

THE
FREETHINKER

• EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN •
— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIV.—No. 23

SUNDAY, JUNE 10, 1934

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Another Life of Christ—The Editor</i> - - -	353
<i>The Lucidity of Landor—Mimnermus</i> - - -	354
<i>Ancient America's Ruined Cities—T. F. Palmer</i> - - -	355
<i>Wilberforce—and Others—George Bedborough</i> - - -	357
<i>Freethought and Social Science—Austen Verney</i> - - -	362
<i>Reaction in Freethought—E. Egerton Stafford</i> - - -	363
<i>The Way of the World—Simple Simon</i> - - -	365
<i>Clergymen as Lime-Lighters—Frank Hill</i> - - -	365

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

Views and Opinions

Another Life of Christ

I HAVE been reading yet another life of Christ* The author, Dr. W. Harvey, is a Freethinker and a reader of this journal, and I may say at once that if one wishes to read another life of Jesus, this is as interesting a one as he can get. It is well-written, and there is, of course, a complete—a too complete elimination of the religious element. A great emphasis is placed on the moral and the reforming element which the author finds in the character of Jesus, and also concerning the relation which Jesus bears to modern thought. It stops short of the crucifixion, and one feels as did the lady who read Renan's *Life*, it is a pity that it does not end with at least a wedding. A few love scenes could easily have been introduced, and it might even have concluded with Jesus safely away from his enemies, with a couple of children around him, and one or two close friends discussing the appearance of an ethical organization some centuries after he was dead, which would embody his views.

I am not at all surprised to find that the book has been very favourably noticed by a number of religious journals, some well known writers, and also by ordinary newspapers. This is, perhaps, its severest criticism. There are in the book many shrewd digs at theology, as one who knew anything of the author would expect. But in spite of the excellence of the book, as a book, I am still left wondering why it was written. In some cases the answer to such a question is obvious. Lives of Jesus are written either to uphold a religious teaching, or because writing is the author's business, and he writes according to the market, and cares little whether he is writing a life of Jesus or one of Charles Peace, or because the writer is an historian and feels that something must be said about Jesus, or because it is felt that Jesus was a very worthy man who has been much misunderstood, and a chivalrous impulse prompts that justice shall be done.

* *The Making of a Messiah*, Bruce Humphries, Boston, U.S.A. Two dollars.

I am quite sure that Dr. Harvey belongs to this last class; and feeling sure of this I can differ altogether from him with the utmost enjoyment, and I hope that his enjoyment of the disagreement will be none the less thorough.

* * *

The Power of Environment

Dr. Harvey says that from his childhood he has always been fascinated by the story of Jesus. That is what one might have diagnosed from the nature of *The Making of a Messiah*, either this, or that the author had been brought up in an environment in which the name of Jesus had exercised a peculiar influence. But if he had come into contact with the story in the New Testament in the years of his maturity, and if his reading of the New Testament had been accompanied by what he now knows concerning the similar stories of other Messiahs, would it then have had the same fascination for him? I do not think that it would. Eliminating, as Dr. Harvey has done in his book, the supernaturalistic element, and fixing attention on the moral teaching only, he would have recognized several things that must have prevented his making an attempt to rescue the fancied reformer from the supernatural saviour. He would have seen that so far as the mere moral teachings are concerned there was nothing whatever in them to excite attention, and nothing to rouse enmity. They were already commonplaces, and often more wisely expressed, among the people amid whom he preached. Taking the New Testament as it stands this much is quite clear. Those who stand nearest to Jesus, chronologically, are not impressed by the human Jesus, but by the incarnate God.

If I may further diagnose Dr. Harvey's case, I would say that it is a very common one. He like so many others has been brought up in a society in which the belief in an incarnate saviour-god has been the foundation of a long and strongly established religion. As is common in such societies, ethical and social teaching has been consciously based on this belief. Everything that was most valued, apart from religion, has been taught as dependent on religion, with the result that while it became comparatively easy to set aside the purely mythological part of the current creed, it was not so easy to set aside the ethical values that had become associated with the creed. Added to this is the kindred fact that to find some goodness—some indispensable goodness about the old belief, make the social break less difficult. The old is not attacked in the name of something new, it is openly attacked because, it is said, the old has not been followed, but has been overlaid with more recent misrepresentations. The Reformer masquerades as a Restorer. He acquires the new without breaking away from the old; and he does it by reading into the old new conceptions. This is a very common phenom-

enon, the pity is that it so often grasps hold of so many worthy men and women, and thus robs their work of much of its effectiveness.

* * *

Bricks without Straw

I have mentioned above the various classes of people who set about writing a life of Jesus. All of these people have one thing in common. They must come to the New Testament for their material. There is none elsewhere. Outside the New Testament there is nothing—even granting the few casual and very fragmentary references to Jesus at a later date than the one given for his existence—upon which one could build a story. Even Dr. Harvey, to get his imaginary social reformer, has to depend upon many "If we assume's," and "We may imagine's," on which to base his story. All are tied down to the New Testament for material. And that is where the trouble begins. For there is not enough biographical material on which to write the bricfest of biographies. The difficulty is not that the character of Jesus is many-sided. It is not. It is simply contradictory; but it is not contradictory in the sense that its conflicting features may be united in a final unity by some skilful student of character or fine literary artist. These different aspects of the character of the New Testament Jesus are irretrievably discordant because they are brought together from different sources and presented as a whole by the Christian Church. The teaching saviour-God has been mixed up with the miracle-working god, the sun-god with the vegetation-god, the sacrificially made god with a semi-metaphysical god, and as these mythological images have worn thin it has been found profitable to forget—or to cease to stress—the saviour-god and other gods, and to replace them with the social reformer and human ethical teacher. The policy and the product of that is quite plain to anyone who bears in mind all the factors involved; but it is a poor policy to play into the hands of the supernaturalist by professing belief in a human character that could no more have existed as an historical fact than could Santa Claus. We are in the world of the mythological when we are dealing with the New Testament Jesus; we have left the field of sober history altogether.

* * *

Helping the Enemy

Now if these lives of Jesus were frankly that of some imaginary person who was, for artistic or homiletic purposes endowed with certain virtues in order to give these same virtues expression, no serious exception could be taken, save on the ground of artistic presentation. But that is not the case. There is another purpose involved. That purpose is sometimes consciously pursued, as in the case of an orthodox life of Jesus, at other times this purpose is unconsciously furthered as in these lives of Jesus that are written by non-Christians. For let us note that if the only reason was to illustrate how good men arise from time to time, teaching their fellows lessons of right living, or pointing out the road to better living, the world supplies scores of such examples from at least the time of Socrates until our own day. And certainly very few feel so impelled to dig into past history in order to discover some unrecognized humanitarian teacher and proclaim his name to the world. The purpose that is—consciously or unconsciously—served by these lives of Jesus is of a different order.

The underlying reason for this manufacturing of biographies of Jesus is that he is the pivotal point of an established religion, and it is felt that some great and good figure ought to be discoverable under the myth. On the one hand we have the professional advocate of religion at the game because it is to his interest to play it; on the other we have the half-emanci-

pated Freethinker who feels that he ought to be able to offer the good man for service when he has reached the point of discarding the incarnate God. His respect and admiration for an assumed historic Jesus is the apology he offers to the Christian world for having rejected its God.

To my mind the reason for this is obvious. Those writers who will have their Jesus—first as a God, then as a good man—have never completely emancipated themselves from the clutches of the old superstition. They have given it up in name and in set doctrine, but they are still under its influence. It is too much for them to give up the God *and* the man. They cannot see that the man was perpetuated because he was a God, and that when the God goes there is nothing essential about the man that is worth keeping. He becomes nothing but a dummy figure on which sentimental reformers may drape their own illogical sentimentalities and intellectual confusions. The half-emancipated man feels that it is too much to break with the old religion completely. Let him at least try to discover a splendid reality under the figure he is discarding. Consciously or unconsciously, the admiration for the human Jesus which he offers the Christian world is the apology he makes for having rejected the supernatural Christ.

And the Christian nowadays eagerly accepts the apology. The apology does nothing to convert Christians, but it does help to prevent Christians becoming unbelievers. It points out to them that in their creed they really have something so precious to the world, so unique in its character that even its enemies have to confess its grandeur and its indispensability. The Christian can use the amiable unbeliever as a weapon to belabour the unbeliever of sterner stuff. The admirer of the ethical Jesus is elevated to the post of being a member of the Christian parade. But he is not in the front. Like the captives of a Roman triumph, he is in the rear, clad in chains of his own forging, cheerfully testifying to the greatness of his captors.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

The Lucidity of Landor

"The stormy sophist with his mouth of thunder,
Clothed with loud words and mantled in the might
Of darkness and magnificence of night."—*Swinburne*.

THACKERAY, in the beginning of his famous lectures on "The Four Georges," makes affectionate mention of an old friend whose life extended back into the eighteenth century. "I often thought," he said, "as I took my kind old friend's hand, how, with it, I held on to the old society." Even such a link with the past was Walter Savage Landor, whose virile writings bridge the gulf between great Freethinkers at the commencement and the end of the nineteenth century.

Shelley, who died whilst the century was yet young, was an enthusiastic admirer of Landor, and Swinburne, the golden-voiced poet of the century's decline, sat at Landor's feet and found inspiration in his wisdom. How lovingly Swinburne refers to the elder singer:—

"I found him whom I shall not find
Till all grief end,
In holiest age our mightiest mind,
Father and friend."

Nor was this a mere tribute of affection. Landor cast the spell of genius upon all who came near him. Southey, who had so many opportunities of judging, has left a magnificent tribute to his memory. De Quincey, Dickens, Emerson, and Charles Lamb have all combined to bear witness in favour of that "deep-

mouthed Boetian," as Byron called him. Browning dedicated his *Luria* to Landor. It is few men who inspire such love among friends, or fear among enemies. Carlyle, visiting him in old age, found him "stirring company; a proud, irascible, trenchant, yet generous, veracious, and very dignified old man; quite a ducal or royal man in the temper of him."

Landor's literary activity extended over seventy years. A poet embodying revolutionary ideas in classic language, he was also a literary dramatist of great power. Above all, he was a critic in the widest sense of that much-abused word. The "Imaginary Conversations," on which competent judges have bestowed unstinted praise, is his masterpiece. There is nothing like it in the whole range of English literature. It is a great panorama of historic persons, and includes such famous characters as Plato in old Greece, to our own Porson; Hannibal of old-world Carthage, to David Hume; Seneca, to his own friend Robert Southey. A great artist, he has painted them all with masterly touches; Kings and greater than Kings, philosophers and prelates, statesmen and scientists, women and writers, of all ages and all types. Epicurus discusses philosophy in his garden; Montaigne smiles at the worthy Scaliger; Melanchthon reproves Calvin. How perfectly too has Landor caught the relation between the French Court and the Romish Church, when the monarch confesses the most heinous crimes and the courtly confessor imposes the most trifling penances. Historic scene succeeds historic scene, and all go to make a splendid panorama of "life, like a dome of many-coloured glass." When Landor is at his best, not many are so perfect as he. There are few things more pathetic than his portrait of the unfortunate Anne Boleyn. He represents Henry coming disguised to see Anne in the condemned cell. Very touchingly does she express her desire to see her child: "Could I but kiss her once again, it would comfort my heart or break it."

Like Shelley's work, Landor's writing was for long "caviare to the general." His masterpiece was described as "the adventures of seven volumes, which are seven valleys of dry bones." This lack of contemporary appreciation is the more remarkable because Landor was a real genius. In nearly every page of his works there is high thinking and rare eloquence. In truth, a well-edited selection of his writings would be one of the most beautiful books in the English language. Although Landor addressed a small audience while he lived, he had no illusions as to his reputation: "I shall dine late, but the dining-room will be well-lighted, the guests few and select."

The chief of Landor's other books is *Pericles and Aspasia*. Another of his works, *The Citation of William Shakespeare for Deer-stealing*, evoked Lamb's epigram that it could only have been written by "the man who did write it, or him of whom it was written." Landor's poetry is not bulky in quantity, but few poets have won such recognition with such a small nosegay of verse. "Sometimes," says Mr. John Drinkwater, "he achieved a lyric finality about which there can be no question." The exquisite lines on "Rose Alymer" have found their way into many anthologies and many hearts, while the lines on the death of Charles Lamb are an admirable tribute to an heroic genius. The single stanza, in his own incomparable manner, prefixed to one of his last books, epitomizes his life and aims in four lines:—

"I strove with none, for none was worth my strife.
Nature I loved; and, next to Nature, Art;
I warmed both hands before the fire of life;
It sinks, and I am ready to depart."

For those who care for "the grand manner" in

literature, Landor's writings are full of delight. As a man he was dowered with a poet's brain. Withal, he was a typical Englishman, with an appetite for adventure. He showed this when on Napoleon's invasion of Spain, he went over and with his own energy and money, raised a regiment, with whom he marched to the seat of war. A man of letters, he was also a man of action; a happy combination.

Landor has been styled a grand old Pagan, and his sympathies were always secular rather than religious. The eternal arrogance of priests always roused the old lion's roar, and he never forgot Milton's advice that "presbyter is but priest writ large." There are many sceptical thrusts in his writings, such as:—

The State is founded on follies, the Church on sins.

Power has been hitherto occupied in no employment but in keeping down Wisdom. Perhaps the time may come when Wisdom shall exert her energy in repressing the sallies of Power.

Plain truths, like plain dishes, are commended by everybody, and everybody leaves them whole.

He who brings a bullock into a city for its sustenance is called a butcher. He who reduces the same city to famine is styled "General" or "Marshal," and men make room for him in the ante-chamber.

After so many have repeated that vice leads to misery, is there no generous man who will proclaim aloud that misery leads to vice?

We may be so much in the habit of bowing as at last to be unable to stand upright.

I see but one cross remaining on earth, and it is that of the unrepentant thief.

Europe is semi-barbarous.

We are upon earth to learn what can be learnt upon earth, and not to speculate on what never can be.

It is better to erect one cottage than to demolish a hundred cities.

Down to the present day we have been taught little else than falsehood.

The book of "good news" tells people not only that they may go and be damned, but that, unless they are lucky, they must inevitably.

Our reformers knock off the head from Jupiter: thunderbolt and sceptre stand.

One of his "conversations" closes with the splendid words: "There is nothing on earth divine besides humanity," and that was the keynote of his writings from the time when, at college, he was dubbed "a mad Jacobin," until his death, when he had made an imperishable name for himself. A Warwickshire man, he was cradled in the same county as Shakespeare, and there was something of "the Master" in Landor's genius. Carlyle said finely of one of Landor's best literary efforts, published when the "old lion" was over eighty years of age: "The sound of it is like the ring of Roman swords on the helmets of barbarians. The unsubduable old Roman." Landor deserved the tribute from grim old Carlyle. Not only was he a remarkable man and a wonderful writer, but he was part-architect of our exciting new world.

MIMNERMUS.

When the wireless machine is entirely controlled by the Government, it simply confirms the power of the dictator to present only one side of a case, and to present it incessantly and on the widest scale. The next war, if civilization is to commit that act of suicide, will be fought in the air in two senses; I am inclined to think that the ethered word will be as influential as the bombing aeroplane.—Ivor Brown, "I commit to the Flames."

Ancient America's Ruined Cities

THE long-cherished belief that the several civilizations of the world have arisen more or less independently is now seriously challenged by an active anthropological school. The celebrated scientist, Prof. Elliot Smith, is its stormy protagonist, and he possesses an able lieutenant in the person of Dr. W. J. Perry. To these well-established names must be added that of Mr. J. Leslie Mitchell, whose just published volume—*The Conquest of the Maya*, Jarrolds, 1934, 18s. net—essays to derive the genesis of the archaic cultures of Central America from the influences exerted by ancient voyagers, who long since landed on the shores of the Western Continent. The culture carried by these Asiatic immigrants originally arose in prehistoric Egypt, a country that the diffusionist propagandists regard as the cradle of all succeeding cultural achievement.

In his foreword to Leslie Mitchell's volume, Prof. Elliot Smith states that its author "has achieved a great work, which will earn the gratitude of all students of Human History."

An introductory chapter is devoted to a critical analysis of the numerous contributions of past-century scholars towards the elucidation of the Maya problem. Yet, despite their many sterling qualities, Mitchell considers the best of them incomplete. This is his justification for his own production. Certainly, many absurd speculations have been solemnly propounded in one decade, only to be derided in another. The discoveries of recent and contemporary excavators are all embraced by Mitchell, and he adopts the wise plan of carefully comparing the scripts that have descended to us from the time of the Spanish invasion of the New World with "the results of archaeological research and excavation in modern times; to recheck these sources of information by references to all pages of Old World history, which appear to have any bearing on them; and transmit the whole with such simplicity and elegance as he may command into a narrative history of the most remarkable culture discovered in the New World."

The beginnings of agriculture Mitchell traces to the Nilotic Valley, where millet and barley abounded in a wild state. These corn seeds were casually gathered by primitive hunters and fishermen as an addition to their flesh and finny food. It is stated that nowhere save in Egypt "with its peculiar times of flood and ebb, obvious influence of its water on the seed, could the connexion have been so impressed on the mind of primitive man. It is indeed extremely doubtful if either of these cereals grew elsewhere in a condition likely to tempt the food gatherer to add them to his stores of food. Chance and long centuries of observation forced agriculture upon the Ancient Egyptian. Here, in all the doubts and delays of the hunt, appeared a secure and certain way to procure periodical quantities of succulent food."

Thus, in terms of the diffusionist theory, were the foundations of all succeeding civilizations laid. With subsequent discovery and invention, and increase in population in this happy valley, the predynastic Egyptians travelled on land and over sea in search of fine timbers and choice spices, as also to gather gold and precious stones to adorn and dignify their proud civilization. The handiwork of these prehistoric pioneers remains in many of those settlements where stone circles and other megalithic monuments survive. When agriculture had supplemented and finally supplanted food gathering, and the Egyptian farmer had made secure a bountiful harvest of golden grain, then his security enabled him to deify his dead, and wander

far afield in quest of Life Givers such as glowing gold and cowrie shells, these last becoming the objects of special veneration owing to their resemblance to the female organ of fertility.

This hypothesis is acutely, and even acrimoniously contested by leading archaeologists. That the ancient Egyptians spread their culture far from its ancestral home seems certain, but whether all the claims of the diffusionist school are valid is perhaps an open question, only to be answered by fuller and deeper research. Yet, be this as it may, it is highly probable that Southern and Central America were long ago colonized by immigrants from Polynesia, who introduced the culture of the Old World to the New in days far antecedent to the advent of Columbus and his successors. Moreover, there exists conclusive evidence that Norsemen reached America in pre-Columbian centuries.

Leslie Mitchell dates the arrival of the Asiatic navigators at a period not much earlier than the opening of the Christian era. "We may picture the coming of boats," he writes, "and the trekking of travellers amid the astounded gapings of the native hunter, the settling of the Asiatic Polynesian prospectors around this or that river-bed where pearls were to be found, where gold was to be dug, the setting up at each halting place of those unremitting elements of the Asiatic culture so strangely twisted and diversified and added to since they left four thousand years before, their home in the Nile Valley."

Having depicted ancient times and the uncivilized communities of Central America, our author devotes a finely informative chapter to the advance of the Maya Old Empire. He surveys the ruins of this fallen dominion in a manner that gives them momentary life. The melancholy remains of Mayan art are appraised in a manner that recalls that of Ruskin in his most pleasant and persuasive moods. Painting, sculpture, ceramics and the minor arts are all passed under sympathetic review. Then, the sciences are considered, and the script and calendar of this remarkable race discussed.

Mitchell notes that: "The main limits set on the science of the Maya architect in the Old Empire were three in number—lack of the knowledge of the true arch, lack of a knowledge of the bonding of corners, and lack of knowledge of a formula by which to lay off a right angle." A pictorial representation of a false arch from Tarentum in Italy appears by the side of one still standing at Palenque which dates from Old Empire times. These are two only of the many fine illustrations of the volume. It is also noteworthy that for nearly 1,000 years the Mayan arch underwent no material improvement.

It is at Copan that a rude representation of elephants was discovered on a sculpture. Now, the native American elephant became extinct many thousands of years ago. Yet what appear to have been intended for elephants, to an ordinary eye, have been transformed by specialists into a sculptured images of reptiles, tapirs, macaws, and even turtles, at least, so it is said. Mitchell, however, very forcibly states that "they are unmistakably Indian elephants, surmounted by mahouts, with turbans and goads, they are the beasts as a sculptor, who had never seen them in the dun flesh, might record from legend."

When the Spaniards met them, the Maya were unacquainted with the potter's wheel, and their clay vessels consequently lack the superb finish of ancient Greek pottery. Agriculture was still rude, and after three or four years' cropping the soil became exhausted or the encroachments of thorny scrub precluded further cultivation. For coming harvests, either fallow or newly broken soil was essential. Maize was apparently the principal crop; cacao and other edible

plants were cultivated, as well as cotton for clothing.

The Mayan calendar, so indispensable to husbandry, is carefully studied in this work. The native religion seems to have been largely related to the divinities that controlled the crops and weather. As among the Aztecs of Mexico, human offerings to their blood-thirsty gods were deemed imperative. It was once thought that these sanguinary rites were unknown to the Mayan peoples. "But it is evident, in the skulls recovered from the hollow altars in the city of Uaxactun, that there also temples were dedicated with sacrifice." In other cities sculptured representations of human sacrifice survive. Indeed, a stela at Predras Negras still stands that depicts "the actual rite—the victim stretched across the sacrificial block, his chest expanded, and blood fountaining in the gash from which the heart has been plucked. . . . Agony was the tribute which humankind paid to divinity."

The busy life of an ancient Maya city is most attractively reconstructed. Then the rise of the Later Maya Empire is brilliantly pictured with its science, art and social intercourse. The disastrous hurricane and ensuing pestilence which heralded the arrival of the European marauders are vividly described, and then the work concludes with a narration of the Spanish invasion, conquest, and destruction of Mayan civilization and culture.

The Maya possessed neither horses nor firearms, and their primitive weapons proved powerless against their well-equipped enemies. For all practical purposes the Amerindians were still in the Stone Age. Nor did they possess wheeled carriages of any kind; thus, even the heaviest loads were perforce hauled from place to place. Leslie Mitchell's remarkable volume is certain to arouse controversy. Nevertheless, it is a very important contribution to New World archæology and a work well worthy the perusal of all who are interested in the world story of man's mental and material progress.

T. F. PALMER.

Wilberforce—and Others

The popular view is that one man, William Wilberforce, brought about the abolition of negro slavery in British dominions. Some people, perhaps remembering Wordsworth's fine tribute to Thomas Clarkson, pay honour to the two reformers. They both deserve the recognition of posterity for good work in a great cause.

It is a pity that since Wilberforce's death, the name of Clarkson, as well as the names of many others, fell gradually into popular forgetfulness under the glamour of Wilberforce's smaller but more brilliant and much more advertised personality.

That Wilberforce did great and good work for the Emancipation cause is beyond all cavil. His fame is assured. His name will never be forgotten. He was never ignored, nor undervalued, nor unpraised, by any of his fellow-workers. They spoke of him with an appreciation he never reciprocated.

It is an unfortunate fact that Wilberforce's official biographers, his two sons, both clergymen, in their voluminous *Life* of their father, have compiled a eulogy of William Wilberforce. Their monotonous pages afford no ordered story of the Abolitionist movement.

A contemporary critic said about this biography, "The Messrs. Wilberforce inherit few of the sympathies of their father, and stand aloof from the great body of those who were their father's associates, and who finally succeeded when he had retired from public life." (H. C. Robinson, *Exposures of Misrepresentations*.)

To be frank, Abolitionism did not begin when Wilberforce first moved in the matter, and alas, he did not obliterate negro or any other slavery, nor did he pass unaided the measures he sponsored in Parliament.

The Rev. Robert Wilberforce and his brother (Soapy Sam), afterwards Bishop Wilberforce, have carefully edited their father's diaries, correspondence, speeches, conversations, etc., from which the reader must often turn perplexed, wondering what is left out, as well as why some silly story, some pointless piety, or some unnecessary eulogy of an insignificant person for an unimportant episode should occupy so much space.

William Wilberforce, born to great wealth, after a mildly "profligate" youth, entered Parliament, admittedly inspired solely by personal ambition. Like many others, he paved the way to election by buying votes at a cost of £8,000 or more for his election.

His life-long friendship with William Pitt might have given Wilberforce an enviable advantage as a parliamentarian, but it is clear that Wilberforce never sacrificed his independence. He declined titles, and he was too wealthy to be bought. He did not even join the Party which his friend Pitt, the Prime Minister, led.

It should be noticed that Wilberforce said nothing about the Slave Trade in his election address on entering Parliament, nor in his first few years in the House. His first speech there was quite the commonplace protest of the taxpayer against the unbearable burden his constituents had to face. His heart was all the time in the Lakes, where he was invited for the vacation. "Between business in the morning (in Parliament), and pleasure at night, my time is pretty well filled up," he said in a letter to a friend, in which he described himself as a "ready-made orator."

Wilberforce was born in 1759, entered Parliament at the age of twenty-one, retired in 1825, and died in 1833. He was a remarkably good speaker, but his health was not good for long at a time. His frequent absences from Parliament were partly due to his ill-health, and probably partly due to the "remedies" he took. He found opium a relief, and became and remained an addict to that drug for a great part of his life.

Slavery is a very ancient institution with many ramifications, and it has needed the work of very many devoted humanitarians, including writers, orators, agitators, statesmen and others to bring us in 1934 to the comparative freedom enjoyed to-day. As Mr. Chapman Cohen has fully demonstrated (see Chapter IV. of *Christianity, Slavery and Labour*), Negro slavery was a peculiarly Christian institution.

The Quakers were certainly Christians, but Christians with a difference. They were despised and persecuted by Christians. They were a small sect with principles about marriage, war and human freedom, and individual religion which rendered them always obnoxious to the Churches, and to the State led by the Churches. It is wonderful that so small a sect should have so noble a record.

Granville Sharp was the Quaker leader of the movement, which later on Wilberforce joined. Sharp interviewed personally all the bishops, incredible at first that they could be so callous about the elementary rights of humanity. Every bishop without exception was opposed to all of Sharp's proposals. Sharp bitingly contrasted the bishops' unanimous slave-lust with "Backsliding Israel" at its worst. "Four chiefs of Ephraim," he complained, "were on the side of justice," whereas England's Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, could not produce even "one single chief to stand up and remove this burden from the land."

Long before Wilberforce came on the scene, Granville Sharp (whose name even is wrongly spelt in the Wilberforce biography), had protested that "Great Britain indeed keeps no slaves, but publicly encourages the slave-trade, and contemptuously neglects or rejects every petition or attempt of the Colonies against that notorious wickedness."

Sharp's interest in emancipation became a passion, when in 1776 he, then a city merchant, saw a slave arrested by his "master" in a London street. Sharp rescued the negro, whose master at once brought him before the Lord Mayor, who refused to hand him over. Outside the Guildhall, after the case had been dismissed, Sharp saw that the "master" was still determined to keep his slave, protected with the certainty that English law was a charter for slave-owners.

A new horror brought Sharp into the field. Over 130 negro slaves had been thrown into the sea and drowned, and a London court was asked to decide that £30 per slave should be paid as insurance recompense for the loss of this "cargo of chattel-goods." Sharp was furious. He gave up his business and devoted his time and fortune to the abolitionist cause. He watched cases such as the foregoing; he paid Counsel to oppose the vicious principle that a slave was only a bale of goods to be thrown overboard when it was desired to lighten the ship in a storm.

Sharp founded and became chairman of an Abolitionist Committee in 1787, to which, six months later Wilberforce wrote his first letter of inquiry about the slave trade. The Committee consisted of twelve, of whom all but two were Quakers.

In 1785 Thomas Clarkson wrote his famous *Essay* which began Clarkson's dedication to the cause. Lady Middleton, a friend of Sharp's and Clarkson's, later invited Wilberforce to her home at Teston, to interest him in a cause she had deeply at heart. She had heard that "Mr. Wilberforce, who had lately come out, displayed superior talents and great eloquence, and was a friend of the Minister" (Pitt). Ignatius Latrobe, another pioneer of emancipation, claimed that "the abolition of the Slave trade was, when the time was come, the work of a woman."

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH.

(To be concluded.)

Acid Drops

Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan, who has somehow gained a certain reputation as a writer on scientific subjects, writes in the *Observer*, that "it seems unlikely that the concepts of physics and chemistry are adequate to the explanation of biological phenomena." No one but a fool, certainly no one who understands what is meant by Materialism ever thought they were. If physical and chemical concepts were adequate to explain biology, what on earth would be the use of laws of biology? It is a pity that these people who write about science do not try to understand it before they begin their job.

Mr. Geoffrey Gilbey is a well known writer on that very popular sport, racing, and he is, therefore, a thorough protagonist of "real" Christianity. Every now and then he bursts into lyric fervour on the wonder of Christianity and the way in which the whole aspect of the earth's surface would change if only we all became "real" Christians. Of course, people call themselves Christians, but, as he said recently in one of his "inspirational" articles designed to bring back the erring sheep—and what sheep!—into the fold, "How many good Christians are there in the world? Not one per cent of the Christians in the world are real Christians." With what pious unction must Mr. Gilbey pray to heaven that he belongs to the one per cent! The other day in church he complained

bitterly to himself that there were no "real" Christians there at all—except himself—and the hardest cut of all was to see the queues lining up outside were not for a church but for a cinema. Alas, it is a sad, weary world for "real" Christians like Mr. Gilbey.

But let him take heart. "Real" Christianity was put into practice when at Haverfordwest, a few days ago, a man was fined five shillings for the heinous offence of selling newspapers on Sunday. The "real" Christians there have been up at arms against such blasphemy, and at last have the satisfaction of making a news vendor pay for thus floating Mr. Gilbey's blessed Lord. It is true that an Italian tried to bring an action against garage owners for selling petrol, an unashamed Christian Alderman for selling newspapers also on a Sunday, and a milk-roundsman. But as these people were "real" Christians the summonses were withdrawn, and the magistrates fined the newsagent because they came to the conclusion that "Sunday newspapers were not a necessity." Mr. Gilbey was losing heart about "real" Christianity not being tried. He need do so no longer. Once again the wicked Sabbath-breakers have been broken on the wheel. "Vengeance is mine," saith the Lord.

Religious newspapers to-day are as contradictory as the Bible. On the same page in the *British Weekly*, appear two articles, one is an almost perfect appeal for toleration, the second article says plainly, "Had those who in all ages have been responsible for the main trend of history been always so tolerant, so free from any moral or religious prejudice, it is doubtful whether the race would not long since have 'turned native,' that is, have reverted to type." This, of course, confuses two totally different things. Mankind is a bundle of prejudices. Progress depends on the toleration of each other's prejudices.

"The secret of Rest," says the Rev. James Reid, D.D., "is to be with Christ." We might add, that "to be with Christ," is another way of saying one is dead. It is like describing prison as a place where nobody stays out late at night.

Professor Kennett says, "We should remember that the language Jesus used had no word either for Heaven or Hell." In the colloquial sense there is no word for what sensible people think about them.

The *Christian World* says: "When men complain that God does nothing, we can only reply that He does everything." Yes, it's quite a smart reply, but the worst of it is that we cannot rely on God doing anything. We are let down every time when we think He will do something. So the conclusion is that a God who does everything, may do something, but cannot be relied upon to do anything.

In a Christian contemporary there is an excellent answer to those who think prayer is useless. It says, "Even idols made with hands sometimes elicited a response in devotion and service which might well put some Christians to shame." After this we may expect the Birmingham Idol-factories to raise their prices and quote this Christian testimonial when offering them for sale in the heathen lands.

We have no wish to discourage Christians from "seeking peace and ensuing it." But we feel bound to comment on the Archbishop's statement from Lambeth Palace, when it states that "God our Father wills that nations should live as members of one family." Dare we ask the date of this "Will"? Surely the Archbishop cannot imply that God made this "Will" six thousand years ago when "creating" mankind? If so, His executors, and administrators (the churches, presumably) ought to be prosecuted for fraudulently diverting His estate to very improper purposes.

Things seem to be going from bad to worse in the United States. An American religious paper reports that the Methodists have increased by over 65,000 during the past year. Of course one has to allow for the normal increase by births, but all the same we are sorry. It looks as though the reports of national demoralization have something to go on. Gangsterism is still alive, and Methodism is increasing. We hope that things are not so bad as they look.

The *Methodist Recorder* thinks that there is existing a general disposition to carry the gospel to the "outsider." Well, there is no lack of outsiders, but the question is that which every fisherman asks himself when he leaves home—will they bite?

If the *Recorder* is not more dependable than it is when dealing with the question of religious education we are afraid many of its readers will be led astray. It says that the "changed attitude of the people towards religious education in the people's schools," is a very striking attitude. But there is no change in the *people's* attitude, it is only that the lack of principle of Nonconformists have brought them into co-operation with the established clergy, and the time-serving character of politicians have induced them to favour more religious education in the schools than now exists. But then most papers are fond of identifying their own views with "public opinion." Actually there is no such thing. There is only various opinions among the public.

Dr. Cyril Norwood says that a generation has grown up that has received no intelligent religious education. With this we quite agree. But will Dr. Norwood be good enough to tell when and where any generation ever received intelligent religious education? We fancy that Dr. Norwood does not say what he means, or if he does, then we cannot agree that he is giving the public intelligent counsel.

A gentleman who calls himself "Paymaster Rear-Admiral," Mr. W. E. R. Martin, is very angry with Mr. R. Bernays, M.P. Mr. Martin is an enthusiastic British Fascist, and anybody who dares to even question that august body (or one of them), brings upon himself the wrathful splutter of this jolly Jack Tar. In reply to a letter which Mr. Bernays wrote in the *Spectator*, the gallant Rear-Admiral screams:—

How much did you pay him? . . . How contemptible it is that our Press should be used by such a creature to poison men's minds against a loyal God-fearing organization formed to fight against the enemies of Christianity.

What a nice person is Mr. Martin! And what a glorious time the "enemies of Christianity" would get at the hands of this champion of God, if only he could get his way. Whether he and his like ever will, depends on Freethinkers and those who uphold our great tradition of liberty of speech, thought and the press. We fancy persons like Mr. Martin have yet to learn what that means.

A number of lecturers have been holding forth on the "Church and Spiritual Healing," at Watermillock, and we are told that "speaker after speaker emphasized the eminent importance of spiritual considerations." This will be most warmly welcomed by cancer and tuberculosis sufferers, especially if they are young people. Canon Lindsay Dewar, for example, must have electrified his hearers when he discoursed on "mental states concerned with sin"—so very helpful; while the Rev. S. M. Wickham dealt on "the spiritual side of work in mental hospitals," also of wonderful value to the insane. Dr. F. S. Hawks, however, said that "while Science was ready to listen to what Religion had to say, many front-line leaders in Religion were abandoning their spiritual position, and seeking to explain the miraculous by mere psychology." Only mere psychology! What are we coming to!

A new book edited by Mr. Sidney Dark is called *Orthodoxy Sees It Through*. A reviewer says that orthodoxy "has been able always to call on the services of devoted sons of the highest intellectual standing," and the book "is further proof that when the faith calls for champions it will always be brilliantly defended." Well, it is true that the faith has been defended—and sometimes very far from brilliantly—for something like nineteen hundred years; and the fact that it still has to be "brilliantly" defended seems to us proof enough that many of the other defences, either have completely failed, or have to be defended themselves. Most of the older champions pinned their faith on "Divine Inspiration" or on "God's only Son and His Precious Blood." Whether this new defence is any improvement or has produced more cogent arguments in defence of Christianity does not seem probable if the critique we have read is anything to go by. The truth is that it is no longer a question of orthodoxy seeing it through, but of orthodoxy being seen through. And Freethought has had a hand in that.

Lourdes sealed another miracle a week or so back. A young Belgian woman suffering from chronic inflammation of the kidneys and bladder was so bad that her doctor sent her to Lourdes. One dip and "she was cured instantaneously." All the doctors present at the enquiry came to the conclusion that it was a miracle, and testified to that effect. Of course they were all Roman Catholics, and there was a sprinkling of priests and bishops among them. It adds to the story to point out that one of the doctors, an Englishman and a Protestant, came to Lourdes three years ago suffering with consumption. Our Lady makes no difference with creeds so, after one dip, the English Protestant was completely cured. He thereupon—just as instantly—became a Catholic.

But what we cannot understand is this discrimination. A little boy of four, blinded by measles, was sent to Lourdes, a pathetic little figure, even to the hard-headed reporter who gives an account of the scenes at the grotto. He also saw many similar cases but, in spite of the fact that he is a whole-hearted believer—or says he is—no cure happened his way. Now why did Our Lady instantaneously cure a Belgian woman whom nobody saw except Roman Catholic doctors and priests, and do nothing whatever to the other deserving cases? Was Our Lady so hard-hearted as to ignore utterly the poor little blind boy? Or are some things "mysteries" even to priests and bishops? One hundred thousand sick and ailing people, the blind and halt and lame, visit Lourdes every year, and one or two piffling little cures are sometimes reported. What a game it really is!

The Bishop of Clonfert, the Most Rev. R. Dignau, laid the foundation-stone of a new church in Galway, a week or two ago. He did it with especial satisfaction. "Little did I think," he said joyously, "that I should inspect and bid the Protestant Church, and see it pulled down and transferred stone by stone, to be erected as a Catholic Church for the true worship of God." If stones could speak, how happy they must be to find themselves now devoted to the "true" worship of God, after having been pressed so infamously into the "false" worship of God called Protestantism!

Yet in spite of God looking after his own this way—stones or priests or people—in the Church's Green Little Island, the Bishop of Cork had to admit that "strangers, reading of the attacks of one political group upon another, would be compelled to say that life in the Free State was unworthy of a Catholic country." Perhaps the building of a few more churches to the glory of the Lord might further prevent what the Bishop of Galway calls "clashing, not merely of opinions, but what I might call of arms, sticks, stones, bottles and revolvers." However, it seems that auld Ireland is still auld Ireland in spite of stones, priests, bishops and churches.

Amongst that large body of lovers of peace who stand in the way of peace is the Rev. Porter Goff. He writes (in the League of Nations journal *Headway*), a very

Christian plea for peace. If it appeared in a periodical meant for purely Christian consumption, it would be obviously consistent with its writer's profession. In a so-called unsectarian journal it is impudent. It is as out of place as a plea for polygamy in a magazine devoted to the advocacy of decimal coinage. It is Christian propaganda from beginning to end. Is there any use at all for a League of Nations if Mr. Goff is correct in saying that "God intervenes in the conflict of good and evil and suffers with the oppressed." If as Mr. Goff says, "He (God) does not stand aside from man's agony," we need more "Gods" instead of more members of the League of Nations.

The *Christian World*, reviewing (most favourably, of course) Julian Huxley's latest work, calls him "a sound scientist." We congratulate Mr. Huxley on the testimonial. This is not to sneer at the value of the work in its own particular and chosen sphere. We only call attention to the fact that the B.B.C. were quite safe in asking one who is considered "sound" by a Christian newspaper, to speak on the wireless and give the impression that "even an Agnostic" is thus welcomed—without adding that he must confine his remarks to what Christians call "sound science," namely science which does not contradict "revealed truth."

A questionnaire was recently sent out to 100,000 Christian ministers in the United States, asking all of them if they were at the present time in favour of a war. One might have expected a unanimous vote of the negative. Even the Bishop of London might conceivably think we are not yet ready to start again, or (to use his favourite nickname for war-time) "the Great Day of God" must wait while we make bigger and better guns. To our surprise only 28,870 replies were received, and of these the majority were fiery advocates of war. The minority included many Socialists who have an idea that Socialism "means" peace. They may be right, of course, but if we must wait for peace until all the world turns Communist, we might just as well say we are in favour of war. A vote for peace is meaningless if it has a tag to it in favour of some other kind of "reform" or "conversion" as a preceding condition.

The Rev. Sidney Berry complains that Christians wait for God to save or heal them, instead of "taking up our bed and walking" ourselves "Faith is not a magic key." Certainly not. "There must be co-operation on our part." Quite so. We fail "because one man grasps the occasion and another man waits for it." That is why "the blessings that might belong to everyone do not." In other words you can have all the faith imaginable, but the only man who gets anything is the one who goes out and grabs it. What use then is this "faith" they talk about?

"A new book by Charles Dickens," suggests something of novelty. A hasty glance convinces us that it is only a very poor re-hash of a very old story. One can buy the same story with quite a lot of other fiction at any Bible warehouse, at a much lower price than the *Daily Mail* is charging for the same yarn told much less convincingly. The Bible story of Christ is also a "Story for Children," and it has the advantage that it may possibly have been written by those who believed it.

A Lourdes "Miracle" has at last appeared. An old lady is said to have been "cured of deafness at the eleventh hour, during the farewell service." There is something rather likely about this poor lady's "cure." A woman who could "listen" to a religious "service" for eleven hours would scarcely be likely to be able to hear anything after that. A friend of ours told us of a similar experience he had. He was at a meeting where the speakers seemed going on for all eternity. Gradually the crowd dispersed, and our friend was congratulating himself that at last he could get near enough to the front to hear something. Just as he reached the front row the chairman closed the meeting.

Apröpos of ceremonial church parades by Girl Guides and Boys' Brigades, a pious person excuses them on the following score. "If the trappings and ceremonies of our youth organizations are foolishness to some who have reached maturity, let them willingly and joyfully be fools for Christ's sake, if it will mean the winning of our young people for Him." This is equivalent to admitting that the various youth organizations are, in themselves, of no interest to the churches, but are patronized by the Churches in order to push religion into the young people. The leaders of the Scout and Guide Movements should be pleased to know this—that their movements are being cynically exploited in the interests of the professional Christian.

A sermon by Dr. Maude Royden called "Peace: An Appeal to the Younger Generation" is on sale at meetings of the League of Nations Union. It contains much with which all who love peace will agree. It also contains some debatable points which unnecessarily seem to make the League responsible for ideas it does not support. Also (being a Christian sermon) it cannot possibly appeal to that part of modern youth which has judged and discarded Christianity. Consequently we can only deplore the attempt to preach, "It is only Christ" who is likely to "take the sword" away. And when she asks us, "Will you be like Christ?" we laugh at the simplicity of the idea that Christians are more peaceable than non-Christians, or that Christ taught peace in any practical or consistent sense (assuming He taught or lived at all). And "Christ Only" are the very words which make for war.

Even life after death has its disadvantages. Harry Emerson Fosdick, expressed the universal disgust at the contrast between the pious lying promises told during the recruiting days of the great war, and the terrible realities the world is facing to-day. "Sometimes, I do not want to believe in immortality," he said. "Sometimes I hope that the Unknown Soldier will never know." Dr. Fosdick makes a frank confession of shame at having once been "a gullible fool," that "I, a Christian minister, participated in the war." He wonders now if the Unknown Soldier heard him "explaining the high meaning of war." Dr. Fosdick was not guilty of the worst of the vile speeches of his brother ministers, and his frank repudiation of his attitude in 1914 does him credit. We hope to do our bit in making some much greater offenders thoroughly ashamed of their very Christian views in 1914-1934.

The Methodists must be easily amused. A writer in the *Methodist Recorder* assures us that a Hymn starting, "Let all the world in every corner sing," is "giving great delight" (to Methodists, of course). "Another favourite" says the same writer, is one containing the jolly line, "Yea in Death's shady black abode." But the following "quaint conceits of the poet deserve some attention"—

"A man that looks on glass,
On it may stay the eye;
Or if it pleaseth through it pass,
And then the heaven espy."

The Methodist commentator admits that "it is easy to miss the meaning here"—if any, we would add!

Fifty Years Ago

If the liberty of the press is infringed, no place is left us behind which to retire as within a fortress to wait, to gather our forces, and thence make incursions into the enemy's country. So long as the laws exist, we are in danger, and therefore we must attack, defy, break down. Liberty has always to be conquered, not conceded. With tenacity, earnestness, determination we may win a permanent legacy for those that succeed us.

The "Freethinker," June 8, 1884.

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE.

EDITORIAL:

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412

TO CORRESPONDENTS

H. T. BUCKLE.—We should be very pleased indeed to find that you were right, and we are wrong. But the *Freethinker* must remain true to itself, and it is that which provides our difficulty and gives us cause for pride. We could, we are sure, at least double our circulation if we turned the paper into an ordinary catchpenny—or two-penny—weekly, but then it would cease to be the *Freethinker*, and we should be no longer interested in it.

FREETHINKER ENDOWMENT TRUST.—A. F. Stringer, 5s.; Vivian Phelps, 10s.

J. SEIBERT.—You did quite well in upholding your right to hold a meeting where you did, so long as other meetings were permitted, and no obvious obstruction was being caused. The police were right in saying you had no *legal* right to hold a meeting in the open-air. On the other hand, the police have no *legal* right to prevent your holding a meeting so long as you are not causing an obstruction, or are likely to create a breach of the peace.

G. PHILLIPS-DEAUDEL.—The article on "The Holy Puzzle," by W. S. Bryan, is based not only on the New Testament, but on the Apocryphal Gospels. This should answer the difficulties you find about his quotations.

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 offices of the National Secular Society and the Secular Society Limited, are now at 68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4. Telephone: Central 1367.

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

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

Sugar Plums

We have had several letters of late from obviously new subscribers who express their surprise that a paper of the quality of the *Freethinker* should not have achieved a paying circulation. Well, the fact remains, as our accountant affirms year after year. The *Freethinker*, like other papers of its class is only maintained because of the devotion of those who believe in it. It has no advertising income worth bothering about, and no resources from which to draw to advertise itself. The Endowment Trust manages to meet the larger part of the deficit, but not the whole. The balance has to be made good as it can be managed.

We have not written this by way of complaint, only as an explanation. But there is a very obvious plan in which those who wish the paper to come nearer paying its way can help. They can take an extra copy to give to a friend, and so help to swell the number of subscribers. They can undertake the distribution of specimen copies, which usually has the result of bringing along some new readers. There is always another subscriber waiting round the corner, and during the summer months there are many opportunities of getting hold of him. We hope that many of our readers will take these suggestions seriously.

In response to the Motion dealing with the B.B.C. passed at the Annual Conference of the N.S.S., the B.B.C. replies that it can make no comment on the terms of the motion because "we are unable to understand the refer-

ence to the exercise of 'a censorship and boycott' by the Corporation." Oh, simple-minded B.B.C. It selects certain forms of opinion and carefully excludes others. It has a continuous broadcast of Christian propaganda, but has never admitted a straightforward and uncompromising criticism of Christianity by a representative Freethinker. It reads all speeches before they are delivered, and where the writer does not sufficiently censor himself, it cuts out passages and expressions, substitutes others, and sometimes writes the whole of a speech, and gets it delivered as the work of the speaker. But it cannot understand what is meant by "a censorship and boycott!" Such innocence in a wicked world is quite affecting—unless anyone is wicked enough to assume that so godly a Corporation would deliberately lie, and lie, and keep on lying. Perhaps the B.B.C. would reply with St. Paul, "If my lie hath abounded to the greater glory of God, why am I then judged a sinner?"

Until very recently the *Freethinker* was, with many other periodicals, displayed on the table of the reading-room of the Woolwich Central Library. More than one of our subscribers has called attention to the fact that this practice has been discontinued. Enquiries that have been made have brought no other information than that the library Committee has seen fit to discontinue displaying the paper, although other papers, religious and semi-religious, are still displayed. We, of course, appreciate the compliment paid us by the Library Committee in seeking to remove the paper from the library. It is a confession that they dread its influence, and we hope it will continue to deserve that fear.

But there is another point of view. The Woolwich Libraries are maintained out of public taxation, and the Freethinkers of Woolwich have to pay their share. They have therefore quite as good a right as Christians and semi-Christians to have journals representing their opinions displayed on the library tables. But it is certain that so long as the Freethinkers of the district submit to a number of bigots refusing them the same privileges as are given to others, those privileges will be denied. We, therefore, suggest to these living in the Woolwich area to bestir themselves. Let them write the Library Committee to have the paper replaced. Let them also see that the matter is kept before the public in the local press, and let them ask, and keep on asking for the paper. Freethinkers will never get their rights until they are persistent in their demands and show a fighting spirit when they are unjustly treated.

The Dean of Exeter's latest publication, *Essays in Construction*, is a clever piece of work, from one of the ablest of living clerics. Here is one striking passage from it:—

We do not obtain any concrete idea of the goodness of God until we have apprehended the meaning of goodness in man. It is safer to rise from a contemplation of goodness to a contemplation of God than to descend. . . . A theological ethic may be the worst kind of ethic.

This sounds very much like the very old Freethought teaching, first, that all goodness is of human origin, and, second, that the best God that was ever conceived was only the best man writ large.

Freethinkers living in Pontypridd and Rhondda will be pleased to know that a branch is being formed at Pontypridd. This is a step in the right direction, and should gain the support of all sympathizers in the locality. All interested are asked to communicate with the Secretary, Mr. Lewis, 4 St. Catherine Street, Pontypridd.

Mr. G. Whitehead will be in the Bradford district for two weeks beginning to-day (Sunday). The local N.S.S. Branch will co-operate, and it is hoped that increased strength will follow the meetings. In Bradford, as elsewhere, there is plenty of work to be done, and Branch officials will be present at all meetings, ready to help those willing to join. Details of meetings will be found in the Lecture Notice column.

Freethought and Social Science

I.

THE term "Social Science," often loosely used, may be taken to include interests of human well-being studied in a scientific spirit with a view to their valid elucidation. Beyond material things it touches those of the spirit in so far as this influences the ideal end in view. It thus connects with social philosophy at large, with first principles of conduct, treated in their more concrete demands. It assumes that its subject matter, Man and Society, is conditioned by natural law and sequence, as distinct from older notions of providential ordinance. Its purpose is to disclose "laws" or sequences that will subserve human betterment under the direction of intelligent Will. It ranges therefore into departments of inquiry other than modes of material sustenance; into hygiene and preventive medicine; mental health and heredity; biology, both plant and animal in health and disease; eugenics or race culture and population; criminology and the morally "unfit"; the separate branches and relations of the Human Race itself. And in its full intention merges into art—the art of living and association in all its finer bearings.

The world's existing pass presents us here with a wide and open field to be tilled. The concept of social science has followed the emergence of science in general—the right interpretation of phenomenal causation as opposed to fantasies of supernaturalism. As when a plague decimates the population under medieval modes of carrying on, this is due in current ideation to "sin," and offended deity must be propitiated by amplified incantations. True, the disorder springs from sin, but in another sense—that of wrong values, ignorance or neglect of the relation between health and wholesome habits, the means of practising this virtue and disposing of dirt and garbage that breed disease. Very slowly has the *modus operandi* of sanitary law become accepted in our modern world that opens up with the dissolution of medievalism from the sixteenth century onwards; illustrated by the old Scotch proverb, "the clartier the cosier," or the feeling of the lady over a fresh water supply brought to her town that it had "neither taste nor smell."

Bacon refers in his *Advancement of Learning* (1605) to "the art of printing, which largely supplies men of all fortunes with books; the open traffic of the globe, both by sea and land, whence we receive numerous experiments, unknown to former ages, and a large accession to the mass of natural history." The opening up of sea routes gave new horizons to Western mankind, incentives to enterprise, cupidity and the pursuit of wealth. This at a time when secular interests came to predominate over ecclesiastical issues, and the means to power and improved sources of subsistence were leading aims in the policy of the rising nationalities and their rulers. The more complex relations, internal and external, arising from trade developments, new agencies evoked to assist in this expansion, colonial adventure in the settlement of distant lands, the establishment of trading posts along the coasts of populous Eastern countries, commercial rivalries, incited to ways and means of maintaining prosperity. It brought also fresh problems to the practical statesman, or matter for reflection by the social philosopher.

Speculation and discussion over these concerns have taken different forms. One is vision of an ideal commonwealth like More's *Utopia* and its imitators; in some circumstances a veiled means of arraignment existing usages in face of the arm of jealous authority in the days dangerous to Freethought. Another is

concrete suggestion for immediate exigencies. From the seventeenth century a considerable literature appears, both here and abroad, aiming to expound the mysteries of trade and prosperity. A book published in Edinburgh in 1700 is entitled: *The Undoubted Art of Thriving*; wherein is showed. 1. That a million L. Sterling Money or more if need be may be raised for Propagating the Trade of the Nation, etc. 2. How the Indian and African Company may Propagate their Trade. 3. How every one according to his quality, may live Comfortably and Happily . . .

The use of public money to promote business is a popular notion to-day, though, as we see, not quite original, while the art of living happily according to one's quality will have attention in the sequel, if perhaps in a different sense to the above. During the eighteenth century much thought was given to questions of commerce and agriculture. Numerous suggestions and experiments were made to encourage industrial arts, either through State or private action. Controversies set up in this way led to systematic treatises on the whole subject of "Political Economy," as it was known—a term attributed to a French writer in 1615. One of the most famous of these is Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, published first in 1776; a work that is epochal from its range of practical illustration, its critical attitude to prevailing usage and outlook for the future.

Much of the social thought of the pioneer century, particularly abroad, is incited by abuses or misdirection under the contemporary régime. Or it deals with theories of human perfectibility as an object of enthusiasm and incentive in place of sterile formulas of theology. It belongs to the era of the *Aufklärung* or Enlightenment—the beginnings of rational cosmic and social doctrine. Men of different temper contribute to this work if in an indirect way: Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Turgot, Mably, Condorcet, Beccaria, Lessing, Kant abroad; Hume, Smith, Bentham, Godwin, Malthus, James Mill at home, merging into the nineteenth century. And in reaction from codes of Governmental supervision arises the doctrine of a *jus natura*, of natural liberty as the way to happiness and welfare. This is the underlying principle of Smith's approach, if he is not its originator. He may be paraphrased thus: nature has made provision for social well-being by the law of the human constitution which prompts every man to better his condition. The Individual in aiming only at his private gain is at the same time promoting the public good without intentionally so doing, as the public advantage is the sum of all separate private endeavours. Interference with the natural action of this force in the supposed public interest defeats its own end.

Smith (himself a sceptic) was too alert a mind to accept over literally generalizations of the kind. He had the intention of linking his survey to a conception of Society wherein the play of moral and intellectual with material forces would receive proportional treatment. That he did not complete it, is matter for regret as to his subsequent influence. It is only so comprehensive a view that truly relates economic to social science at large. It may be convenient to detach material issues for purposes of study; but exclusive attention to the subject in this way by later exponents has limited its value and distorted its perspective.

Laissez Faire had a surface plausibility at its first inception, and blended with the movement of emancipation from restrictive fetters. It came at a time of rapid change in method through a series of inventions and discoveries which transformed industrial action in a quite short period. Freedom of experiment with the new instruments was necessary to their successful adoption. Once set going they eventually altered

the mechanical statics of civilization as it stood at their early stage. The age of invention has continued uninterruptedly a work of renewed ingenuity. The steam motor is followed (or superseded) by an oil, electric, or spirit engine; the electric telegraph by "wireless." Coal, the basis of the first industrial expansion of Britain, is menaced by rivals like hydro-electric power. This factor in the flux of things ever heightens the task of coping with problems set by the process itself. The theory, however, that public interest is invariably served by unrestricted pursuit of private gain received rude shocks in its actual application during the early working of machine production in England. Not that this experience was altogether novel. For the reconciliation of private interest with the assumed needs of the Commonwealth, and the means thereto, had attracted close attention under the previous polity.

Widened knowledge has brought home the relativity or empirical character of most theoretical economics. Its promoters in the nineteenth century failed to recognize this; with a few signal exceptions; they believed they had discovered in political economy something in the way of final truth on the matter of achieving or maintaining prosperity. This was only possible through conformity with certain laws, and limited at best. Hence its well earned cognomen of the "dismal science." Curiously enough, a similar obsession pervades the dictates of rival schools to the orthodox and revolutionary coteries, who in turn are in possession of absolute authority.

AUSTEN VERNEY.

Reaction in Freethought

It should be obvious to the Freethinker that Freethought, if it is to render the fullest possible service to mankind, should include the application of criticism in as free and unrestrained a manner to social and economic questions as to Biblical and religious questions. The Freethinker should be prepared to accept the findings of scientific investigation into and criticism of social conditions, even if the outcome is the doctrine that only by revolutionary activity on the part of the working class, and those who are prepared to support the workers, will the present form of society be destroyed and a new and better one established.

"We seek for truth," should be carried into the sociological sphere as well as into that of theology and philosophy; and as fearlessly with regard to present social conditions as to those of the past.

If Freethinking is nothing more than an intellectual pastime, then its value is considerably limited.

It is rather remarkable that the attitude taken up towards Communism, by a large percentage of Freethinkers, is very much akin to that taken up by Christians when dealing with Atheism. There is little or no attempt made to study Communism, understand it, and form a critical opinion about it. Just as Atheism is rejected out of hand, by the average Christian, as something dreadful, so is Communism turned aside by many Freethinkers as being not fit for any human being to touch.

Such an attitude is unsatisfactory. It is against the careful investigation of facts and theory; it closes the door to scientific conviction.

A better attitude should be taken up, especially as Communistic teachings have been wrought out on scientific lines, and deserve to be treated in the same way as we treat any other scientific exposition—in

biology, physics, chemistry, etc.—even if such teachings should turn out to be faulty.

The Freethinker who cannot adopt this attitude has much to learn concerning the mental outlook of a Freethinker.

If you can prove Communism to be wrong, in whole or in part, good. On the other hand, if you cannot accept the findings of Communism owing to being unable fully to grasp them, then say so; but try at least to remain scientific in your attitude.

It should be the object of every Freethinker, who is interested in the social development of the human race, to study Communism, especially as expounded by Marxists and Leninists, in the light of historical processes; not to reject it as something dogmatic and devoid of theoretical understanding.

Stalin has pointed out the value attached to theory by Lenin, while he scorned all theory that is "out of touch with the world of reality." Stalin says: "Revolutionary theory is a synthesis of the experience of the working-class movement throughout all lands—the generalized experience. Of course theory out of touch with revolutionary practice is like a mill that runs without any grist, just as practice gropes in the dark unless revolutionary theory throws light on the path." . . . "It alone, can give the movement confidence, guidance, an understanding of the inner links between events." Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I., p. 94.

Communism, then, stands for careful, scientific, study of events and of everything connected with the universe. It is not concerned with making dogmatic statements about ideals and utopias that have no relation to the world in which we live. Theory must be kept in close touch with the movements of history; and if ideals and utopias are to be of any practical value, it can only be when a way to realize them has been found.

Unfortunately, too many of us have developed the habit of thinking about liberty, equality, and fraternity in the abstract. We forget the social conditions which determine their possibility and extent.

The materialism of historical development is quietly neglected. Hence, when dictatorship is discussed it is defined in a given way and treated as being the same in principle no matter what its historic conditions and function may be. Lenin, or Stalin, acting as the dictator-leader of the proletariat, subject to the criticism of the members of the proletarian dictatorship, engaged in leading the workers and peasants in the work of building up a socialist society, is dismissed "on principle" as being the same as Hitler.

Yet the latter is dictator in the interests of the German Imperialist Capitalists, and is engaged in oppressing and suppressing the mass of the people for the benefit of those Capitalists. If there is no difference between these dictatorships, why are the Capitalist Governments so much afraid of the Russian Union of Soviet Republics becoming firmly established?

The way in which many Freethinkers treat dictatorship "on principle" was brought out very clearly in Mr. Chapman Cohen's note to my letter in the *Freethinker* for April 8, 1934. He said: "whether the dictatorship is exercised for or against 'economic freedom' does not, in my judgment, alter its character as a dictatorship." In other words we might say, whether a prison system is used for the purpose of trying to correct wrong-doers or brutally to let them know that society is master, does not make any difference to its character. Or, again, an "Incitement to Disaffection Bill" is the same in principle whether it confines itself to preventing distribution of seditious propaganda leaflets, or gives the

magistrates and police power to take all the unorthodox books a man may have in his library, and charge him before a court of law into the bargain.

When Mr. Cohen deals with slavery under Paganism and Christianity his method is different from that which he adopts when he treats with dictatorship. Now, if there is any justification for the theory that the principle of dictatorship is the same in all cases, there is the same justification for the theory that the principle is the same in all cases of slavery.

Yet Mr. Cohen can make, on sociological grounds, a distinction between slavery in Pagan and Christian times; and not to the advantage of the latter. He says: "There is always the important distinction that, while ancient slavery represented a phase of social development, and tended to something better, modern, or Christian slavery stood for a deliberate retrogression in social life." (*Christianity and Slavery*, p. 11.)

Again, "Christianity gave just that religious sanction which slavery required for its ethical justification. Slavery applied to whites was revolting, slavery applied to blacks became part of the divinely appointed order. Next, because slavery was, so to speak, native in ancient society, the growth of ethical sentiment and of legislation tended to eliminate the harsher features of the system, and to move in the direction of its abolition." (*Ibid*, p. 13.)

Here, the object is to discredit Christianity, but it is not explained by Mr. Cohen why slavery under Paganism should be considered more "native to ancient society" than slavery was native to society under Christianity. Nor are we told how Christian society was to avoid slavery under the existing form of society; that is, without changing the economic basis of society.

The real charge against Christianity is that it does not do what it claims to do—teach men so to reconstruct society as to make it possible for everyone, as far as possible, to live in happiness and get the best out of life. In truth it adapts itself to various forms of society for providing ideological justifications whereby traders, merchants and manufacturers can remain Christians, and at the same time perpetuate, for economic purposes, the worst features of the particular society, or social structure, under which they happen to live. Consequently, Christian beliefs have continued to be held and claimed to be uplifting, under slavery, serfdom, and wage-slavery, all of which have been dependent upon certain economic conditions, and have been as much native to those conditions as was "pagan slavery" to pagan social conditions.

On this head I cannot now say more; the point I wish to press home is the fact that Mr. Cohen is not only able to see a distinction between Christian and pagan slavery; he can also see the possibility of the harsher features being eliminated from the latter system, and even a movement being made in the direction of its abolition. Yet, when he comes to deal with the Russian dictatorship he can see no difference in principle between it and a Fascist dictatorship. Nor can he see that the object of a proletarian dictatorship is to bring about its own abolition by the establishment of a classless society. This is due to the habit of discussing historical movements, and their outstanding features, "on principle" instead of trying to estimate them in the light of the conditions which made possible their rise and subsequent existence or disappearance. In this way one has only to settle upon a definition of the principle of slavery, war, dictatorship, democracy, or socialism in the most abstract manner and proceed to describe them as good or bad, without taking into consideration their historic mani-

festations; or by selecting such historic features as fit in with "the principle" of the social function or social form under discussion.

Thus one may carry on talking about a new state of society being brought about by the spread of Freethought and the application of reason to the problems of life, and at the same time avoid facing the fact that Freethought has not brought about a fundamental change in the structure of society; and the further fact that such a change cannot be brought about except by the wise application of force against the force used by reactionaries to oppress the masses of the people and keep the present form of society in existence.

It can be said that the basis of society would soon be changed if everybody would be reasonable, just as the Christian can say that all would be well with our social life, if only our spiritual life were in good order.

In this way the Freethinker helps the reactionary, as does the Christian, by refusing to face the facts of a given economic and social crisis, except by way of putting up a smoke screen of fine phrases, and enunciating the principles of things. Both talk about the wonders of our English liberties, even when such hard-fought for liberties as we have are being swept away, and refuse to see that only by massed action, involving the use of force, can those liberties be saved for the workers and their allies, and further liberties be won in the future.

It is true that Freedom of thought and speech should be the right of every man and woman; but this freedom can only be had in the fullest sense of the term when we have established a form of society from which economic exploitation of the individual has been abolished. Communism shows the way to the establishment of such a society by its scientific examination of the processes of social development. It points out that the overthrow of the existing form of society can only be brought about by the class struggle; and the ultimate establishment of a proletarian dictatorship, which will secure to the masses of the people economic freedom, on which full freedom of thought and speech will ultimately be based.

That some limitation of freedom of speech will take place during the period of building the new society is not denied; but this will be not in respect of criticism of the details of reconstructing society. It will apply only to those who by speech and writing seek to persuade others to prevent the upbuilding of a socialist society. This in the light of our social evolution, especially as seen in the economic sphere, is an historic necessity; and to oppose it with theoretic talk about freedom, is to reject determinism in history, and take the side of reaction.

E. EGERTON STAFFORD.

To the politician the fact of an opinion being held by a minority is to discount its value, to the sociologist it is a fact worthy of the closest examination, for it is with a minority of one that all opinion starts. Darwinism itself rests upon the supreme importance of the minority, upon the appearance of some accidental variation that gives a new direction to life. And just as this new variation has to overcome the powerful influence of the host of normal organisms, so a new idea has to fight against the world of ideas that represents man's normal intellectual life. The new idea has to run the risk of persecution or neglect. If it establishes itself it may in time become part of the thinking of the normal man and woman. All the benefits to mankind come from the few. One may put it that society lives on the normal, but develops through its exceptional specimens.—*Chapman Cohen*.

The Way of the World

In the "spiritual home" of Lord Rothermere and Sir Oswald Mosley, another step has been taken to reduce the number of unemployed. At Frankfort-on-Main, all workers under twenty-five years of age have been discharged to make room for "married men and workers in the Nazi movement." This reduces the number of unemployed, as the discharged ones are not placed on the list. They are sent to labour camps, to be properly drilled, and to become part of the new Fascist slave state which is in process of creation. If we could only be induced to follow the same plan here, and also to wipe out of all benefit those who were not sworn Fascists, we might soon stand as the one country in the world without any unemployment whatever.

The Disarmament Conference is dead! But how can that die which has never lived? The one thing that has never been discussed is disarmament. What has been discussed was how to make war less costly and less dangerous to civilians at home, and that really does not matter very much. Civilians ought to share the dangers they invite, and to gain some of the manliness which so many civilians believe war encourages. As to the "Disarmament Conference" the sight of a body of men meeting and denouncing war, while everyone was aware of the fact that the governments represented there were permitting their peoples to supply war material to any country that would buy it, and even connive at the makers of armaments arranging loans to purchase guns and war material, should be enough to prevent anyone shedding tears over the passing of the Conference.

We do really like the dictum of the *Daily Express*, "The British people are resolved on no more war—except in defence of the British Empire." That is very satisfying. And as the British Empire reaches all round the globe, and as a move of any other nation anywhere, may easily put the British people on the defensive, it looks as though we may have war whenever we feel inclined to have it. But it will always be in defence of the British Empire. And what was the last war about but to defend the British Empire? Looking over the records we discover that the British people have never gone to war yet save in defence of the rights of this country. The exceptions to this rule have always been provided by the other fellow.

We wonder how the *Express* discovers what is the resolve of the British people? We have always been under the impression that the British people entertain all sorts of ideas and wishes, for and against war, for sensible things and silly ones. But perhaps the *Express* understands by the "British people" those who read and agree with the *Daily Express*. Who was it who said that the three tailors of Tooley Street are dead?

Some time ago the question was asked in these columns, "What is meant by a King or a Queen looking regal?" An answer is supplied by one of the Sunday papers. It says that King George, whether riding or walking, whether in uniform or in mufti, always looks regal. Now everyone knows. To look regal is to look like King George. If a King does not look like George V., then, however he may look, he cannot look regal. And as we do not know of any other King that could be mistaken for King George, then we have the good fortune of possessing the only King that does look regal. So, God save the King?—our King. Other Kings must save themselves.

SIMPLE SIMON.

THE FOOLS' PARADISE

The greatest fool's paradise, it would seem, are not in the bubbles that idealists blow, but in the real world of hard-headed practical men—so practical in fact, are they as to be void of ideals; and so hard are their heads, that while all sorts of notions play around them, it is found impossible for profitable ideas to penetrate.

Clergymen as Lime-lighters

UNDER the above heading, *The Journalist*—the official publication of the working newspaper-men of Australia—publishes, in a recent issue, some interesting disclosures regarding the self-seeking, sordid methods of the present-day clergy.

Says the editor of *The Journalist*, in the way of introduction: "This provocative article was written by a member of our association who has had extensive experience with clergymen as sources of news. It expresses his opinion of some clergymen. Do you agree with him?"

The writer of the article proceeds:—

"When even the theatrical limelight becomes so bright that clergymen want to bathe in it, we might well ask, 'What's wrong with the sun?'—for there never was a more indecent clamour for publicity than the present invasion of the press by the godly men of cloth.

"In a world of sharply varying beliefs and opinions, there can be no justification, in an article such as this, for attacking or defending religion. That, after all, is for the free indulgence of conscience. But clergymen are now wandering so far away from the pulpit—and some of them performing such feats of gymnastics to attract the vulgar gaze—that 'the greatest show on earth' might soon have a very serious rival.

"Every pressman knows—unfortunately, the general public does not—that there are hundreds of clergymen as thirsty for personal publicity as were Diogenes and kindred philosophers for Truth.

"Many big newspaper offices have a list of these 'talkers,' so eagerly ready to be of service on the slightest provocation. If, for instance, it is cabled that a Somerset lady organist had been seen bathing in a one-piece suit of daring design, the local clerical 'talker' is only too ready to explain just how young lady church organists should bathe. He would doubtless go a little further, and answer the following questionnaire:—

"(1) Are you in favour of one-piece bathing suits for lady church organists? (2) Do you believe that lady church organists, even if robed from neck to knee, should be allowed to bathe in 'mixed bathing' areas? (3) What do you think is the correct attire for lady church organists when bathing? (4) Is there, to your knowledge, any Biblical injunction applicable to lady church organists who bathe?"

"Flippant as they may appear, these questions—and many more foolish ones—would be answered by our cleric.

"He probably borrows the old legal plea, 'Truth and public benefit.' He may argue that the end justifies the means, and the Cause is everything. Unfortunately, he demonstrates that he has lost the cherished sense of proportion, perspective, and balance.

"Worst of all, he is not alone in the scrounge for publicity.

"There are clergymen who, to get their names in the paper, will allow them to be used over comment that is not theirs—but that of the reporter—the only qualification being that the cleric be told, before publication, what he is supposed to have said."

There is much more in the article to the same effect.

For example, there are references to this "type of hypocrisy"; to "these publicity-loving parsons"; to the fact that this "newspaper small-talk" is frequently "not connected with the Word of God so much as the word of self"; and to "this indecent exposure of the small parsonic mind."

Finally, we read this:—

"The public is utterly sick of lime-lighting clerics whose major weaknesses have become incorporated in the supposedly unholy trinity of public torment—the press, the pulpit, and the petticoat."

The clerical invasion of the press is pretty well the same in all countries. Self—in the sense of vanity and material, fleshly well-being at the expense of a long-suffering world—is, of course, the prime, actuating

motive. Extremely welcome, therefore, is the flagellation administered through *The Journalist*. The only pity is that it should be more or less alone among the general run of papers with the frankness and courage to perform a so very much needed public service.

FRANK HILL.

Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.

Correspondence

THE MONGOLS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. Shaw's letter is beside the point. My remarks were solely confined to the Mongol *invasion*, described as "hideous," and which Mr. Shaw himself admits "was certainly most bloody," but that they afterwards proved themselves enlightened rulers.

If the belligerents in the late war had slaughtered the civil population, man, woman, and child, of every town that resisted them—sometimes to the point of utter extermination—as the Mongols did; I don't think their after conduct, however good, would be held to excuse the frightfulness of their war methods.

W. MANN.

GREAT BRITAIN AND WAR

SIR,—In your issue of June 3, the writer of "Acid Drops" says: "Mussolini has declared that he does not believe in perpetual peace," and he draws the conclusion: "We Britishers have, at the present juncture, much to learn from Mussolini and Hitler."

I fear the writer of "Acid Drops" is not quite up to date on this subject. I have read a good deal of militarist literature, especially German, and Great Britain is constantly cited by all militarist writers as the great example of what militarism can achieve. In his latest book Oswald Spengler says: "England gained her wealth by battles, not by book-keeping." If the writer of "Acid Drops" does not know that much history, he knows a good deal less than every child in Germany, Italy and Japan.

What has war done for the Anglo-Saxon race? This is what it has done. Fifteen hundred years ago we were a handful of people at the mouth of the Elbe. To-day we own a quarter of the world, and number nearly two hundred millions. Every inch of that territory was got by war.

We are also the greatest trading nation, and most of that was got by war. For example, at the Peace of Utrecht we compelled France to hand over to us the whole of the fur trade, and Spain to give us a monopoly of carrying slaves to her own colonies. Again and again we did that kind of thing. Even under Queen Victoria we fought a war to compel China to buy our opium.

Perhaps you will say that now at least we believe in peace. Of course we do. We should be unutterable fools if we did not. A small island which has grabbed a quarter of the world naturally believes in peace, just as a millionaire disapproves of burglary. If, however, you imagine that Germany, Italy or Japan are in the least impressed when they hear Satan rebuking sin, you greatly underestimate the intelligence of those countries.

R. B. KERR.

A COMMON COMPLAINT

A friend told me how, having got into the habit of living beyond his means, he found it difficult to discover how to economize and still continue to do so.

What about the origin of the Nicene Creed? I strongly recommend a course of Gibbon. You will find the whole story there painted with masterly irony by the brush of a very detached and mocking outsider.

H. H. Asquith, "Letters to a Friend."

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.

INDOOR.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, Prof. F. Aveling, D.Lit—"Pain."

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN AND HACKNEY BRANCHES N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 6.0, Mr. L. Ebury.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead): 11.0, Sunday, June 10, Mr. Campbell Everden. Highbury Corner, Hampstead, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury. South Hill Park, Hampstead, 8.0, Monday, June 11, Mr. P. Campbell Everden. Highbury Corner, 8.0, Thursday, June 14, Mr. Campbell Everden.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH (Brockwell Park): 7.30, Sunday, June 10, Mr. G. F. Green. Rushcroft Road, near Brixton Town Hall): 8.0, Tuesday, June 12, Mr. L. Ebury. Stonehouse Street, Clapham High Street, 8.0, Wednesday, June 13, Mr. P. Goldman. Aliwal Road, Clapham Junction, 8.0, Friday, June 15, Mr. P. Goldman.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Corner of Deanery Road, opposite the Library, Water Lane, Stratford, E.): 7.0, Mr. R. H. Rosetti.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 12.0, Sunday, A Lecture. 3.30, Platform N. 1, Messrs. Collins and Wood. Platform No. 2, Mr. Hyatt. 6.30, Messrs. Hyatt, Bryant and others. Wednesday, 7.0, Messrs. Collins and W. P. Campbell Everden. Thursday, 7.30, Messrs. Wood and Saphin.

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N.S.S. A grand combined Rail and Coach Tour through the High Peak of Derbyshire will take place on Sunday, June 17. Train leaves New Street, L.M.S. 10.0 a.m. Fare 9s. Further particulars, F. Terry, 9 Middle Park Road, Selly Oak.

BLYTHE (Market Place): 7.0, Monday, June 11, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

BRADFORD BRANCH N.S.S. (Bank Street Parking Ground): 7.0, Mr. G. Whitehead will lecture each evening commencing Saturday, June 9.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (West Regent Street): 7.30, Mr. R. T. White—A Lecture. Literature on sale.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Queen's Drive, opposite Walton Baths): 8.0, Sunday, June 10, Messrs. C. McKelvie and J. V. Shortt. Corner of High Park street and Park Road, 8.0, Thursday, June 14, Messrs. A. Jackson and D. Robinson.

MORPETH (Market Place): 7.0, Saturday, June 9, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

NELSON: 7.30, Tuesday, June 12, Mr. J. Clayton.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE (Bigg Market): 7.0, Sunday, June 10, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

NORTH SHIELDS: (Harbour View): 7.0, Tuesday, June 12, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

PRESTON (Town Hall Square): 3.0 and 7.0, Sunday, June 10, Mr. J. Clayton.

SEAHAM HARBOUR (Bottom of Church Street): 8.0, Saturday, June 9, Mr. F. Bradford—A Lecture.

SUNDERLAND (Gill Bridge Avenue): 7.0, Mr. F. Bradford—A Lecture.

WHEATLEY LANE: 7.30, Wednesday, June 13, Mr. J. Clayton.

WORSTHORNE: 7.30, Friday, June 8, Mr. J. Clayton.

WOMAN AND CHRISTIANITY

By CHAPMAN COHEN

The Story of the Exploitation of a Sex.

Price 1s.

Postage 1d.

**RATIONALIST EVALUATIONS
AND
THE TRUE DIRECTION OF CIVILIZATION**

By **AUSTEN YERNEY.**

Introduction : The Genius of Rationalism : The Spiritual Dilemma : The Liberal Faith and Order : The State Contra Mundum : The Economic Conundrum : Antinomies of Progress : True Civilization and Outer Darkness : The Personal Life. Appendix : The Problem of Government.

"In this volume the author discusses the fundamental bases of Civilization, which he shows to have reposed, on the psychological conditions which have regulated human evolution. It is his aim to demonstrate that it is by the exercise of the increasing and extending capacity of rationality that mankind may transcend the limitations to which its historic past has been subject. . . ."—*Ethical Societies Chronicle.*

Heath Cranton Ltd., 6 Fleet Lane, London, E.C.4. 7s. 6d.
net. Postage 6d.

**PAGANISM IN
CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS**

BY

J. M. WHEELER.

Clothette 1s. Postage 1½d.

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

**Realistic Aphorisms and
Purple Patches**

By **ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.**

320 pages.

Paper Covers 3/6. Postage 4d.

(All Cloth copies sold).

ACADEMY CINEMA,

Oxford Street. Ger. 2981

BOLVARY'S gay Masquerade
"LIEBES KOMMANDO" (U)
Delightful Viennese Music

UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no
UNWANTED Children.

An Illustrated Descriptive List (68 pages) of Birth Control Requisites and Books sent post free for a 1½d. stamp.

N.B.—PRICES ARE NOW LOWER.

J. R. HOLMES, East Hanney, Wantage, Berks.

ESTABLISHED NEARLY HALF A CENTURY.

**LETTERS TO
A COUNTRY
VICAR**

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Paper 1/- Postage 2d. Cloth, gilt 2/-
Postage 3d.

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

SECOND EDITION.

MOTHER OF GOD

By

G. W. FOOTE.

WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTE

By

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Post Free - - - 2½d.

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

**SHAKESPEARE
. . . and other . . .
LITERARY ESSAYS**

BY

G. W. FOOTE

With Preface by **CHAPMAN COHEN**

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price 3s. 6d. — Postage 3d.

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

A Devastating Document.

ROME OR REASON?

BY

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

A Reply to Cardinal Manning.

with

Introductory Preface by **H. Cutner.**

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price 3d. By Post 4d.

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

THE MIRACLES OF ST. MARTIN

By
C. CLAYTON DOVE

With
Introduction by Chapman Cohen

This is a booklet that should be read by all Freethinkers, and by as many Christians as can be induced to do so. It offers a scholarly illustration of the genesis of the miraculous, and the use made of that belief by the Christian Church.

Price Post Free - - 7d.

THE "Freethinker" Endowment Trust

A Great Scheme for a Great Purpose

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

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

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

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

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

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 OTHER SIDE OF DEATH

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Cloth Bound THREE SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE
Postage 2d.

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

The Foundations of Religion

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN.

Paper - - - - Ninepence
Postage 1d.

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

THE CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS

by
W. A. CAMPBELL

Cloth 2s. Postage 2d.

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

History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science

BY PROF. J. W. DRAPER.

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

Cloth Bound. 396 Pages.

PRICE 2/- POSTAGE 4½d.

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