitionists and "scoptophylic" (from vision); or the sadist and masochist (from pain).

It is worthy of note that the "sexual" is omitted, which seems to point to the fact that there is no pure sex instinct. "Normal adult sexuality results from an integration of a number of what were originally more or less independent impulses" (Flügel)—technically termed "component instincts." These become co-ordinated and organized under the leadership of the genital components, and ultimately serve reproduction. Freud used the term "*libido*" to designate the sexual impulse in all its various manifestations.² Sex impulses, though of immense importance, emphatically do not exhaust the instinctive equipment of man, a fact which Freud finds himself compelled to reiterate with frequency.

Instincts, then, become "organized," but simultaneously they can become "displaced" and "sublimated." In sublimation energy is transferred, say,

² Jung, the Swiss analyst, uses it for "the whole creative forces of the mind."

to non-sexual goals, and much of our social culture largely depends on this form of displacement.

Instincts can, then, undergo the processes of *organization, displacement, and sublimation* (when the displacement is of an advantageous, or pro-social, nature). In this development there is "perversion" (e.g., sadism, etc.). If psycho-analysis can detect our sadists early enough to make them butchers, or (better still) surgeons, and if it can state how much of our legal code is the mere gratification of our sadism (the historical case is the moral justification of tortures), it will have performed a useful service. Sublimation is the erection of a higher goal, and is the basis of much cultural achievement.

The stages of instinct development are: (1) the *autoerotic*, wherein each instinct seeks its own satisfaction (cf. smoking, toffee-eating, dancing, and gymnastics);

(2) *Narcissism*—love of self;

(3) *Alloeroticism*—love of others (people or things).

* * *

The Super-Ego, the Ego, and the Id. The conduct of everyday life requires that many of our instinctive energies and desires must be suppressed; sexuality is the chief repressed tendency, and another of importance is aggression, since industry requires co-operation with people possibly disliked. Criticizing the secession of Adler, Freud quotes him as saying, "Do you believe, Freud, it is a great pleasure to stand in your shadow my whole life?" (History of P.A. Movement).

That which requires to be suppressed is the *Id*, and that which suppresses is the *Super-Ego*.

The "Id" is a great mass of instinctive energies from which all desires are ultimately derived, but for which we are not always ready to hold ourselves responsible (hence the "Id"). The "Super Ego" is concept governing unconscious morality, a strict taskmaster, at whose behest the *Censor* does the work of repressing, or inhibiting, desires. Thus, says Freud, "The normal man is not only far more unmoral than he believes, but also far more moral," which looks like a paradox but isn't.

Thirdly, the *Ego* is that part of the mind concerned with perception and adjustment to the external world. Its task is to satisfy three masters—the outer world, the *Id*, and the *Super Ego*. In mental disorder the *Ego* has proved unequal to the task. Perhaps the instinctive desires of that low fellow, the *Id*, have been incapable of compromise with the moral standards located in that model of propriety, the *Super-Ego*. The aim of the psychoanalyst is to strengthen the *Ego*, by (a) uncovering the *Id* for inspection, (b) examining the demands of the *Super-Ego*, and (c) breaking down narcotic compromises such as have been arrived at between the two (compare the agreement of the Church and the bootleggers on the question of Prohibition, both giving support, but from different motives).

The *Super-Ego* needs putting in his place, too, and Freud deems many of our social troubles to arise from excessive morality. (The Sale of Indulgences is an instance of first getting rid of the *Super-Ego* by paying him his toll).

Psycho-analysis and God. Is there a non-primitive approach to God? Must all types of Theism be traced back into the realm of anthropology? Can we have an external equivalent of the *Super-Ego* for our God?

An affirmative answer is the dearest wish of many Theists to-day. But the venture is doubly impracticable. In the first place, such an idea of God could not have any objective counterpart, for the

Super-Ego is a concept governing the subjective, the personal, the human. It is indispensably connected with body—the human body. Then, again, we are back with the primitive savage, for the ejection of a *Super-Ego* is an implicit fact in primitive anthropology.

"This persistent longing," writes Flügel, "for an ideal parent," leads to his "projection into the heavens as a deity, for gods and goddesses are the omnipotent parents of our infancy, permanently enthroned in their high estate. By this act of projection the human adult saves himself the painful realization that he is ultimately dependent on his own efforts, and is enabled to retain the infantile notion that there is somewhere a watchful and loving parent, who is ever solicitous for our welfare. . . . God, as judge and avenger, fulfils much the same functions as the *Super-Ego*."

G. H. TAYLOR.

Thug-ism.

THE question as to whether mankind is making progress in any fundamental and lasting sense, often comes up for review in the mind of the thoughtful. Even if in certain directions the difference between what exists now and what used to exist justifies the use of the word progress, it cannot be gainsaid that there is much in modern life which harks back to the early days of mankind. Many a trait of the savage remains with us, and exercises powerful influence over our activities. Especially so is this on the psychological side of our life in relation to matters of basic importance, such as industry; and in relation to international questions which involve the adoption of methods of war or peace.

On the one hand we have adjusted ourselves, in many cases, to the material improvements which go to the making of human progress; while our mental attitude to the products of industry as a whole has remained non-social. On the other hand our attitude to international questions has for most of us remained national instead of becoming international.

That progress in the production of useful material objects often indicates some measure of mental progress is true; but is our mental progress what it should be when we have so many means at hand to the building of a better world? Does not the attitude of most people to war, and international problems in general, reveal the persistence of a primitive psychology? To the student of psychology and sociology, there is no doubt that it does. Nationalism—"my country right or wrong"; "everything for the good old land of my birth"—in the mind of the modern man is only an extraordinary edition of tribalism. It has not the justification that tribalism had; and its effects, both psychological and social, are worse than those of tribalism.

Under the title of "A Religion of Murder" (*Freethinker*, September 5, 1933) W. Mann has reminded us of the Thugs, concerning whom he relates some very interesting details, while reviewing a book dealing with these people.

Whether Colonel J. L. Sleeman, the author of *Thug; or a Million Murders*, should be described as a Christian I do not know; but in case some Christians may think the Colonel is un-Christian in placing to the credit of their God the creation of a people who believe in the religious value of murder, I have consulted a rather old cyclopedia of religious beliefs.

In *The Faiths of the World*, by Rev. James Gardner, I find a short article on the Thugs, in which the details given agree with those of Col. Sleeman. Quoting a Dr. Duff, the article says the Thug is "most

devoutly religious in the performance of divine worship," and then proceeds to describe how a band of the murderers will betake themselves to the temple of the goddess Kali, prior to a murdering expedition, to present their prayers and supplications along with a promise of a goodly share of the booty in the event of success. If failure should befall them, they take all the blame, and "laugh to scorn the idea that any evil could possibly have befallen them, had they been faithful in the observance of all the divinely appointed rules of their sanguinary craft." Vol. II., p. 903.

This seems to be not unlike the mentality of a body of Christians praying for the success of their particular army in the Great War.

To the latter the question as to the right or wrong of the war seems hardly to present itself; and, under the influence of a passion that is carefully fostered by the great Thugs of modern civilization, they are prepared to go out, or send others out, to kill members of another nation with the same determination that a Thug went out to accomplish a murder.

Some few may take part in a war in the belief that, war having come, they are helping to save the nation which stands for all that is best in modern civilization. Yet even they, when peace comes, fail to realize that war is inevitable in a class-ridden society, for the control of which various economic and imperialist sections are ever striving. Consequently they are not able to understand that Christianity is useless against these vested interests, and that war can only be prevented by the majority of those who have no vested interests, in all nations, refusing to take part in war against those of other nationality; and, also, insisting upon the reconstruction of society so that vested interests will become impossible.

This means the cultivation of an international outlook, and peace talk without that is of no avail. Nationalism means Thug-ism sooner or later, and the war-mongers know how to develop it to that pitch. The outstanding example at the moment is Germany, but it would be foolish to imagine that the elements of Thug-ism do not exist in England, as elsewhere.

It would be equally foolish to think that all members of the German nation retain the nationalist outlook—but unfortunately that outlook is predominant at the moment. As expressed in official activities, it reveals the existence in European society of a too deeply-rooted Thug-ism.

If the mentality which makes this kind of thing possible were confined to one nation, it would not be quite as dangerous as it is; but the thug type of mentality is to be found in all European nations. While, with the worsening of social conditions, its growth on a widespread scale is made more and more possible, especially if it be cultivated by those who are interested in keeping the poorer classes in their place.

In this work religion, with all its promises of rewards in another life for suffering undergone in this life, is a valuable asset, and must be destroyed; not only in respect of mere profession of belief, but, also, as a habit of mind.

We must train ourselves to investigate and criticize social problems and institutions, and to be prepared for the destruction and reconstruction of society, if that is found to be necessary by way of bringing about a social order in which wholesale exploitation of our fellow-men for the benefit of the few, which makes war inevitable, will be impossible.

The man who rids himself of his religious beliefs, and continues to accept the constitution of present-day society as if it had been "divinely ordained," has not attained to the fullest possible freedom of thought.

The history of the development in Germany of what

I have called Thug-ism cannot be dealt with in detail, but a few indications may serve a useful purpose.

As Belfort Bax has said, "the Prussification of Germany in matters military, and in matters bureaucratic, has gone on apace since 1870" (*German Culture*, p. 277)., and this has meant the continued teaching of the doctrine that war, as far as the German nation is concerned, is as much a part of life as is anything else. That we have had jingoism in England, and chauvinism in France, to an unpleasant degree for many a long year, will hardly be denied by any but a jingoist reader of history. Yet there is little doubt that in Germany the doctrine of nationalism, along with the philosophy of war, has been taught with more persistence and with greater authority than in any other country.

The universities have been under the specific influence of the government, and great care was taken that displeasing opinions were not held for long by any of the professors. Nationalism, world-politic, world power, and war as one of the chief means to attaining these, were outstanding features in the educational system. While the Press, in the main, at all times played its part in making the philosophy of war as popular as possible; and in bringing about subjection to the will of the state.

In view of this, it is not surprising that so large a percentage of the German people can, by means of propaganda, be worked up into a state of patriotism that enables them to look upon war as if it were a specific German national halo. As one writer says, "the Prussian philosophy of war. . . is that the moral health of the nation depends upon this struggle, that it is a legitimate way to spread a particular type of culture over the world." . . . "This philosophy of war was part and parcel of Prussian State and policy. Germany's marvellous organization and her national life were permeated by the idea of war as an end, and the German people accepted it." . . . "Not only Bismarck, Moltke, Roon, and Bernhardt grew up in the atmosphere of this teaching, but Germans generally were imbued with the doctrine." (*Germanism from Within*; A. D. McLaren, pp. 130-131.)

Nobody with a grain of common sense will deny to a vast body of people, such as the Germans, a right to a place in the sun; but that does not lessen the regret that Germany has been led by so many who have taught war as a great national objective. Had other teachings prevailed, even if the great war had come, as the outcome of economic struggle and the failure of all concerned to find a better way to international social and economic adjustment, there would have been the possibility of Germany coming out of the war with a desire for rebuilding in a more humane way than the one which now prevails.

It is one thing to accept war as an incident in the life of nations, unavoidable under existing circumstances, and a very different thing to accept it as the consummation of a philosophy of war, which has for a long time found widespread acceptance.

The collapse of the German Social Democratic Party, on the question of a stand for peace, in the early days of the war, was one of the most significant proofs of the effectiveness with which German nationalism had been instilled into the minds of the majority of the nation. It was the greatest party of its kind, and yet its leaders, with few exceptions, were able to vote on the side of the war-monger, in spite of their long-standing teaching on the score of international brotherhood on the part of all working classes as essential to the destruction of imperialistic war-making.

The greatness of the German Social Democratic collapse into the hands of the Thugs can, to some extent, be realized when we recall the words of Prince von

Bülow; "Our Social Democratic Party lacks this national basis. It will have nothing to do with German patriotic memories which bear a monarchical and military character. It is not, like the French and Italian parties, a precipitate of the process of national historical development, but since its existence it has been in determined opposition to our past history as a nation. It has placed itself outside our national life." (*Imperial Germany*, p. 184.)

Evidently the teaching of the "national idea," as propagated year in and year out by the Government and agents, had kept the majority of the Social Democrats more within the bounds of national life than von Bülow imagined to be possible. That economic development in an imperialistic world was driving in the direction of war was no excuse for a great party's failure to take a firm stand. It was all the more reason why the stand should have been taken, and the failure is testimony to the sinister influence of blatant nationalism over the minds of even those who make internationalism a leading tenet of their political creed. The lesson remains for all to learn. Peace among the nations cannot be brought about by nationalism and its inevitable Thug-ism.

It must not be imagined that the Thug-ism of Hitlerism is of recent growth; or something that has suddenly appeared as if from out of the sky. Nor must it be looked upon as a mere importation. It is the outcome of German economic life captured and controlled by the intellectualists who have taught, by all manner of means, a self-sufficient nationalism and militarism of the worst type. Its doctrine is well expressed by the following words of the historian Treitschke: "A man must sacrifice not only his life, but also natural, profoundly justified feelings of the human soul; he must yield up his whole ego to a great patriotic idea; that is the moral exaltedness of war. If we pursue this thought further we recognize that war, with all its sternness and roughness, also weaves a bond of love between men, since here all class-distinctions vanish, and the risk of death knits man to man. He who knows history knows also that it would positively be a mutilation of human nature if we tried to banish war out of the world. There is no freedom without warlike strength, which is ready to sacrifice itself for freedom." (Selections from Treitschke's lectures on Politics, Translated by Adam L. Gowans, p. 104.)

Why war should be required to save mankind from mutilation; and in what way the risk of death in war knits man to man more so than does the same risk in many of man's attempts to master the force of nature, for the purpose of building up a better social structure, is not explained.

That men who have war forced upon them should acquit themselves well is to the good; they thus bring into operation some of the best qualities of human nature. That they should be asked to glorify war as the finest forcing ground for the development of human character is to the bad.

Unfortunately the monopoly of Hitlerism does not belong to Germany. Its germs are to be found in other countries; and it will be used in those countries to oppress and enslave the masses of the people to the utmost degree, if the majority of the people wake up when it is too late. The thugs are busy in England and France, as elsewhere, preparing for a war, or series of wars, the object of which is to bring about the abject enslavement of the many. That objective may be self-frustrated by international feuds ending in the destruction of human society, or by the masses of the people refusing to follow the leaders of the thugs, with their press and pulpit allies.

E. EGERTON STAFFORD.

Religion and Health.

IN the matter of religion, no thinking man or woman to-day cares to wear a label. All religions are in the crucible. While to one individual doctrine may stand as the means whereby he projects his ideals, to another it may be a refuge from personal thought and anxiety, and to yet another the only method whereby he can complete the unfulfilled desires of the *Id*.

In the etymological meaning of the word, religion implies bondage—*L. religio*, bind. In actual practice does it mean anything different? What, for example, is Christianity but a child of Judaism? Without the Hebraic religion there could have been no accepted religion of the West with Christ as its head. Yet what do we find? The cross has become both figuratively and actually the handle of the sword. Even at this writing the Jews are being systematically persecuted, rancorously ostracised, and robbed of their rights. This has been the uniform story for fifteen centuries or more. Wherever Christianity possesses the power it is relentless in wielding it. Liberty of thought is not allowed.

Yet every human creature should have the right to do, say and think whatever he wishes; *so long as equal liberty to others is not impaired by his so doing*.

From the moment that such forthrightness of opinion, a dauntless integrity, is recognized as man's supremest social duty, it becomes more and more repugnant to penalize any belief to which such honesty may lead. Religion will then emerge not as dogma but as Ethic. The honest man speaks the truth because he can do no other than speak the truth. Hence a Bible oath, or any other form of religious pledge, is powerless to restrain a dishonest man from lying.

Unfortunately, under the reigning religions of the world, there are a full half-dozen codes of conduct—the one used by the individual in private; the one he shows to the world; the one which animates the natural policy; the one dictated by class distinction (the *noblesse oblige* of the aristocrat, the proud independence of the charity-fearing poor, etc., etc.); the religious code; the legal code; and so on, almost *ad infinitum*. It is the duty of the true and earnest eugenist, the thoughtful Ethicist, to reduce all these codes into one harmonious rule of social conduct. It is a stupendous task, if only because of the vested interests involved.

Yet international strife can never cease while public morality and private morality are in conflict: the latter being generally much superior to the former. Many an honourable and truthful man acts the hypocrite because our social life imposes upon him an endless pretence and make-believe.

Thus is proven my postulate that a man without religion is free—not free to offend; but free to base his ethical code four-square upon the rational foundation of a common need. There is, moreover, a completeness of personality about such a *libre penseur* that far and away transcends the thwarted "ego" of the man whose thoughts and acts are trammelled by religion.

The truth is that every thinker to-day—being neither buffoon nor hypocrite—has a message for humanity. From the bizarre prophecy of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, to the impassioned pleading of H. G. Wells's *God, the Invisible King*, and the unquiet reasoning of Gustave Geley's *From the Unconscious to the Conscious*; from the deeply-biassed views on Sex of Sigmund Freud to the calm economic discussions of Major C. H. Douglas and J. M. Keynes; from Einstein or Feuchtwanger to Jeans or Eddington; from the inharmonious warp and woof of the Talmud, the Bible, the Koran, to the in-

coherences of David Herbert Lawrence—all these must inevitably carry a seed which fructifies into the expanding religion of the future.

The fault with dogmatic Christianity is that it is not Christ-like. We hear quite a lot about equality and the perfected brotherhood of mankind. Yet here in Nigeria the very Missionaries themselves invite the sparse lay European community to an "all-white" religious service. Several times I have raised the point with our different Christian Bishops. I am told, "We like occasionally to be *among ourselves* for worship."

I find an even stronger piece of evidence in the fact that at the World's Sunday School Convention, held in Washington, in 1910, every coloured teacher was banned. They were not deemed good enough to join their White "brethren" in taking part in this "world"-demonstration. In more recent years we have had instances of Africans being denied admission to London hotels, kept by professing Christians.

This unfortunate lack of consistency between theory and practice is startlingly vivid in the history of slavery. It was the *Jesus* (how ironically named!), captained by that pious Mariner, John Hawkins, which sailed for West Africa in October, 1564, under the "direct blessing of Almighty God," to kidnap slaves.

Thus was slavery, as an institution, inaugurated. I write feelingly, for I have visited and slept within those "castles" which to this day ornament the Gold Coast, attesting the benevolence of organized Christianity. The West Coast of Africa was the greatest slave-reserve in the world, and these "castles," dotted along the Coast at ten or twelve miles' intervals, were the prisons where thousand after thousand (until the figures reached millions) of negroes were immured. Slave-ships from Liverpool and Bristol there loaded; and the resultant Black Cargo was carried to American ports or the West Indian Islands.

Sir William Butler, who served on the Coast forty years ago, makes the soul-searing statement that "from these prison-castles to some West Indian port, a cable of slave-skeletons must be living at the bottom of the ocean." The victims of "man's inhumanity to man" died like flies in winter during the middle passage. Withal, so lucrative was the traffic in human flesh, that if two out of each ten survived, the trade paid enormously.

Christians are apt to gloss over or deny these truths. Orthodoxy has the most conveniently short memory. As recently as 1916 (*Daily Chronicle*, October 20) we find the Rev. R. J. Campbell contrasting Russia with England, to England's disadvantage. He then declared:

"The difference between Russia and England is essentially that Russia is a *spiritual and religious country*, and England is *not*. England was religious once, and it *might* be again!" (The italics are mine.)

Now, in the intervening seventeen years, neither Russia nor England can have changed so radically as to make contemporary opinion of a superbly righteous England and a callously infidel Russia either right or wrong. Quite clearly, "opinion" is a matter of a hundred shifting and unreliable factors. Rarely indeed is the professional preacher so thoroughly in earnest as to be wholeheartedly believed. We each have our vision of the world, and nothing is either right or wrong but thinking makes it so.

I must therefore close my task on the earnest argument that the ideal of human balance is *mens sana in corpore sano*. Deities and rules of health are useless unless we command the co-operation of the mental and spiritual planes. It is even possible (absurd as the statement may appear at first reading) to comb health and beauty into one's hair by a mental exercise, praying for its vitality during the toilet. Let it never be

denied that the ascendancy of mind over matter is Nature's Way. In the beginning, remember, was the *Word*!

As I have shown, there is, with an official priesthood, a tendency to degrade the expounded religion. Where there is *no* official priesthood a man or woman, religiously inclined, may develop the personality and satisfy that personality's needs on both emotional and intellectual planes. Are there not the Arts? Is there not Music? Poetry? Letters? Why, Science itself may become more fascinating than *The Arabian Nights' Entertainments*!

Religious organizations, by their very structure, warp and restrict. As the professed custodians of man's belief about the non-material world they dare neither change nor expand. But Growth and Change are the Law. It is merely folly to affirm, "Because my remote ancestors believed thus and thus, I must believe the same!"

How remarkable, as a passing example, it seems that many American Indian Tribes, perished or perishing from the earth, believed in the same bases of religion as Egyptian, Hebrew, Babylonian and Christian.

J. M. STUART-YOUNG.

Onitsha, Nigeria, W.C.A.

The Thing that Matters.

Did you tackle the trouble that came to you
With a resolute heart and cheerful:
Or hide your face, from the light of day,
With a craven soul and fearful?
Oh! A trouble's an ounce,
Or a trouble's a ton,
Or a trouble is what you make it.
It isn't the fact that you're down that counts,
It's the fact of how did you take it?

CRITICUS.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead): 11.30, Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 12.0, Sunday, B. A. Le Maine. 3.30, Platform 1, Messrs. Collins and Bryant. Platform 2, B. A. Le Maine. 6.30, Various speakers. Wednesday, 7.30, Messrs. Collins and Le Maine.

INDOOR.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (New Morris Hall, Hall No. 5, 79 Bedford Road, Clapham, S.W.4): 7.30, Annual General Meeting. Branch Members only.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, Gerald Heard—"The Revival of Progress."

THE METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Reggiori's Restaurant, 1 Euston Road, opposite King's Cross Station): 7.30, Next meeting January 7, 1934.

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

EAST LANCASHIRE RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION (28 Bridge Street, Burnley): No meeting until January 7, 1934.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Musical Evening.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Transport Hall, Islington, Liverpool, entrance Christian Street): 7.0, D. Robinson (Liverpool)—"The Religious Blight."

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N.S.S. (Plymouth Chambers, Hall 5, Drake Circus): Next meeting, January 7, 1934.

BLASPHEMY ON TRIAL**DEFENCE OF FREE
SPEECH**By
G. W. FOOTE.WITH HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION BY H. CUTNER
Being a Three Hours' Address to the Jury in the Court
of Queen's Bench, before Lord Coleridge on April
24, 1883.Price **SIXPENCE.** Postage 1d.

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

WOMAN AND CHRISTIANITYBy **CHAPMAN COHEN**

The Story of the Exploitation of a Sex.

Price **1s.** Postage **1d.****A
Grammar of Freethought.**By **CHAPMAN COHEN.**Cloth Bound **5s.** Postage **3d.**

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

**The
Revenues Of Religion**By
ALAN HANDSACRE.**A RECORD OF ESTABLISHED RELIGION.
IN ENGLAND.**Official Facts about Church Revenues.
History—Argument—Statistics.Cloth 2s 6d. Postage 3d.
Paper 1s. 6d. Postage 2d.

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

The Secular Society, Ltd.

CHAIRMAN—CHAPMAN COHEN.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 62 FARRINGTON 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 pro-
mote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Edu-
cation. 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 some-
times 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.**PAGANISM IN
CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS**

BY

J. M. WHEELER.Clothette **1s.** Postage **1½d.**

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

UNWANTED CHILDRENIn 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.

Bradlaugh and Ingersoll

A critical study of two Great Reformers

By
CHAPMAN COHEN

Issued by the Secular Society Limited

208 PAGES

CLOTH

12 PLATES

2s. 6d. - By Post - 2s. 9d.

Seasonable Gifts

By CHAPMAN COHEN

Opinions :—

Random Reflection and Wayside Sayings. With portrait of the Author. Calf 5s. Cloth Gilt 3s. 6d. Postage 3d.

Selected Heresies :—

AN ANTHOLOGY. Cloth Gilt 3s. 6d. Postage 3d.

Gramophone Record :—

Gold Label Edison Bell :—"The Meaning and Value of Freethought." Price 2s. By post 2s. 9d. Foreign and Colonial orders 1s. extra.

A New Year's Card :—

A folding card, printed in colour with a telling and suitable quotation from Ingersoll, and floral design by H. Cutner. Post free, single copy 2d. Packet of seven 1s. Issued by the National Secular Society, 62 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

BRADLAUGH AND TO-DAY

A Verbatim Report
of the speeches delivered at the Cen-
tenary Demonstration and Dinner on
Sept. 23rd and 26th

By Professor Laski, Chapman Cohen,
J. P. Gilmour, G. Bernard Shaw,
Lord Snell, Lord Horder, A. B. Moss,
Josiah Wedgwood, M.P., Dr. C. V.
Drysdale, Professor Gilbert Murray,
Judge Cluer, F. Verinder and
C. Bradlaugh Bonner.

128 pages

In paper 6d. by post 8d. Cloth 1s.6d. By
post 1s. 9d.