

THE FREETHINKER

▪ EDITED *by* CHAPMAN COHEN ▪
— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIV.—No. 41

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1934

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Ourselves and Others—The Editor</i> - - - -	641
<i>Two Freethought Poets—Mimnermus</i> - - - -	642
<i>George Grote: Freethinker, Philosopher and Historian</i> —T. F. Palmer - - - -	643
<i>Science and Religion Reconciled?—James O. Hanlon</i> -	645
<i>Francesco Ferrer—G.F.G.</i> - - - -	646
<i>Chasing Shadows—Chapman Cohen</i> - - - -	650
<i>Dialectical Materialism: A Reply—E. Egerton Stafford</i>	651

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

Views and Opinions

Ourselves and Others

THE other day I received from a comparatively new reader of this paper a letter which I read with more than ordinary interest. The letter invites comment because the criticism offered is likely to be such as many may feel without taking the trouble to express it. Here it is:—

I have been a reader of the *Freethinker* for nearly a year, and I hope to continue a regular subscriber. Your paper is fearless, it is fair, and I find it stimulating. It arouses criticism, and if I dissent from your own expressed opinions you have only yourself to blame. You have impressed upon me the value of forming opinions for myself, as you have said, an opinion is only *mine*, when I have made it my own by assimilation, and do not repeat it as a mere echo. . . . If I may offer one or two comments, these would be, first, you appear to press very hardly, sometimes I think harshly, upon those who do not express their views with the forceful logic, and the uncompromising candour with which you express yours. In this I think you overlook the important fact that circumstances are often stronger than theory, and that many of us are so placed that it would mean social or financial suicide to say all that one thinks. Others, while going a long way with you have not reached that point of certitude which would warrant our rejecting, lock, stock, and barrel the whole body of religious ideas. But many of us are doing what we can to spread the light, and from my own experience our efforts are not without results.

Second, are you completely justified in your rejection of religion as a whole? You are right when you say that the definite religious teaching which we find embodied in the various creeds are out of date, and are, in fact, rejected by multitudes of educated men and women. But all the same there are many good things associated with religion, and always have been. . . . Does not your wholesale condemnation of religion—extending to even the use of the word “religion,” savour of intolerance and go a little farther than the facts warrant? Do you not run some risk of emptying the baby out with the bath water?

May I add that I have found one of the most effective methods of interesting intelligent Christians in your *Letters to a Country Vicar*. It covers the ground clearly and persuasively. I think a cheap edition of it should be issued, say at sixpence, and if this could be done, would cheerfully contribute towards its cost.

Now I like that kind of letter. It forces one to review one's own position, and it indicates the fact that if one has followers they have not sacrificed their own independence in becoming such. Freethought needs voices, not mere echoes.

* * *

On Compromise

In a general way my defence would take the form of a plea of “Not Guilty,” at least in the sense that I have damaged my case by over-emphasis. Colonel Ingersoll commenced one of his lectures by saying, “I am here to say what thousands are thinking of, but cannot say,” and whenever I write or speak I have that in mind. And, really, unless what a writer or a speaker says does to some extent correspond with what his readers or hearers are thinking, his message must fall flat. Thought is never born in solitude, although it may come to maturity there. A wise man is helpless in a congregation of fools, the writer comes into his own only when a working partnership is formed between him and his audience.

That is one sense in which one may read Ingersoll's comment. But there is another. Many who hold Freethought opinions feel they dare not say openly all they believe. Politicians would lose votes, business men would lose trade, teachers would risk promotion, or even dismissal, parsons would lose their pulpits. They are forced by a co-operation of character and circumstance to voice their heresy—whether it be religious, ethical, or economic in a hesitating, compromising way. I have often been asked to advise in such circumstances and have declined to say what any man or woman must do. All I can do is to make clear the implications and consequences of different courses of action, and then leave the final decision to the individual concerned. He must decide for himself. The risk is his, and it is he who must pay the price, and it is he who must decide whether he will pay it or not. I will only add that of the classes mentioned my greatest sympathy is with the one who “wilts” for fear of social status, for in no other case is the nemesis of personal degradation of character so certain.

But I would ask my correspondent to remember that my job is that of a teacher; and as a teacher I have nothing to do with either hesitation or compromise. My work is not that of telling a man what he might do in a given set of circumstances and so avoid arousing the suspicion and enmity of bigots; my job is to tell what *ought* to be done, and thus incite him to work for the creation of conditions that will put a

greater value upon intellectual honesty than exists at present. I want to stop the fool dictating to the philosopher, and the tricky politician determining the conditions of controversy. Like Ingersoll, I would say that I am here to say what many thousands would like to say if they knew how to say it, and if they felt they dare say it without paying too great a price. That for one class; but for another and a very great class, it is necessary to point out that the *right* to say what one believes is generally admitted—in theory, but in practice this right will never be established clearly until a far greater number not merely claim the right to say what they believe, but regard as a very solemn duty to *practice* it.

In one respect my critic does me an injustice. He complains that I press hardly, sometimes harshly, on those who refrain from saying publicly what they believe, and who seek some compromise in an awkward situation. That is not the case. I have never, I think, found fault with those who feel themselves compelled to be silent, or to speak with great care and moderation. The responsibility for silence or for compromise really rests with those who insist on making honesty of speech so costly that many cannot, or will not, pay the price. In dozens of cases newspaper dealers have been compelled to cease exhibiting the *Freethinker*, because their Christian customers, often parsons, have threatened to cease dealing with them if they continued exhibiting our poster. Teachers have complained that to let themselves be known as Atheists would mean loss of position. Politicians argue that to let themselves be known as anti-Christian would mean to lose an election. The list might be extended, and I blame none that appears on it. Again, it is the social and religious system that penalizes honesty and rewards rascality that is responsible.

But there are two classes of people who compromise. There are those who are forced to make terms with the enemy and let matters rest there. They make terms as a matter of compulsion. But there are others who not merely make terms with the enemy; but probably as a means of salving their conscience, set to work to justify their surrender by trying to prove that they have gained a victory, and by railing at those who have stood for more equitable conditions. Not caring or not daring openly to attack the enemy they try to prove their impartiality by firing on their friends. They do not say, "We do not care to carry our ideas to their logical conclusions," but they say to us, "You are going too far, you must be gentler with the enemy, more considerate of his feelings, you must try to find an element of goodness in things which experience has shown to be wholly evil and completely untrue." It is not really we who attack them, it is they who attack us. Not satisfied with reducing their own criticism of religion to the weakest and most apologetic form, they turn round upon those who refuse to compromise and charge them with coarseness, lack of consideration, failure to note the value of religion; and they salve their conscience with stupid explanations of the value of religion in the history of civilization.

* * *

Seeing the Other Side

I fully recognize the importance of "seeing the other man's point of view." With most people this is not an easy task, and the failure to accomplish it is responsible for the irrelevancy of a great deal of criticism. Seeing the other man's point of view is essential to understanding, and I think it will be conceded that I am not slow to see it, nor am I backward in publishing views with which I have little or no sympathy. But when the phrase, "seeing the

other man's point of view," is used to mean finding some truth in it, that is a very different thing. And in the case of religion I notice that what "seeing the opposite point of view" appears to mean, is discovering some valuable truth in religion by giving it a meaning that is philosophically and historically false.

But it is quite plain to me that a great deal is conceded to religionists that ought not to be conceded. I will deal with this next week, but for the moment I want to protest against the common assumption that the religious bigot has a prescriptive right to express his opinions without the least restraint, while the *Freethinker*, in the interests of an alleged "good taste" must express his opinions with considerable diffidence. And that will not do. I see no justification whatever for the assumption that the fool must always be given greater consideration than the philosopher, that stupidity must always take precedence of common sense. Ordinary experience proves that if a bully is given the right of way once he will look for it a second time. Grant it twice and he will demand it as a right. Religion has been so long in the saddle that it resents as an outrage any attempt to unseat it; and yet unseated it must be sooner or later, and we gain nothing by taking the bigot's right to the seat for granted, while trying to prove that others are entitled to a turn.

I do not, therefore, think that I am either hard or harsh to opponents; I am simply plain and uncompromising. I admit that where religion is concerned this attitude is not common, but I have always held that a large part of the strength of religion in the modern State is due to the indifference or hesitation of those who have no belief whatever in religion.

Next week I will deal with the belief that religion in spite of manifold errors and evils does contain elements too valuable to be disregarded.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Two Freethought Poets

"Song is not truth, not wisdom, but the rose
Upon truth's lips, the light in wisdom's eyes."

Watson.

"True to the truth whose star leads heroes home."

Swainburne.

DESPITE the innocent question, "What are Keats?" attributed to a very illustrious personage, this great poet has an ever-increasing audience, and editions of his works continue to multiply. To *Freethinkers*, it is interesting to recall that John Keats is the most Pagan of the great English poets. If there is a poet whose poetry is quite uninfluenced by religion, it is Keats. His correspondence shows quite plainly that it had little attraction for him, and there are surprisingly few references to religious beliefs. Writing after the death of his brother, he says: "I will not enter into any parsonic comments on death." In the last days of his very short life he writes to Fanny Brawne, the woman whom he loved, that for her sake he would "wish to believe in immortality." In the midst of his poetic career he writes to a clergyman named Bailey who afterwards became an archdeacon, and voices his complete scepticism: "You know my ideas about religion. I do not think myself more in the right than other people, and nothing in the world is provable," and he classes "religion" as a "mental pursuit." Like politics, the Christian Religion played no part in his life. The only time he allowed his views concerning religion to assume metrical form was in his youthful days, and the solitary sonnet entitled, "Written on a Summer Evening," was not

considered of sufficient literary importance to be included in his first printed volume. In his brother's transcript this particular poem was called: "Sonnet: Written in Disgust of Vulgar Superstition." As Keats grew in intellectual power he consigned religion to the limbo of forgotten things, and his poetic confession of faith in his prime was:—

"Beauty is truth, truth beauty: that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know."

Keats is among the immortals of literature. Even among the unnumbered wonders of the Eternal City, the tree-clad English Cemetery holds a place apart. Pilgrims come from remote corners of the earth to linger in the quiet corner where John Keats lies beside his friend, Joseph Severn, his gravestone bearing the bitter words:—

"Here lies one whose name is writ in water."

Not far away rises the slope where the heart of Percy Shelley lies buried beside the body of his friend, Edward Trelawny. It is curious that when Shelley visited the place years before his own death, he described it as "the most beautiful and solemn cemetery I ever beheld," and, in the preface to *Adonais*, the elegy on Keats, he says: "It might make one in love with death, to think that one should be buried in so sweet a place." Nor is this all, for Shelley's little son, William, was buried in the same cemetery.

John Keats' grave is the older in this Roman cemetery. Shelley sang the younger poet's death-song in *Adonais*, having in that immortal rhapsody coupled the name of Keats with his own for ever. Keats was indeed fortunate in his friends. When he was dying of consumption, his friend, Joseph Severn, cheered his last days. "Poor Keats," he wrote, "has me ever by him, and shadows out the form of one solitary friend; he opens his eyes in great doubt and horror, but when they fall on me they close gently, open quickly, and close again, till he sinks to sleep." Is not this a picture of true friendship? At the last, Severn held his dying comrade in his arms for seven hours. Severn outlived Keats for fifty-seven years, and Severn's remains were removed from their original resting-place and buried beside those of Keats. It was well and happily done.

Because of these infidel graves, generations of English and American visitors to Rome make pilgrimage to where they lie beside the Pauline Gate at the opening of the Ossian Way. It is a public confession that these two great Freethought poets confer glories upon one of the greatest cities of the civilized world, and that even the Eternal City is made more honorable and illustrious by their presence. Such memories cling to this spot that this last resting-place of Keats and Shelley challenges comparison with the relics of the greatness of old-world Rome.

Those people who think that Keats and Shelley were over-emphatic in their criticism of the Christian Religion would do well to look, occasionally, at the files of old newspapers, where they would find many things to astonish them. Take, for example, the following paragraph from the *Sunday Times*, January 22, 1826:—

Rome: Previous to the execution of the Carbonari, a dispute arose among the priests. It had formerly been the custom, when a criminal rejected conversion, to compel him to yield by applying to the hands and feet of the culprit burning torches. The priests wished to reintroduce this custom; they had nearly succeeded when the Court forbade their doing so, saying that such conduct would expose the Roman Government to obloquy.

In the same issue of the newspaper, it is stated that J. Mills, a youth of seventeen, and W. Astell, aged

nineteen, were found guilty of stealing a silk handkerchief, and were transported for life. Another paragraph states that two "resurrection men" were punished for stealing dead bodies. In an adjoining column is the statement that there were 18,000 persons unemployed in London, mostly loom-weavers. There's a picture of Christian civilization just over a century ago.

As for Shelley's influence, both literary and political, much has happened since the poet's untimely death. Theodore Hook's cruel jest that Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* was likely to remain unbound has been utterly falsified, for the young Freethinking poet who was expelled from Oxford University for his Atheistic opinions is now recognized as one of the greatest poets, if not the greatest, of the nineteenth century. Seventy years after Shelley's death, W. T. Stead issued a penny edition of the poet's lyrics, and pointed out that Shelley's political poems met with "great acceptance" at the hands of the "fierce democracy that musters in Trafalgar Square," and that the great poet's verse had as their chief motive the struggle for liberty, and the attempt to realize the aspirations after the ideal. Where is that "fierce democracy" to-day?

MIMNERMUS.

George Grote: Freethinker, Philosopher and Historian

AMONG the numerous eminent Rationalists of the nineteenth century, George Grote is a distinguished figure. By profession a banker—a partner in the house of Prescott, Grote & Co.—he devoted all his leisure hours to classical, economic, philosophical and historical research, and in mastering French, German and Italian. Educated at the Charterhouse, he was early introduced into the Bank by his father, and consequently owed nothing of his acknowledged position as a classical scholar to the customary University training.

Grote became smitten by the charms of Harriet Lewin, and was enraptured by the usual day-dreams of his impending marriage. But his hopes were shattered by a mendacious clergyman, who assured him that the lady's hand was already plighted. This tale Grote accepted as true, but it was subsequently revealed that the reverend gentleman had invented the story, for the purpose of furthering his own designs with the lady and her property. After much unmerited misery both to Grote and Miss Lewin, the parson's falsehood was exposed, and the lovers became united in wedlock. The lady, long known in intellectual circles as Mrs. Harriet Grote, became her husband's constant adviser and help-mate.

As a youth, Grote visited the home of David Ricardo, the economist, who introduced him to James Mill who was then engaged on his important work the *Analysis of the Human Mind*. The various conversations that resulted led to Grote's conversion to the sociological, philosophical and anti-theological convictions of the elder Mill.

Grote also became acquainted with the sage, Jeremy Bentham, whose Freethought and Philosophical Radicalism confirmed the teachings of Mill, and thus were formed the leading opinions which Grote retained through life. The latter's complete emancipation from all forms of supernaturalism is obvious from the notes on Bentham he elaborated or revised and published in 1822, under the title of the *Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind*. Grote chose the pseudonym of Philip Beauchamp, and the book ap-

peared, it is said, under the auspices of Richard Carlile, then a prisoner for conscience' sake in Dorchester Gaol.

The book was republished in 1875, by Edward Truelove, and it is from this edition that the following passage is culled. After citing many instances of the evil effects of religious animosity, Grote says: "Such is the antipathy which religion sows in the human bosom—and such are the principal shapes and varieties which it assumes. It is, unhappily, but too notorious how fruitful this factitious hostility has proved in every species of destructive and sanguinary result. If we merely contemplate the fierce and merciless persecutions, whose enormity has obtruded them upon the view of the historian, the misery thus introduced will appear sufficiently atrocious and revolting. But it is not by these extreme barbarities that the largest aggregate of suffering is occasioned. Very shocking instances of cruelty must be comparatively rare from the desperation and inextinguishable thirst for vengeance which they are sure to provoke; and they are rather to be viewed as indicating the pitch of fury to which the antipathy will occasionally stimulate mankind, than as aiding our measurement of its evil effects. . . . The very same principle, which at time breaks out into such ferocious excesses, is eternally at work, provoking innumerable manifestations of lesser hostility and ill-will—and these acts, although less injurious when individually considered, yet abundantly compensate this defect by their ceaseless recurrence and ubiquity." (pp. 75, 76.)

Religious tests so strictly enforced in the older seats of learning, which were still little more than clerical preserves, impelled both Dissenters and Rationalists to establish a University College on purely secular principles. From 1826 to 1830, Grote laboured with Mill, Brougham and other reformers in creating a London University. The foundation stone for this edifice was laid in 1827 by the Duke of Sussex amid marked public approval, and the first council included Lord John Russell, Zachary Macaulay, Mackintosh, Grote, Mill, Thomas Campbell, Birkbeck and Joseph Hume.

Newman naturally viewed the new secular University with sad misgiving, and its opening gave rise to much speculation, both in England and abroad. Mrs. Grote, in her *Personal Life* of her husband, refers to a writer in Vienna, who predicted a marked change in British sentiment "since the business of education seems to be leaving the hands of the clergy." But Freethinkers and Dissenters were alike determined to nullify the long-felt grievance of their sons' exclusion from the social and cultural advantages conferred by the ancient Universities.

London University was formally opened in 1828, when its Professor of Surgery, Charles Bell, delivered the inaugural lecture. Fearing that the new University would benefit the Whig and Radical cause, the Tories determined to establish a rival institution to which they gave the loyal name of King's College. In a few weeks, however, 312 students were entered at the London University and from this modest beginning there has since arisen perhaps the most important University system in the world.

Bentham, Mill, Francis Place and other Philosophical Radicals were prominent in the struggle for Parliamentary Reform. For, prior to 1832, great centres of population such as Birmingham had no representatives apart from their county members, while derelict boroughs with a mere handful of electors each returned two members to Parliament, while one deserted borough, little better than a mound, known as Old Sarum, near Salisbury, was represented at Westminster. Bentham's organ, the

Westminster Review, fought for reform, and was ably supported by the *Morning Chronicle* and *Examiner*.

It was now evident that the Reform could not be delayed much longer. At last, in 1832, amid great public excitement, procrastinating Whigs and die-hard Tories were beaten, and the Bill was passed into law. Grote now entered the House of Commons as one of the members for the City of London, which was then regarded as one of the most advanced constituencies in the kingdom.

Grote was most anxious to purify elections which were then usually distinguished by bribery, corruption and intimidation. Hence, his unceasing advocacy of the vote by ballot as the sole safeguard for the independent elector. In his Election Address, Grote stated that "Without the Ballot, free and conscientious voting is unattainable; without Triennial Elections, the purest system of voting will fail to ensure in the member chosen a steady feeling of accountability to the people." He also advocated an immediate inquiry "into the constitution and revenues of the Church of England," and he contended "that tithes are the worst possible modes of raising a revenue either for Church or State." And this was in 1832!

As a member of the Council of the New University in Gower Street, Grote assisted in the organization of the faculties and curriculum. In 1860 he officiated as its treasurer, and when Brougham died in 1868, he became President. On the death of his intimate friend, Hallam, the famous historian, Grote succeeded him as a trustee of the British Museum, and he greatly helped in directing the improvements in its departments of science and classical antiquities.

Despite his various public activities, after his retirement from Parliament, Grote contrived to devote his chief attention to the prosecution of the great undertaking upon which his literary reputation mainly rests. This standard work, his celebrated *History of Greece*, is in several ways comparable with Gibbon's masterpiece, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

The first two volumes of Grote's *Greece* appeared in 1846, and the succeeding ten were published between 1847 and 1856. Earlier histories of Hellas were now completely eclipsed, and works such as those of Gillies and Mitford greatly overshadowed. Bagehot truly noted that Mitford's *Greece* was superseded by Thirlwall's, while Grote's superseded both. There is, of course, a wide difference between the broad scholarly achievement of Thirlwall and the reactionary product of the ultra-Tory Mitford. Grote glorified the achievements of Athenian democracy, and the superiority of Grote's *History* to his own was most candidly and courteously acknowledged by Bishop Thirlwall himself.

Grote tested the accuracy of Gibbon by carefully comparing that historian's work with the authorities upon whom he relied, only to discover Gibbon's unswerving fidelity to truth. But, like Ruskin at a later decade, Grote took exception to Gibbon's style, although some venture to think that had the Greek historian's composition been more in the manner of the Roman chronicler's, his work would have attracted an even larger public than it did. Even so, Grote's masterpiece is replete with facts patiently gathered from every available source. Its plan is relatively simple, and its presentation is forcible and lucid. Throughout, its author was guided by the exacting requirements of modern historical science, and its enthusiastic reception by the republic of letters as well as by the more thoughtful of the general reading community was keenly appreciated by Grote himself.

Crowned with many distinctions, including the Fellowship of the Royal Society, Grote died in 1871, in his seventy-seventh year. Everywhere esteemed as a man of integrity, courage and ability, Grote's remains were laid to rest in Westminster Abbey, and among the pall-bearers were the Master of Balliol and Gladstone's "saint of rationalism," John Stuart Mill.

T. F. PALMER.

Science and Religion Reconciled?

EVERY year, when the British Association holds its annual parliament, the churches are at pains to proclaim the reconciliation of Science and Religion. This year, at Aberdeen, the Very Rev. Sir George Adam Smith was the spokesman for the churches, and his British Association sermon was (vide the *Christian World*) "an utterance worthy of the great occasion—both in its intellectual quality and in its spiritual force."

Whether a reconciliation has really been effected or not between Science and Religion, it is at least agreed on all sides that there was once a disagreement between these two, otherwise there would be nothing now to become reconciled over. The common impression is that science brought about the disagreement by conducting its investigations along such lines that the generally accepted view about such things as the creation of the earth could no longer be maintained. But this was not on account of any perversity on the part of the Scientists, says Sir George. No, the naughty theologians were at fault, or, at least were far more to blame than the scientists. "The theologians of all people," says Sir George, "should not have failed to see that the Scriptures, which in their own belief are the Word of God Himself present perhaps the most remarkable display of evolution which history has to show us."

Who but a theologian could have made such a fatuous statement as this? The inference here is that, when Darwin propounded his theory of evolution, all the theologians need have done, if they had not been so blind, was to have drawn his attention to the fact that he had been forestalled by God, who had already revealed in the Scriptures the evolutionary plan.

But the theologians, whatever their other failings might be, were not as blind as the Very Rev. Sir George would have us believe. It may sound very convincing for a theologian thus to take his own class to task and mildly castigate it, but the truth is that the defenders of the Scriptures of Darwin's day saw only too clearly the implications of his theory. They saw that, if his theory were to be accepted, it smashed the story of the foundation of the world which Christianity, basing its authority on the inspired Old Testament, taught. Out of the wreckage later theologians have seized upon the framework of the Genesis story of creation, made a few adjustments such as making days stand for aeons, and flattered themselves that the situation has been saved for Christianity, and that Religion and Science have been reconciled.

I have said that the theologians of Darwin's day were not blind. I do not think that the theologians of to-day are blind either, but I do think they are stupid. If they were not, they would not reiterate each year, as the British Association meets, that Religion and Science have been reconciled, and attempt to uphold their contention by specious arguments such as the evolutionary theory being enshrined in the opening chapters of Genesis. "The common-sense view of the Creation story, and one that is now

widely accepted even by orthodox Christians, is that it is a myth," wrote Philip Vivian nearly thirty years ago in his famous work, *The Churches and Modern Thought*. "Many of us will, therefore, agree with Professor Huxley," he added, "when he says: 'I suppose it to be an hypothesis respecting the origin of the universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge, or what he thought was knowledge, of the nature of things, and therefore assumed to be true.'"*

While, therefore, no scientist worthy of the name would give support to the story of Genesis, Sir George can still preach to the British Association and refer to the Word of God as presenting perhaps the most remarkable display of evolution which human history has to show us. It is true that it is a remarkable display in one sense. In the light of the Word of God being the utterance of an actual omniscient being, such a God's pronouncement upon the creation of the world, and all pertaining to it, is a remarkable display—a most remarkable display—of colossal ignorance. But God is not an omniscient being. He is a creation of the early Hebrew writers who, in ascribing the creation of the World to God, declared it was created in the manner they thought it must have been, and, not being themselves agreed upon their suppositions, disclosed their want of harmony in the varying accounts to be read in *Genesis* (see ch. i to ch. ii. 1-3; ch. ii. 4-25).

The creation story of *Genesis* can be looked upon as a discarded theory, yet Religion still cherishes it as true, for, assuming a divine, infallible authority it must tenaciously hold to its primary pronouncements in face of all attacks upon them. "Religion," says Julius L. Brenchley, in *The Cruise of the Curaçoa*, "is first moulded by barbarism, and is afterwards employed in perpetuating it." Ringing bells, making the sign of the cross, sprinkling holy water, saying masses for the dead, prayers for rain, and blessings of harvests, which play such a prominent part in Religion, are not wonderful discoveries like the stamping out of yellow fever and malaria by Major W. C. Gorgas in the Panama Canal zone by pouring oil upon the mosquito-infested water, but are survivals from times when man in his ignorance believed in their efficacy.

Science is as old as Religion, but whereas Religion was a reflection of man's ignorance, Science was a reflection of what he knew. As man grew in knowledge so did Science grow, discarding immediately anything which experience showed was no longer tenable. And to-day we find Science still reflecting man's knowledge and comprising many departments, as man's knowledge has grown to vast proportions.

As ignorance and knowledge are poles apart, so Religion, which is derived from the first, and Science, which is derived from the second, must remain apart. So far from becoming reconciled the breach is widening. Individual scientists may subscribe to Religion, but Science, or rather that part of it which is concerned with the things with which Religion is concerned must be in opposition to it. The annual assurance that Science and Religion are reconciled is a sign that all is not well, for, if there were indeed a reconciliation, there would be no need to dwell any longer on the matter.

JAMES O. HANLON.

* *Churches and Modern Thought* (Watts). p. 196, ch. v. third edition.

"SACRED COVENANTS"

Men's words are their bonds; but these are just the very things by which nations are not bound!

Francesco Ferrer

Born January 10, 1857. Martyred, October 13, 1909

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, Francesco Ferrer, Freethinker, became the victim of Jesuit machinations, and died by shooting at Montjuich, near Barcelona.

An ardent Secularist, Francesco had offended the powerful clique of Jesuits who practically ruled Spain, because he devoted his life to building up Secular schools for the sons and daughters of the Spanish proletariat. His successes were the antitheses of Roman Catholic education, and were a positive menace to the supremacy of the autocratic power which the Church had built up for itself in Spain.

He was born on January 10, 1857, of poor parents, who were agriculturists and ardent Catholics. At the age of thirteen he was compelled to seek his own living, and by good fortune his first employer was devoted to liberal thought. Under his influence Ferrer began to shape the ideas which were later to lead to his martyrdom. He next entered the service of the railway as controller, but on account of his participation in a riot he had to leave Spain in 1886. He went to France, where he earned his living as a teacher of languages. His period of exile gave him the great chance for developing his mind and widening his horizon.

As time passed Francesco became more and more passionately interested in Freethought ideas, and in education policy generally. Never a good speaker, he was unusually active and persistent. It was the combination of his quiet methods of working, his splendid talents and rich store of knowledge, which enabled him to leave his mark on the world. His conviction that the liberation of the people must begin with the education of the youth grew stronger and stronger, and all his hopes were centred on the coming generation.

In Paris he found patrons who were willing to finance his projects, and in 1901 he was enabled to return to Spain to open the first Secular school at Barcelona. Naturally the start was on modest lines. He began with thirty girl and boy pupils. Overcoming his numerous difficulties with unflinching energy, he increased this number to seventy pupils in the first year. The fame of his school now began to spread beyond the Spanish frontiers, and the hatred of the Jesuits, who rightly felt their own position being undermined, grew in proportion.

They awaited an opportunity for giving vent to their hate. In July, 1909, certain anti-militarist disturbances which broke out in Barcelona gave them their chance. The Government had decided to send reservists to Morocco to crush upheavals there, and the people of Barcelona had objected. The workers' organizations had declared a general strike. Bloodshed and riots resulted, but the revolt was speedily stamped out by Government troops sent from Madrid.

Ferrer took no active part in these disturbances, but he was none the less hounded down. The Jesuits took advantage of the Government's whirlwind campaign of revenge against the rioters to remove their deadly and most dangerous enemy.

On the libellous charge of high treason they managed to effect his arrest. The court which was to try him was already prejudiced. In face of the wire-pullers, the docile judiciary, and the corrupt or intimidated witnesses, he stood no chance of receiving a just trial. But Ferrer defended himself calmly and with weighty arguments. He was courageously supported by Colonel Galceran, his military advocate appointed by the court. This young officer exposed the hidden motives that had inspired the trial, as well as the wirepulling and the corruptness of the witnesses who were being used to secure Ferrer's conviction. His efforts, however, were all in vain. The sentence—death by shooting—was not based on evidence but was "by order of the court." Consistent with the Jesuit tradition the cowardly sentence was given publicly only after it had been carried out.

The night before he died Ferrer refused categorically all religious offices, and only expressed a desire to make his will before a solicitor. This document besides private arrangements, contained a protest at the charges

made against him, a re-affirmation of his devotion to his Freethought ideas, and a request that his body should be cremated.

On October 13, Francesco Ferrer was led to execution. The victim of Jesuit infamy, he stands in the annals of Freethought history as an inspiration to his successors, and a devastating indictment of the holy fathers of Rome.

G.F.G.

Acid Drops

Speaking at the City Temple, on October 8, Mr. Lloyd George said that Mussolini "is going to attune the minds of children to the prospects of slaughter—not of peace, not of good will, not of brotherhood, but of killing." Mr. Lloyd George must be fair, even to Mussolini, and it is hardly done in the way depicted by him. Mussolini is shrouding his militarism in talk of patriotic devotion to country, love of the fatherland, the good influence of the military life on the development of character, developing the courage to defend one's homes, the need for being ready to resist attack on the honour of one's country, and so forth. And we should very much like to hear of any country that is not doing exactly the same thing. The distinction is that Italy, being, like Germany, a huge prison house, no one is allowed to voice an opposite sentiment.

Mr. Lloyd George reached the fatuous conclusion that the only hope for the country lies in the Churches. They must, he said, act together in the name of God. They did that in 1914, they have done that when previous wars broke out. The trouble is that the Churches have always, with rare exceptions, acted together, and they have always been on the wrong side. And one must always bear in mind General Crozier's statement, and he knew the situation from the practical side, that we have no greater or better creators of blood-lust than the churches.

The London Corporation is introducing a Bill asking Parliament to make a "Sacred Zone" around St. Paul's Cathedral to "reduce the liability to crack." Somebody should endeavour to erect a scientific zone around the heads of Christians to prevent *their* further "cracking." Prayer has long been seen to be useless in protecting even a Cathedral from collapse. How long before mankind sees that if prayer is obviously useless, it is ridiculous to maintain expensive temples in which purposeless prayers are to continue their silly repetition to a heaven no sane man any more believes to exist?

Some heart-breaking remarks have just been made by the Rev. T. T. James, of Manchester. The cheaper, motor-cars become, the more successfully will they compete with the Church. "There is now," he wailed, the other day, "a generation to whom the words 'the breaking of the Sabbath,' have simply no meaning." Civilization is inventing, he added, more and more "attractive" methods for spending leisure, and this obviously meant fewer people would go to Church. So, it was the business of the Church to make its worship attractive and compelling, and thus it would hold its ground "by reason of its answer to man's deeper necessities." But will it ever again hold its ground? Won't man find "his deeper necessities" far better catered for *outside* the Church? If this is not the case, why all this moaning and weeping? Mr. James will have to reconcile himself to the fact that the old church-going Victorian days are gone for ever.

The Government is once again going to introduce the Matrimonial Causes Bill—the Bill which proposes to enlarge the grounds of divorce to include desertion, cruelty, incurable insanity, and incurable drunkenness, as well

as imprisonment following a commuted death sentence. The Roman Catholics are up in arms at the horror of disagreeing with Jesus about the permanence of the marriage-tie, and once again, Dr. O'Donovan will do his best to talk the Bill out as he did when it was introduced by Mr. Holford Knight. We hope that Members of Parliament will not merely see that the antiquated legislation regarding divorce be properly thrown out for good—that surely, is merely common sense—but that England should fall into line with modern progress and modern humanism in a matter which so intimately concerns social life. That such a long-needed reform should be so violently opposed, not merely by Catholics, but by other Christian sects is proof of the terribly corrupting influence Christianity has exercised through the centuries. But divorce reform is inevitable and Christians will have to face the fact.

Queen Marie of Roumania in *The Story of My Life*, reveals why Queen Victoria's wish to see her married at St. George's Chapel was frustrated through the quarrels of the rival medicine-men. The intention was to have two ceremonies, one a Catholic and one a Protestant wedding. But the clericals could not agree as to which ceremony should come first. So she was married in Roumania.

Queen Marie was carefully brought up. In her *Life* she says: "A risqué book never reached our hands. As for the Bible, although we were well up in both Testaments, all the more revealing episodes had been carefully circumscribed." Queen Marie is not over-explicit, but we can guess the sort of Bowdlerization which took place. But we should like to see what parts of the Bible were left, after everything objectionable had been, as she says, "circumscribed."

We learn from the *New Statesman*, that a man at Cirencester (Glos.) has been prosecuted and fined—not for killing a hare, but for killing a hare on the Sabbath Day (which we may explain to our readers, means Sunday, not Saturday as they might think from reading the Bible).

Dr. John A. Hutton expresses his astonishment that we no longer get excited over the old yarns, which were once able to move mobs to frenzied extravagances. He puts it in his quaint way: "It is certainly not flattering to us, least of all to our wise men, that we can see nothing necessary for the life of the soul in a story in which simple people three thousand years ago saw so much." Yes, of course, we used to meet pious religionists, who thought the story of Jacl's vile crime a noble narrative; who praised Jacob for his lying deceptions; who made excuses for David's wickedness. To-day, even Christians would like to hide all traces of these "stories which moved the emotions of our forefathers."

Mr. Hugh Redwood, the religious writer, declares that "never since Sunday schools began have they confronted a more difficult task than at this present day"; and he quotes the Chairman of the Congregational Union as saying that "the English Sunday of tradition is not going. It has gone. Breaking the Sabbath is a phrase which means nothing to children born in the age of motoring week-ends and Sunday cinemas." This is exactly as it should be, and we hope that these out-of-date defenders of religion will keep on pointing out this gradual secularization of daily life in general and Sunday in particular.

Mr. Redwood, however, is arguing that the failure of the Sunday schools is really due to the "amateur young men and maidens with no qualification for their task beyond a zealous church membership." It appears there is a dearth of "properly qualified persons," and the amateurs "have inevitably failed." But why should Mr. Redwood put all the blame on those young men and

women who teach the Gospel story in all its beautiful simplicity? Why does he assume that the "professionals" would have succeeded in "putting it over?" As a matter of fact Christianity is losing ground, not because of the amateurs, but because the fully-trained theologians have failed miserably in trying to prove that a Saviour, a Resurrection and Miracles—to say nothing of a Devil and a Hell—are of the slightest value in these hard scientific and materialistic times—at least for any educated or instructed person.

Something like 3,000 ex-soldiers of all nations with fourteen Bishops, attended the great pilgrimage to Lourdes to pray for peace. In addition, there were another 60,000 people present. The Bishops distributed the "sacred host," and crowds of men grovelled continuously at the altars. And—as far as we know—"Our Lady" did not perform a single miraculous cure. Not a single blind soldier was made to see, nor any help whatever given to the numerous sad cases of crippled and sick men. Of course, the meeting was supposedly for "peace," and not for "cures," but surely "Our Lady" ought to have managed at least one tiny cure—if not for the sake of the poor chap himself, for the sake of the numerous converts out to prove the absolute truth of miracles to an unbelieving world. "Our Lady" didn't even show herself as an apparition, nor did Bernadette. It looks as if this particular "peace" meeting was a huge "flop" from the point of view of miracle cures.

A new note is discoverable in the "Thanksgiving," or Harvest Festival in our churches this year. It looks as if "the God of Harvests," as He used to be called, has played a huge joke on His faithful, if rather naïve, believers. God has answered the prayers for bumper crops, but has taken care that these crops are not available where wanted, or in some cases that they cost more to gather than the farmers can get for them. The Church Prayers must be revised. In the literal sense, God must be asked to "deliver the goods."

What a delightful joke the anti-Semitic Nazi Church in Germany is playing on Christian tradition. It is the nemesis of the nonsense which pretended that Jesus was not the plain straightforward son of Jewish parents. If Jesus was born of Jewish parents, He was a Jew. The absurdity which traced his ancestry through either parent to the Jewish King David was bound in the end to prove that he was a mere man. The Nazi fanaticism says He was not a Jew because He was a God. The fact is that Jesus was the Son of Jehovah, both of them Jewish "conceptions," but if Jesus lived at all He was born on Jewish territory, of Jewish parents.

The *British Weekly* objects to "Faith" being regarded as "a begging of the question." It truly claims that "Life also is a begging of the question." What we Freethinkers object to is the common and dishonest Christian attempt to confuse the issue by pretending that the nonsensical superstitions of religion mean just the same as "good faith," or the many other legitimate uses of the word "faith." "He kept his faith," need not mean what religionists mean by "faith." As to life, it is ridiculous to confuse with indiscriminate praise (or blame) the noblest aspects of human life with the "life" of tigers, bugs and disease germs. Yet we often hear Christians proclaiming their thanks to God for the question-begging "gift of life."

Those who read the recent Editorial in this journal about Women and the Ministry, will be interested in what Prof. Alexander Findlay says about it. He starts by repudiating the famous passage in Paul's Epistle to Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35). He calls it "fatuous," "bathos," "absurd," and a forgery. He adds, "Christian women can with a good conscience erase a passage from the Bible, which has caused them much bewilderment."

While noting with pleasure that Dr. Findlay seems heartily ashamed of parts of his Bible, we need not remind our readers that besides this passage, our Editorial dealt with the whole spirit of the Bible and Christianity; not with merely an isolated passage, but with the universal practice of the Church from its start to the present moment. It is a delight to know that we can cut out of our Bible all the passages which "bewilder" us. If we omit also those which disgust us, there will be little left to complain of.

We are all familiar with the story of the Irishman who said that millions of Irishmen waited but the signal to rise and destroy the hated Saxon. When asked why they didn't rise, he said, "Because of the cursed police." Something like that must have happened when, according to Dean Harold Hough, "Christ's resurrection was the seal of the death of evil." Dean Hough is an incorrigible old romancer. He told the League of Nations that the Christian Church was "the creator of civilization." Worse still, his sermon proclaimed that "unless the League of Nations is a League of children of God," there is no hope for the world. Has it got as bad as that?

The Rev. Lincoln Jones is a convert to "Groupism," after he had been for a long time "bothered," and after "demurring and hesitating." The "group demanded that I should be all out for God." So he is now "all out." This state of mind is defined by this clergyman as coming at last to "take Jesus seriously." Presumably Mr. Jones had hitherto "taken Jesus" flippantly or laughingly. Now he leaves all the laughing to outsiders. We can assure him there will always be plenty to laugh at, and Mr. Jones is doing his share in providing food for fun in his solemn announcement that when once you are all out for the group "anything may happen."

Dr. A. E. Garvie, in the *Christian World*, writes sympathetically about the German Church crisis. We make no complaint that Dr. Garvie does not hurl venom at the German Government, but tries to understand exactly what are the facts. He is sure that "the masses in Germany are indifferent and even hostile to the Churches." While naturally devoting most of his space to the religious revolt against Nazi interference, Dr. Garvie pleads that "the ecclesiastical controversy" is not the only movement in Germany "which should claim our consideration, sympathy and support."

Dr. Garvie might have added that the Nazi chiefs are all to a man religious, even fervidly so. Their intolerance of independent religious bodies is in no case dictated by any sort of anti-clericalism. It aims solely to "establish" religion in the State like many earlier rulers have done. Vatican City is the model of all who want religion established among us effectively. In Germany, as Dr. Garvie reports "here is a powerful body of militant Christians called "Christliche Kampfschar" (Christian Storm Troops), under the control of and indeed incorporated in the Nazi Storm Troops, and possessing the full confidence of Hitler himself. The C.K. are led by Baron von der Ropp, established in barracks, and "subject to a very rigid discipline, such as one might expect a Prussian ex-officer to favour."

Major W. C. Lockyer, of the Salvation Army, has won a prize of three guineas, in a pious contemporary, for an essay which he calls "I followed the Band." Major Lockyer was apparently "converted" to Salvationism from Methodism, but he says he stood once "on the slippery slope." He says, "I was on my way towards a pleasure resort, when I heard a Salvation Army Band." In the case of St. Paul, it was a stroke of lightning. In the Major's case it was the thunder of the drums. No more pleasure for Lockyer, no more week-ends at Southend-on-Sea. As he admits, "very little was said about

being saved to make one 'happy'" (even the word "happy" is put in quote-marks). God spoke to this intrepid man, "it was clearly revealed that for me the path of obedience was *officership*." These "revelations" are most revealing. Hitler and Mussolini have the same divine notion of "obedience."

A "Manifesto," signed by about a score of Congregational Ministers, betrays a restlessness in that denomination which official announcements tend to hide from public knowledge. It shows that the London Missionary Society is in sore straits, "it is not paying its way," many missionaries have been eliminated, "and a further reduction is inevitable." The Manifesto, instead of insisting upon instant liquidation, begs for an immediate raising of an additional "£80,000 a year in money." We like the sound of the insistence on "in money." Old clothing, superfluous vegetable marrows, and dud L.O.U.'s are not required. "We trust in God"—but everyone else must pay up "in money."

The judge in the Westminster Court, who recently told a woman who had come without a hat that the same rule that applied in Church applied in court, evidently thought that in his court stupid practices should be treated with the same veneration that is accorded in Church. It might be a *rule*, that in his court women must wear a hat, but we know of no law that would compel them to do so. But while there is plenty of stupidity about the administration of the law, we do not think that official reminders of its existence should be encouraged by those who evidently believe in its perpetuation.

The talk of a united Italy is just about as truthful as the talk of a united Germany. On his recent visit to Milan, over 4,000 special police were told off to guard the Italian dictator, and there was a special house to house visit in order to clear out anyone who might be suspected of not being in love with the "idol of the Italian people." An open vote would probably depose Mussolini at once.

Fifty Years Ago

"BLOODY AND BLASPHEMOUS"

MR KILNER, a missionary returned from Ceylon, recently stigmatized the religion of the people among whom he had been living as a "bloody and blasphemous Hinduism." This gentleman's "feelings" are protected by Mr. Justice North and the common law of England. Hindus, not being orthodox, are no doubt in the same case with Freethinkers, and have no feelings to hurt, or ought not to have any; but were Hindus to come to this country and charge Christianity with being "bloody and blasphemous," such a remark would at once qualify them for Holloway Gaol, however true it might be when applied either to the history or teaching of Christianity. Is Mr. Kilner aware that a firm doing a very extensive ready-money business in faith has recently registered the trade-mark "Blood and Fire" as descriptive of the essence of Christ's teaching? And with reason; for the mainspring of Christianity lies in the belief that we are all of us totally depraved, and that the blood of Jesus Christ alone can cleanse us from all sin. Listening recently to a street-preacher repeating once more the "grand and glorious" doctrine of total depravity, we found that "blood, blood, blood" was the most frequently recurring word in his discourse, and his correct appreciation of the Nazarene's teaching was proved by his ringing about a dozen changes on the word "blood" in the space of five minutes. Before Mr. Kilner again applies the words "bloody and blasphemous" to a superstition in which he does not believe, let him think for one moment whether an unprejudiced mind might not have good grounds for applying the same expression to the superstition in which he does believe.

The "Freethinker," October 12, 1884.

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE,

EDITORIAL:

61 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412

TO CORRESPONDENTS

M. ROGERS.—Thanks for sending copy of *Psychic News*, but the article is too full of emptiness to call for any reply. The talk of having had "convincing evidence" is so much eye-wash. On that basis every delusion from which the race has suffered might be well-established as solid truth.

J. BRIGHTON.—Mr. Cohen might visit the Stockton and Middlesbro' area in the New Year, but he is full up this side of Christmas.

FOR Distributing the *Freethinker*.—B. Jenkins (S.A., £3; Don Fisher, 3. 3d.

S. GLADING (— Auckland).—The address is an excellent one. Thanks for copy. New Zealand has the same fight on that we have here, and lovers of freedom will have to be both active and wary if victories are not to be scored by the enemy.

H. SYKES.—You are quite right, but it is all part of the impudence of the B.B.C. and the apathy of the general public with regard to real liberty and discussion. We might paraphrase the old tag about governments and say that a people get the kind of wireless service it deserves.

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 1357.

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums

The Liverpool Branch had a capital send off for their 1934-5 indoor season last Sunday. The Large Picton Hall was crowded out, and a larger number than ever turned away. The lecture was a "live" one, and it was followed with evident interest. Mr. Shortt, the President of the Branch, was in the chair, and made a strong appeal for continued and larger support. There were a number of questions, and we hear a good sale of literature. The Branch holds its weekly (Sunday) meetings in the Milton Hall, 12a Daulby Street, Liverpool, off London Road, at 7.0. The speaker for this evening is Mr. Shortt. We hope that Liverpool Freethinkers will make it a point of introducing a friend, or two, to these meetings.

To-day (October 14), Mr. Cohen will speak in the Co-operative Hall, Downing Street, Ardwick, Manchester at 7.0, on "The Fight for Freedom of Thought." Admission will be free, but there will be reserved seats at one shilling each. The Co-operative Hall is a few minutes tram ride from Piccadilly, and we trust that Freethinkers will do what they can to induce their Christian friends to attend.

Mr. Cohen visits Glasgow on the last Sunday in this month, and on the Monday evening he is debating with the Rev. Joseph Levine, on the subject, "Is the Belief in God Reasonable." Further particulars next week.

We have received a letter from the Rev. Walter Wynn in reply to our "Views and Opinions" of last week. Unfortunately we are unable to publish it in this issue, but it will appear in our next.

Reviewing Mr. Lansbury's *My England*, the *Times Literary Supplement* speaks of Mr. Lansbury's "incredible amateur adventures into journalism, one at least of which was successful even in the worldly sense which Mr. Lansbury has always despised." We believe this to be quite wrong. The *Herald* was never a financial success under Mr. Lansbury, although it was a success in a sense that was not worldly, but which was more in accord with Mr. Lansbury's ideals. The paper became a financial success—which is the only sense the present newspaper world cares about—when the *Herald* ceased to be a purely propagandist paper and came more into line with other papers. If one were to ask Mr. Lansbury which was the better paper, we have little doubt as to what would be his reply.

The truth is that no propagandist paper—if the propaganda is of an unpopular kind—can hope to pay its way in this country. There are not enough people seriously interested in ideas to make it pay. The *Freethinker* has been in existence for over half a century; it has never paid its way yet, and if all the labour on it had been paid for it would have been dead long since. Even now in spite of the revenue from the Endowment Trust, it still loses money. We have had many suggestions as to how to make the *Freethinker* pay, and we have no doubt that it could be made to meet expenses. But that would be to destroy its character as the "*Freethinker*," and we have not put thirty-seven year's work into it to see it go the way of other financially successful journals. The paper was founded to make Freethinkers, not to make money, and it will remain true to its aim.

The Birkenhead Branch N.S.S. will open its winter session to-day (Sunday), when Mr. G. Whitehead will speak in the Boilermakers' Hall, Argyle Street, Birkenhead, on "Why I am an Atheist." The lecture will begin at 7 p.m. Admission is free, with Reserved Seats at Sixpence each. Bigotry is very strong in Birkenhead, and the local saints are to be congratulated on their determined efforts to defeat it. All local saints should feel an obligation to help, even if only by supporting the lectures which have been arranged.

We are glad to learn that the first meeting of the West London Branch indoors was a very successful one. Mr. George Bedborough was the speaker, and his lecture was greatly enjoyed by those present. These meetings will be continued each Sunday; full particulars of which will be found in the Lecture Guide column.

We are asked to announce that Mr. J. P. Gilmour will lecture on behalf of the East Lancashire Rationalist Association in the Phoenix Theatre, Burnley to-day (October 14) at 2.45, on "The Assassins of Liberty," and at 7.0, on "Believing is Seeing." Admission is free.

I can hardly have been fourteen years of age when the Christian faith, as a scheme of mysteries and miracles—and with this any and every form of faith involving a supernatural mythology—became inoperative upon my mind; and so it has always remained. I am not weak enough to plume myself upon this fact, which simply depends upon the constitution (be it a good or a bad one) of my mind; there is no reason why a "free-thinker" should be a potent thinker, or a devotee a weaker vessel. The term Agnostic was not invented in those years. As soon as it got invented, I found it to be the clearest and the simplest definition of my mental position in relation to the supernatural. It appears to me (also) that an Agnostic should be more or less a necessitarian or fatalist! such is the case with me.

W. M. Rossetti, "Some Reminiscences."

Chasing Shadows

(Continued from page 636.)

THE point we reached last week was this: taking the classical schools of philosophy—Materialist, Spiritualist, Idealist, Idealistic Realist, and Pantheistic Monist, we found a common ground of agreement that the word as it is in consciousness is not a true reflection of the world as it exists "in itself." There is, apparently, a real world underlying the world we know, and with which science deals, of which world we know only "modes" or appearances (phenomena) which represent evanescent forms taken on by an indestructible but unknown "substance."

So far as I am capable of wording it, this is a plain statement of the position freed from technical scientific and philosophic terms. These theories assert that the world we live in is not the *real* world. Existence—in a permanent sense—is not what we *know*, the things we see, or touch, or even think about are not *real*, not truly objective, but are the shadows cast by an unknown "matter," or an "unknown," or unclassified "existence." Religionists stress the existence of this unknown "Mind," because it helps to keep God in being, some "Materialists" stress the importance of an unknown "Matter," because it is, they think, useful as a weapon to dethrone supernaturalism, and a certain number of philosophers and scientists labour the statement that we cannot deal with "things in themselves," either because they are anxious not publicly to break with religion, or because they have not completely outgrown primitive thought-forms.

All this is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. It is simply nightmarish to suggest that the only things that are real are those we can never know, or even think, while the world in which we have to live, and with which we *must* come to terms is not *real*, that the objectivity we know is not real, but only a distortion of a real objectivity. Plainly I believe the whole situation to be wrong. Further, I believe that we have got a wrong (almost an insane) answer, because the question has not been properly framed, and as a consequence, we have the same questions perpetually asked without any more satisfactory answer being given than when they were first propounded.

Usually the questions asked are: "What is the real nature of the external world, which evokes in me the sensations of which I am conscious?" or "What is the nature of the atom?" or, "How can sensations arise from the movements of atoms?" and so on almost without end. The mere fact that the answers given to these questions seldom satisfy anyone but those who give them should be enough to make one doubt whether the question has been properly framed.

Suppose we were to try a different form of question, and instead of asking "How does mind arise from atomic motion?" etc., ask, "What actually is implied in the statement that we believe in the existence of an external world?" Put in the first form, we indicate the answer in the question, and wander round and round in a circle. Put in the latter form we open the way to a genuine and, therefore, profitable enquiry. We may also hope to reach tangible results.

Let us see if we can start from a basis of fact, and of agreed fact. There can be no reasonable dispute that science, philosophy, everything, begins in experience. However complex, or however abstract our ideas may become, however subtle our reasoning, we are always referred back to experience for the elements of our intellectual life. As I have

already said, we can conceive animals and plants that we have never seen, of lands that have no actual existence, of things that exist in our imagination only. We can picture a future of such a kind that it is a practical certainty that no such future will ever come into existence, but in all these operations we do no more than split our experience into parts and recombine them in a fantastic fashion. We can think of the unknown, but so far as we do think of it, we can do so only in terms of the known.

I pause a moment to stress this last statement, because so much absolute nonsense is talked about an "unknowable." There can be no such thing—at least we can have no conception answering to the expression, and, therefore, it is quite meaningless. "Unknowable" does not stand for any "thing," or for any conceivable thing, and the moment we begin to think of it as existing we bring it within the world of the knowable. "Unknowable" does not stand for either thought or thing. It can only stand for a sheer blank. To think we must have something to think about; we cannot think about nothing. Thought must deal with the known and the knowable, and the known and the knowable can only be ours through experience—either the direct experience of the individual, or that larger experience which we inherit in written records and social customs and experience.

If the reader is with me thus far, we can clear out at once the "thing-in-itself," which lies beyond experience, whether we call it mind, or spirit, or matter, or an "existence," which we know only through its modes, or a "reality," which is distinct and totally unlike the reality we know, and that is not what I mean when I say that the machine on which I am typing is real, or the table on which the machine rests is real. The "real" is the real I know. The table is real, the feeling in the tips of my fingers when I strike the keys is real, even the visions of a dipsomaniac are real. Each stands for a reality within its own particular category. The full meaning of this will be made clear presently.

But if the reader is with me thus far, and it is difficult to think of a genuinely scientific thinker disputing it, then it follows that in all our thoughts and descriptions of things, whether we call them material or mental, hard or soft, hot or cold, they stand for so many phases of actual or possible experiences, and not shadows of some unknown world which impresses itself on our consciousness. (There is a deal of question-begging in that "impresses itself," but it is not convenient to deal with it here). And from the fact that our descriptions of things stand for phases of experience, it follows that our laws of nature are also generalizations from experience, for these are only our experiences arranged and methodized.

Please note that I am in all this, assuming as little as it is possible to assume. If any fault is found I expect it will be that the thing looks too simple, and that people cannot have got confused, generation after generation, over so simple a matter. But I think it will be found that here, as is so many other instances, it is the simple that is really profound, and that very often what passes for profundity is only confusion expressed in pompous language.

Already, however, our questions are beginning to assume more intelligible and more hopeful forms, and the question of what the real world is like apart from the world of our *real* experience looks about as sensible as asking what is left of the colour of a smell after we have done away with its weight. The whole question is narrowed down to the simple and intelligible one, "What is the nature of experience, or what are the combinations of experience that together form what we mean when we speak of the world?"

One other comment on a probable remark. It may be said that I am placing a very sharp limitation on human knowledge. Nothing of the kind. I am only indicating the conditions of human knowledge. What we know of anything must be learned under the conditions that make learning possible, and it is idle to complain that we cannot know things if we abolish the conditions that enable us to know. To use an old and classical illustration, we should then be doing as a bird would, which complained of the resistance the atmosphere offered to its flight, when it is the atmosphere that makes flight possible.

Still keeping to what is known and verifiable, we find experience splitting up into two main divisions or categories. Under the awesome names of Ego and Non-ego, Noumenon and Phenomenon, Existence and Mode, Substance and Accident—terms that really could lead nowhere, because in the form given them they assumed at the beginning all that was discovered at the end—we find this elementary division of experience stalking through the history of philosophy, inspiring all the veneration that is given to an aristocratic family ghost. But like other ghosts, they lose all their terrors once we summon up sufficient courage to look boldly at them. They stand for no more than the simple and almost indisputable statement that we are conscious of sensations, and we assume another form of experience to which they are related. And that statement, once it is understood is self-evident. A knowledge of anything always involves a statement of likeness and difference. Heat is known as such, because there is something that is relatively cold. Heavy is opposed to light, big to little, happiness to misery, and so on through the range of knowledge. That is why the statement "a thing-in-itself," or "existence *per se*," or "that which is conceived in itself," is not science, it is not sense, it is just non-sense, because it is unintelligible.

When I am told that the cause of sound is vibrations, the statement is incomplete and misleading. In offering an explanation of the whole, it leaves out just one half of what really occurs. A sound is the combination of vibrations with a sensitive organic structure—the ear. Do away with either of the factors and the product—sound—no longer exists. The same is true of everything else. A stimulus has no meaning and no existence apart from something stimulated; stimulation has no meaning apart from a stimulus. It is this elementary truth, that everything must be related to something else in order to become the subject of consciousness, that explains this conception of a "me" and a "not-me." Each is real in relation to the other. Neither is real without the other.

Of late years this division has been classified under the terms "public" and "private." This is preferable to subjective and objective, since it serves to get rid of the misleading connotations of the old terms. This replacement of the old words by "Public" and "Private" was first suggested by F. H. Bradley over forty years ago, in his very able and cleverly critical *Appearance and Reality*, and I have not observed that those who have used the terms have given any credit to Bradley for the suggestion. But this kind of intellectual piracy is nothing new in the history of thought.

By "private" is meant all those experiences which in a very special manner belong to me; by "public," all those experiences which I share with others. Thus, my feelings of pleasure or pain, my emotions and passions, are mine; they belong to me in the sense that while I may have excellent reasons for believing that other people also experience similar feelings, they are not *mine*. My feelings cannot be shared with others,

even though I may manage to excite similar feelings in others.

While I am pressing the keys of my typewriter, no one but myself can feel the sensation I have in the tips of my fingers. But the marks that are made on the paper, the shape of the machine, etc., can be shared by as many people as are in the room. This, I think, will make quite clear the meaning of the old terminology, objective and subjective, and the new, public and private. The world which I share in common with others is the world which I say is independent of each. The world that I cannot share with others is my world. One is the world of the "ego," the other that of the "non-ego." Each is to be thought of only in relation to the other.

But it must be borne in mind that this analysis of experience, beyond which it is impossible to go for the reason that it is impossible to carry thinking farther, has no reference whatever to any of the ghosts of pseudo-metaphysics, that has for so long bemused people. It has nothing to say about a "thing-in-itself," about "Existences" that are conceived "*per se*," or an existence which we know through its "modes," or of the unknown "reality" with which theologians and amateur philosophers, such as Sir James Jeans bemuse both themselves and their followers. All these terminological absurdities are cleared out of the way when we are content to rest on the solid foundation of experience, to face the world as we know it, and to confine ourselves to intelligible statements. The world then becomes a real world, not a world of shadows that masks a real world of an unknown "matter" or an unknown "mind." Things exist as they are; if that does not constitute "reality," then reality is a sheer absurdity. These pseudo-metaphysical entities that have befogged so many Materialists and all Spiritualists are seen, when stripped of their philosophical coverings, to be nothing but the attenuated survivals of the "Soul" of the primitive savage. They are the ghosts of gods, which the force of inherited thought-forms have caused even some professed Atheists to carry round with them.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

(To be concluded.)

Dialectical Materialism: A Reply

IN his fourth section on Dialectical Materialism, Mr. G. H. Taylor (*Freethinker*, September 9) continues his criticism by taking Lenin's reference to Engels as having "opposed the 'vulgar' Materialists, Vogt, Büchner and Moleschott, because they assumed that thought is secreted by the brain as bile is secreted by the liver, holding that in this matter they were confused." Quoted by L. Rudas, in *Dialectical Materialism and Communism*. (Pamphlet Ed., p. 19.)

Mr. Taylor then points out that the "bile and liver" theory has been traced to Cabanis (1757-1808), although he does not quote Büchner as having drawn attention to this fact, and followed it up with a criticism, in which he says he cannot "refrain from finding the comparison unsuitable and badly chosen." *Force and Matter*, p. 303 (15th German, 4th English Ed.).

Büchner then goes on to say that the analogy is faulty as bile is tangible, ponderable, and visible in addition to being a waste product of the body, while thought is none of these. He also adds "thinking can and must be regarded as a special mode of general natural motion, which is a characteristic of the substance of the central nervous elements as the motion

of contraction is of the muscle substance, etc." p. 304.

I add this to Mr. Taylor's protest, as I think it is time men like Büchner were given their place in the history of Materialism instead of being dismissed as "vulgar," because they were not proletarian, especially when they stood for an advance in thought as against the generality of doctrine, both professional and popular.

Whether the bracketing of Vogt, Moleschott, and Büchner as vulgar Materialists has simply become a tradition with Marxists, I do not know, but comrade L. Rudas might at least have checked the reference of Lenin, following on Engels; especially when we find Büchner in agreement with Engels on the question of matter in motion.

That Büchner was 100 per cent a Dialectical Materialist I would not like to claim, but he does say, "F. Engels speaks of a motionless condition of matter as 'one of the shallowest and most absurd conceptions, a mere phantasm of a heated brain.' According to him *motion is the mode of existence of matter*. Never and nowhere has there been matter without motion, nor can there exist any. Motion in the universal space, mechanical motion of smaller masses in individual spheres, molecular vibration as heat or as electrical or magnetic action, chemical decomposition and composition, organic life—each single atom of matter in the world is in one or other of these modes of motion, or in many of them at the same time, at any given moment. All rest, all equilibrium is but comparative, and has only a meaning as a transference from this or that definite mode of motion. For instance, a body may be at rest mechanically, i.e., in mechanical equilibrium on the earth, but this does not prevent it from sharing in the motion of the earth as in that of the whole solar system, neither does it prevent its smallest physical particles from completing the vibrations necessitated by its temperature, or its material atoms from undergoing chemical change." pp. 75-76.

This is a rejection of the idea of "mechanical" Materialism, and is dialectical so far as it goes, inasmuch as it recognizes "motion, movements, processes," which L. Rudas says is Dialectical Materialism, as above, p. 19, provided we remember that "the lowest is mechanical motion, mere change of place, the highest is thought"; a position with which, I think Büchner would have agreed although he does not seem to have carried his dialectics into the sphere of history and sociology. Unfortunately Mr. Taylor does not appear to have realized the importance of "motion, movements, processes," and their relation to our thinking. Otherwise, he would not have taken exception to the statement of L. Rudas that "the laws of movement of society are, too, *in essence*, identical with the natural laws of movement. (Society is a product of nature!) They are totally different from them *in expression*." (Pamphlet as above, p. 26.) Nor would he support the claim of Hogben, that "the methods of physics will one day claim the whole field of knowledge."

Society is a product of nature, and is consequently the outcome of the movements and processes which have taken place in nature, but this does not mean that all movements and processes are identical in form. Hence, if we realize mechanical movements, physiological movements, psychological movements, and the movements of men in society, and the consequent movements or processes in social evolution; with the changes of movements as we pass from the inorganic to the organic, and from animal society to human society with all its intricate processes, it should not be difficult also to realize that the methods

of physics will not one day claim all the field of knowledge. Just as matter in motion appears in different forms or modes or expressions, so must we have our different sciences to correspond, and to describe the various but interconnected motions, movements, processes which go on in the universe. In this sense Dialectical Materialism is an ideology which reflects what goes on in the universe or, as Clemens Dutt says, "dialectics is not a mere form of thinking, but is something objectively occurring in nature. . . . Theoretical thinking which reflects the dialectical character of natural processes must itself be subject to the same dialectic." (*Labour Monthly*, February, 1933, p. 86.)

Mr. Taylor insists that the "methods of physics," not "physics," are to claim the whole field of knowledge; but, if this has any meaning at all, does it not mean that the methods of physics are the same, fundamentally, as those of other sciences, and are therefore not the methods of *physics*, but belong to methodology in general?

When Mr. Taylor approaches social dialectics, it is obvious he is in the position of one who realizes that a great change in the structure of society must be made, if we are not to plunge into chaos, but allows his fear of the proletariat to upset him.

"Why should a proletarian dictatorship have to be the next stage in social development?" (*Free-thinker*, September 9, p. 572.)

Just because this is the way in which things are happening in the world. Marxism-Leninism is not a theory based upon eternal principles, or abstract ideas of social right and justice. It is based upon, and is a reflex of what is actually taking place in the world, in conjunction with what has taken place.

It is true we can formulate all sorts of social theories as to how everything could be made better for everybody on the basis of the great "if." If all men loved each other in the brotherhood of Christ; if everybody lived his life with reasonable consideration for his fellow man; if everybody ceased to be selfish; if capitalists and workers would gather around a big table and decide to put society in order—then everybody would be happy, and a revolution of the shocking kind would be avoided. Unfortunately all these theories remain very much at the "if" stage so far as a fundamental reconstruction of society is concerned.

Whether these theories are embodied in the activities of religious societies for the betterment of the working class; or in trade unions, for enabling working men to bargain for higher wages; or, again, in social democratic societies for bringing about Socialism by means of gradual improvement, they one and all ignore the basic industrial, commercial, and social conditions with which they should deal.

It is rather curious that Mr. Taylor should ask us to grant the conditions of society developing into "its" other, and then proceed to argue that it need not do so. What has become of Mr. Taylor's determinism; what of his Dialectical Materialism?

He says, "Let us suppose, with Lenin, that a social form must develop, 'not into any random other, but into *its* other.' Let us postulate all these things as true, and even then we ask, why is a proletarian dictatorship the necessary successor to the present régime?"

Just so; but, Mr. Taylor, if a social form *must* develop into its other, why try to prove that it must not do so? That is the point. Dialectical Materialism says a certain form of society must and will develop out of a certain previous form. Capitalist society must develop by way of a proletarian dictatorship into Socialist society, and so on into the best form of Communism. Is there anything unscientific

about this? Does it not fit in with Mr. Taylor's determinist interpretation of history? Variations of development will show themselves in different countries, but they will be due to variations in conditions; while the main line of development will be the same. A feudalist might just as well have argued against the development of feudal society into capitalist society, as a modern thinker argue against capitalism developing into Socialism via proletarian dictatorship. To which Mr. Taylor will reply: I don't dispute the Socialism, I dispute the proletarian dictatorship. This is the trouble, Mr. Taylor wants to get there, but he does not want to go the way of historical development. So he brings in the scientists to help us to formulate an unscientific conception of how things are to be done.

He tells us of the way in which Capitalist society has misused science, and of how "it repels the goodwill of men of science by its treatment of the workers." Then he says a group of scientists will be formed, and they will create "potent means of destruction," by which they will no doubt blow up things in silence, and proceed to "relegate the capitalist bourgeoisie to the level of wage-earners," while as an oligarchy the scientists will proceed to build up a new order of society.

Hallelujah! Only Mr. Taylor has forgotten that if this were a possibility, it could have been done long ago; that most scientists are not much in favour of the workers; that scientists and science in a bourgeois society are bound up with the conditions of that society.

Assume the advent of the well-meaning group of scientists. Would not the capitalists form their group of scientists with means of destruction to be used against the building-up of a new society?

Then the fight would be on, and Mr. Taylor's group of scientists would have to have the help of the proletariat, and follow the lead of, or become members of, the section forming the proletarian dictatorship. Surely it should now be obvious that only a strong body of men and women with proletarian outlook can lead the way in such a crisis.

E. EGERTON STAFFORD.

Correspondence

CHRISTIANITY AND WOMAN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I have not long returned from abroad to find two copies of the *Freethinker* awaiting me, for which I thank you. These issues (August 19 and 26) deal at considerable length with points arising out of my first letter to you, sent early in August, which protested against certain remarks concerning "Christianity and Women" in your issue of July 29.

You find fault with my assertion that Jesus Christ "always observed broad principles with regard to the relationships of the sexes," and you quote two incidents in the Gospels as proof. (a) "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Although the word "Woman" is not necessarily used here in any derogatory sense, there is much evidence, especially in Mark's Gospel (Mark iii. 22) that the family of Jesus did not understand either him or his mission, and were trying to prevent him from fulfilling it. However this may be it did not prevent Christ from making provision for his mother's future when hanging from the Cross—"Woman (the same title) behold thy son," thoughtfulness quite in keeping with another remark, also from the Cross, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." (b) Moffatt's translation of the words to Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not," is "Cease clinging to me," a very different inter-

pretation. In any case, your inference that Christ permitted Thomas to handle him because he was a man, has no value, inasmuch as earlier in his ministry, Christ not only permitted a woman to anoint and kiss his feet in the Pharisee's house, but pointed out this action as an example to the whole world.

I could add many more proofs from the Gospels that Jesus was in advance of his time in his treatment of women. Jewish women in those days received little or no education, yet we find Christ frequently singling them out for special instruction, not imparted to men. Some of his highest spiritual utterances were given to the woman of Samaria, a heretic as well as a woman. Mary of Bethany sat at his feet. Martha was the recipient of a well-known discourse on the after life, whilst there is nothing to prove that the numbers of women who "ministered" to him were not also the objects of his tuition. Again, in the story of the woman taken in adultery, Jesus enforced the necessity for an equal moral standard between the sexes, when the men came off decidedly the worst. His healing power was given freely to both sexes alike.

It is quite impossible to read the Gospels with an unbiased mind and not acknowledge that here was one who valued *personality* over and above the accident of sex. And yet you say in your issue of August 26, that Jesus knew women "only as servants or attendants, and in their inevitable functions of wife and mother." As to the non-inclusion of women against the chosen Twelve, you yourself admit that "women teachers . . . took no part in religious services among the Jews," so, surely it would have been an act of folly, not of wisdom, if Christ had thrust women into an administrative office which would have been at once repudiated.

You maintain (in your issue of August 19) that women only secured subordinate positions in the Early Church, and you quote Principal Donaldson in confirmation of your statements. I, in return, must confine myself to quotations from another authority, *Women in the Apostolic Church*, by Rev. T. B. Allworthy, M.A., B.D. (W. Heffer & Sons), who maintains (p. 139) that "the prophetic ministry of women was a normal feature of Church life," also that, at the first, women were also teachers and addressed Church assemblies. Later, when these informal and spontaneous ministries had given place to fixed offices, Mr. Allworthy states, "It is clear that women had won for themselves a place in the official ministry which had now been organized; and the status of deacons, men or women, was inferior only to that of the elder-bishops or overseers." Dean Alford has also put it on record that up to the time of the prohibition by the Church Council of Laodicea in A.D. 363, women were "ordained by the laying on of hands."

Mr. Allworthy's book is doubly valuable in this connexion, because the author renders full justice to the high value St. Paul undoubtedly placed upon women's co-operation in spreading the gospel. This can be readily deduced from his many references to women helpers in his Letters to the Churches, by all except those who wilfully permit themselves to be blinded by other Pauline utterances implying the inferiority of women, frequently torn from their context, and in many cases wrongly translated.

DOROTHEA M. NORTHCROFT.

[I have space only to reply briefly to Mrs. Northcroft's letter. With regard to paragraph one, I must, in the main, leave this matter in the hands of those who will consult their New Testament again, merely remarking that the fact that the family did not understand the mission of Jesus is rather remarkable in view of his divine birth. The alteration of the text from "Woman, touch me not," to "cease clinging to me," does not materially alter the case, and with regard to Thomas, Mrs. Northcroft does not consider the primitive significance of the dangerous influence—to males—believed to be associated with women.

With regard to paragraph two and three, I did not say that women were not associated with Jesus, and if the fact that because among the Jews women took no part in the religious services it would have been folly for Jesus to have given women administrative offices, seems to discount all that has been said before by Mrs. Northcroft, and to substantiate my statements.

Paragraph four represents the efforts of recent writers to give women a dignified place in the early church, and reflects the influence of modern thought on Christian writers. But the fact remains that the early Christian writers did consider woman as an instrument dangerous to the salvation of man, and that so soon as the Church emerges fully into history women have not functions at all equal to those of men. That Christianity in its early missionary stage made full use of women is not surprising, or that they did some sort of teaching. But the facts are obscure, and the general status of women was a subservient one. And the low position that women occupied when society became completely Christianized is indisputable.—EDITOR, *Freethinker*.]

THE AFTER LIFE

SIR,—In your issue of September 30 you say: "Thousands of generations of people have lived believing that after death those belonging to them lived again, without the information diminishing in the least the sorrow felt when death touched their homes."

Surely that is natural, seeing that it was always believed that the dead were as likely to go to hell as to heaven. Dean Inge himself has said:—

"The threats of hell-fire are intensely horrible to everyone who believes them, while the descriptions of the bliss of heaven are not always very attractive. Accordingly, fear has been more potent than hope among the majority of Christians." (*Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, p. 169).

Dr. Johnson is often described as the most typical of Englishmen, and his fear of death is repeatedly mentioned by Boswell. On one occasion Boswell asked: "But is not the fear of death natural to man?" Johnson replied: "So much so, Sir, that the whole of life is but keeping away the thoughts of it." On another occasion Johnson said, "he never had a moment in which death was not terrible to him."

R. B. KERR.

Obituary

OSCAR FREIDMAN

ON Wednesday, October 3, the remains of Oscar Friedman were cremated at Golders Green Crematorium. After an illness of about a year's duration death took place at the age of fifty-five years from Bright's Disease. For many years he was associated with the National Secular Society, at one time being a member of the Manchester Branch, and later at Headquarters, where he remained a member until his death. Like many other business men time did not allow him taking a very active part in the work of the Society, but his interest in the N.S.S. and welfare of the movement generally were maintained to the end. In the presence of a number of relatives and friends, a Secular Service was conducted by Mr. R. H. Rosetti.

A Question of the Day.

Socialism and the Churches

By CHAPMAN COHEN

PRICE - THREEPENCE.

Postage ½d.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead): 11.30, Sunday, October 14, Mr. Paul Goldman. Highbury Corner, 8.0, Mr. W. P. Campbell Everden. South Hill Park, Hampstead, 8.0, Monday, October 15, Mr. W. P. Campbell Everden. Highbury Corner, 8.0, Thursday, October 18, Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 12.30, Sunday, Mr. W. B. Collins. 3.30, Messrs. Wood, Bryant, Collins and Tuson. 6.30, Mr. Wood (W.P.). Wednesday, 7.30, Messrs. Wood, Bryant, Collins and Tuson. *Freethinker* on sale outside Park gates, and literature to order.

INDOOR.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, John A. Hobson, M.A.—"Human Survival."

STUDY CIRCLE (68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4): 8.0, Monday, October 15, Mr. A. Allison will speak on "What is Religion?"

THE METROPOLITAN SECULAR SOCIETY (Conway Hall, 49 Theobalds Road, W.C.1): 7.0, Har Dayal, M.A., Ph.D.—"The Practical Aspects of Freethought."

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. ("The Laurie Arms," Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.): 7.30, Mr. E. C. Saphin—"Does Christ Matter?"

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

BIRKENHEAD (Haymarket): 8.0, Saturday, October 13, Messrs. F. G. Stevens and H. Little.

BLVTH: 7.0, Monday, October 15, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

INDOOR.

BIRKENHEAD (Wirral) BRANCH N.S.S. (Boilermakers' Hall, Argyle Street, Birkenhead, opposite Scala Cinema, entrance in Lorn Street): 7.0, Mr. George Whithead (London)—"Why I am an Atheist."

BRADFORD BRANCH N.S.S. (Godwin Commercial Hotel, Godwin Street, Bradford): 7.0, Mr. Jack Clayton—"The Anti-God Campaign."

BURNLEY (Barden Club) 11.0, Mr. Jack Clayton—"The Problem of Freedom."

EAST LANCASHIRE RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION (Phoenix Theatre, Market Street, Burnley): 2.45, Mr. J. P. Gilmour (Chairman R.P.A.) "The Assassins of Liberty." 7.0, "Believing is Seeing."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (McLellan Galleries, 270 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow): 7.0, Mr. Halbert Tatlock—"The Drama: Life in Design." *Freethinker* and other Freethought literature on sale at all meetings.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Milton Hall, 12a Daulby Street, Liverpool, off London Road, by the Majestic Cinema): 7.0, Mr. J. V. Shortt, President Liverpool Branch N.S.S.—"Freethought, a First Principle in Sociology."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Co-operative Hall, Downing Street, Ardwick): 7.0, Chapman Cohen, President N.S.S.—"The Fight for Freedom of Thought."

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N.S.S. (Plymouth Chambers, Drake Circus): 7.0, Mr. Knowles—"Summerland."

SEAHAM HARBOUR (Women's Sec., Labour Rooms): 7.0, Wednesday, October 17, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

SUNDERLAND BRANCH N.S.S. (Co-operative Hall, Green Street): 7.0, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

TO ALL NEWCOMERS.

If you are not a regular subscriber and would like to test the quality of the *Freethinker* for the next four weeks, free of charge, please sign and post this form:—

Please send me, post free, the *Freethinker* for the next four weeks. The sending of the paper does not place me under any obligation whatever.

Name

Address

To the *Freethinker*, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Five Leaflets by Chapman Cohen.

WHAT IS SECULARISM ?

6d. per 100.

DO YOU WANT THE TRUTH ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

THE BELIEFS OF UNBELIEVERS.

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

DOES MAN DESIRE GOD ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

ARE CHRISTIANS INFERIOR TO FREETHINKERS ?

1/- per 100 (4 pages).

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

A

Grammar of Freethought.

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

Cloth Bound 5s.

Postage 3d.

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

BRAIN and MIND

— BY —

Dr. ARTHUR LYNCH.

This is an introduction to a scientific psychology along lines on which Dr. Lynch is entitled to speak as an authority. It is a pamphlet which all should read.

Price - 6d. By post - 7d.

ACADEMY CINEMA,

Oxford Street.

Ger. 2981

Film Hitler Banned

FRITZ LANG'S famous study of hypnotic power

"DR. MABUSE" (A)

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.

The Secular Society, Ltd.

CHAIRMAN—CHAPMAN COHEN.

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Secretary: R. H. ROSETTI.

THIS Society was formed in 1893 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this world is the proper end of all thought and action. To promote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Education. To promote the complete secularization of the State, etc. And to do all such lawful things as are conducive to such objects. Also to have, hold, receive, and retain any sums of money paid, given, devised, or bequeathed by any person, and to employ the same for any of the purposes of the Society.

Members pay an entrance fee of ten shillings, and a subsequent yearly subscription of five shillings.

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up.

All who join the Society participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, one-third of whom retire (by ballot), each year, but are eligible for re-election.

Friends desiring to benefit the Society are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favour in their wills. The now historic decision of the House of Lords in *re Bowman and Others v. the Secular Society, Limited*, in 1917, a verbatim report of which may be obtained from its publishers, the Pioneer Press, or from the Secretary, makes it quite impossible to set aside such bequests.

A Form of Bequest.—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—

I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £..... free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy.

It is advisable, but not necessary, that the Secretary should be formally notified of such bequests, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid. A form of membership, with full particulars, will be sent on application to the Secretary, R. H. ROSETTI, 68 FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

WOMAN AND CHRISTIANITY

By CHAPMAN COHEN

The Story of the Exploitation of a Sex.

Price 1s.

Postage 1d.

SPECIAL OFFER.

Essays in Freethinking

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

The Three Volumes Complete of "Essays in Freethinking" will be sent post free for

7s. 6d.

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

BRADLAUGH AND INGERSOLL

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN

Price 2s. 6d. Postage 3d.

Materialism Re-stated

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

Cloth Bound, price 2/6. Postage 2½d.

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

Paganism in Christian Festivals

BY
J. M. WHEELER

Price 1s. Postage 1½d.

THE MIRACLES OF ST. MARTIN

BY
C. CLAYTON DOYE

Price post free 7d.

THE REVENUES OF RELIGION

BY
ALAN HANDSACRE

Cloth 2s. 6d. Postage 3d. Paper 1s. 6d. Postage 2d.

History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science

BY
Prof. J. W. DRAPER

Price 2s. Postage 4½d.

The Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus

BY
W. A. CAMPBELL

Cloth 2s. Postage 2d.

Christianity & Civilization

A Chapter from "The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe."

By Prof. J. W. DRAPER.

Price- TWOPENCE. Postage ½d

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

MOTHER OF GOD

BY
G. W. FOOTE

Post Free 2½d.

Realistic Aphorisms and Purple Patches

By ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.

320 pages.

Paper Covers 3/6. Postage 4d.

(All Cloth copies sold).

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

BY
G. W. FOOTE

Price 6d. Postage 1d.

Infidel Death-Beds

BY
G. W. Foote and A. D. McLaren

Price 2s. Postage 3d.

GOD AND THE UNIVERSE

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN

Paper 2s. Postage 2d. Cloth 3s. Postage 3d.

SELECTED HERESIES

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN

Cloth, gilt 3s. 6d. Postage 3d.

Shakespeare & other Literary Essays

BY
G. W. FOOTE

Price 3s. 6d. Postage 3d.

The Foundations of Religion

BY
CHAPMAN COHEN.

Paper Ninepence

Postage 1d.

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