

# THE FREETHINKER

▪ EDITED *by* CHAPMAN COHEN ▪

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LV.—No. 9

SUNDAY, MARCH 3, 1935

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>A Bellicose Bishop—The Editor</i> - - - -	129
<i>Browsing With Birrell—Mimnermus</i> - - - -	130
<i>The Little Shop in the Side Street—T.H.E.</i> - - - -	132
<i>The Armenians and Their Cult—T. F. Palmer</i> - - - -	133
<i>More About Marcus—C. Clayton Dove</i> - - - -	138
<i>Pre-War Germany and Religion—X</i> - - - -	139

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

## Views and Opinions

### A Bellicose Bishop

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER has been shocked; so shocked that he has threatened to make a very desperate move. Not merely in his own person, but in the name of the Church, for he was addressing a Church Assembly when he made the threat. The situation that gave rise to this explosion is as follows. The Associate editor of the *Daily Mail* wrote to the *Times* confessing that he had reported one speech made in favour of the Indian policy of the Government and eleven speeches against it, and he had done this for a definite purpose. This policy of suppression has shocked the Bishop, and he said:—

If this kind of thing is to be a habit of the press in this country, it was going to hinder men and women from thinking, and it would mean that the Christian Church would have to call on the people to take the trouble to think. He did not in the least resent the fact that certain newspapers represented certain positions, sometimes in politics, sometimes in religion; all he asked was that the Press should give a sufficient amount of both sides to enable people to exercise their thinking capacity.

The Church has uttered many terrible threats in its time. It has threatened a whole nation with excommunication, and it has threatened individuals with torture and death. But I do not recall that it ever threatened to call upon people to think. Of course, I take it to mean independent thinking, since some sort of thinking is inevitable. And the chief concern of the Church, up to date, has been to control the thinking of the people, not to make it independent.

Still, it is a risky sort of threat for the Church to make. For once incite a people to think and who can tell where it will stop? Keep the people in the state in which the Lord has placed them, teach them to thank God for their manifold blessings, and they will continue to repeat the same thoughts day after day without noticing the monotony and the uselessness of it all. But tell them that they ought to take

the trouble to think, and there is no saying where they will stop. It is literally true that if you give a beggar an inch he will want an ell. It is, in fact, only that the beggar will long for an ell that justifies his being given an inch. It incites the desire for more, and that is a very good state of mind to encourage. When a man is *very* depressed in mind, he does not long for happiness, still less fight for it. He is just wholly and hopelessly passive. But set his feet on the path that leads to happiness and he will not only fight for the little he has gained, but will continue to fight for more.

And once set a people thinking, encourage them to do their own thinking, which really means to question anything and everything that is established, and there is no telling when or where they will stop. It was thinking that led the French people to the great revolution of 1789; it is thinking that has been responsible for all the troubles in Russia, in Italy, in Germany, and in other parts of the world. If the people in these countries had merely been underfed, over-worked and badly housed, they might have gone on in that condition for long enough. But once the force of independent thinking began to make its presence felt, and there was nothing that could be said to be absolutely safe. Thrones and Churches and all sorts of institutions become insecure. The formula "It is written," or "It is established," loses its sacred character, and the questions "Why is it established?" and "What is it worth?" take their place. The Church was wise in its own interests when it insisted, as it could not stop people thinking, on taking control of the kind of thinking that was being done.

\* \* \*

### The Closed Mind

But I imagine that the Bishop of Manchester was in a temper, and did not mean all his words imply. More, I fancy that the Bishop is a supporter of the Government policy and was asking that those papers that did not agree with him, should give his side a fair show. That is what all political parties, from Communists to Conservatives, and all religious parties, from Roman Catholics to Quakers, would like. I am only wondering whether the Bishop means any more than this. I am afraid he does not. He says that the Policy of the Press involves to the "Christian individual and to the Christian Church" the danger of "the closed mind." But what else has the Christian Church ever been striving for but this? Does the Bishop ever see that those under his direct charge, and so far as he can effect it, the large public outside his ministry, have placed before them "a sufficient amount of both sides to enable people to exercise their thinking capacity"? I doubt it very much. If he did I am certain that his present followers would be the first to denounce him. If he is really an advocate of the open, as against the closed

mind, there is plenty of scope for his activities. Manchester has one of the few remaining papers in this country that upholds the idea that the first duty of a newspaper is to give reliable news, and the only news that is reliable is one that does justice to both sides. But even in that paper the "other side" of religion is very seldom permitted a hearing. And in the press generally the other side is never presented at all. Books which make a direct attack on religion are ignored in the review columns. Lectures by avowed Freethinkers, no matter how large the audiences and how important the subject, are very seldom reported. A journal such as this one is boycotted to such an extent, that many newsagents dare not exhibit it lest they excite the hostility of their religious customers—clerical and lay. Parsons—a very limited number—will avow mild heresies on public platforms and in the public press, but how many of them ever do so direct to their congregations in church? What does the average church or chapel-goer know of modern discoveries and modern theories and their bearing on religion? What is the meaning of the bringing up of children in an artificially constructed religious environment, the warning to them as they grow up not to visit Freethought meetings and not to read Freethought literature, but an attempt to create a "closed mind"? The Bishop is right, unless the people can hear both sides of the case, how can they do any thinking that is worth anything? But what is the Bishop doing to create an open mind, and when and where has he ever made a protest against the creation of the closed mind by the Church to which he belongs, and of which he is an official?

\* \* \*

#### Our Heredity

I agree with all that the Bishop says about the character of the yellow press, and could say a great deal more than he has said. No one thinks less of the popular press of to-day than I do. With some few exceptions it is as venal as it could well be. It will exploit every phase of popular ignorance and superstition in religion and politics. It will create "stunts" to-day, and denounce the same "stunts" to-morrow. The same proprietors will boom an Empire union in a paper at one end of the country and damn all outsiders, and in another part of the country will denounce the idea of a closed Empire, and preach an "enlightened nationalism." It will pander to any passion and suppress the truth about anything—so long as the suppression pays. It has encouraged the growth of a public that mistakes slogans for syllogisms, lives on headlines, thinks an insinuation is as good as a logical inference, and riots in any kind of sensationalism, from a royal marriage to a sordid murder. Its aim—as its founders in this country openly avowed—is to give the public what it wants, not what it needs. And its misdirection of public opinion is mainly achieved by using the favourite weapon of the Christian Church, that of suppression.

But the Bishop should be just, even to the yellow press. It has had to deal, in the main, with a Christian public, one that has been bred in an atmosphere saturated with the intolerance and narrowness that is characteristic of historic Christianity. There is more than this. The process adopted by the Christian Church of eliminating by death the more independent and the more fearless type of mind, meant the survival of the intellectually poorer type. It also meant, and this was of even greater importance, the creation of an environment in which it became a crime to question, and a virtue to accept blindly whatever the Church chose to say. The "closed mind" has been created by the Church, and it has persisted until to-day. Neither by training nor by

tradition has the public of this country been habituated to independent thought. It is true that men can no longer be imprisoned for expressing their thoughts, but they can be socially ostracized and they can be boycotted in trade. Many find that whatever career they follow, and wherever religion is concerned, the one unforgivable offence is independent thought and straightforward speech. We breed hypocrites, and then marvel that men are not honest.

In social matters, considered alone, the balance has usually been in the direction of the open mind, because here was an obvious field for discussion, and, as Bagehot said, to discussion nothing is sacred. The fact of putting a question up for discussion is to admit the possibility of being wrong. But religion put nothing up for discussion, it demanded belief, and in the end succeeded, not in securing permanence of belief, but in cramping the intellect for generations.

It is not fair, then, for the Bishop of Manchester to blame the yellow press for the existence of the closed mind. The Press takes the type of mind it finds and makes the best it can of it, and the most it can out of it. And in its turn it intensifies the evil it finds. The yellow press looks for nothing better than the type of mind that Christianity has provided. Any other type of mind would look for a better type of instructor. At present the social stew has a tendency to throw the scum to the top.

But it ill becomes a Bishop of the Church to chide the princes of the press. They are cast in the mental mould that Christianity has favoured; they live upon the type of mind that Christianity has worked so hard to develop. "Ye are my sheep," says the New Testament referring to the followers of Jesus. Well, if we breed sheep, we must not expect them to act like goats. The Bishop has got his sheep, he should not begrudge the yellow press its participation in the results of the shearing.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

### Browsing With Birrell

"Though Priestcraft has been a potent factor in human affairs, it could never have availed without a foundation of lay incompetence.—J. M. Robertson.

A GOOD story was told concerning Augustine Birrell shortly before his death. Asked whether he intended following the fashion adopted by so many celebrities and write his reminiscences, he replied: "I have reached a serene and philosophic height, from which I do not want to upset anybody. If I wrote my reminiscences and told the truth, I should lose some very good friends, and if I do not tell the truth the book would be valueless. So I shall do precisely nothing." It was a pity that Birrell did not screw his courage to the sticking-place, and, like the boyish George Washington, "tell the truth." Almost everything he wrote repaid perusal, from his delightful *Obiter Dicta* to his most fugitive pieces written for the reviews. His life of Locker-Lampson, the witty versifier of the foibles of fashion, shows quite clearly that he had a distinct taste for biography. Birrell possessed a whimsical humour all his own which was as marked, as personal, as "the Correggosity of Correggio," to adopt his own clever jest.

Birrell was, usually, a good companion in the garden of literature. Whether he wrote on Charlotte Brontë or Marie Bashkirtseff, William Hazlitt or Cardinal Newman, he always proved himself a rare humorist and a real lover of books. The numerous flashes of humour are, perhaps, the most memorable things in his pages. Hazlitt once declared: "I started in life with the French Revolution," and the fact remained that he was baptized in a sober meeting-

house. Birrell genially remarked of this incident that "there were always more traces of the Revolution about Hazlitt than of the rite of Christian baptism." Concerning Hazlitt's professed admiration for Napoleon, Birrell commented urbanely: "It is wisest to hate your country's enemies. The Christian Church allows it, the National Anthem demands it, and the experience of mankind proves it." Hazlitt said that Tom Moore ought never to have written his sugary poem, "Lalla Rookh," for three thousand guineas—which, observed Birrell, is a hard saying. "Had he written the poem for nothing one might have wondered."

How good, too, is Birrell's remarks that "the thought of Milton's pipe sanctifies your own." There is some really excellent, though sly, fun in the statement that "the motives that prompt men and women to go to lectures on winter nights are very varied, and include many which have nothing to do with respect for the lecturer or interest in his subject." Writing of mixed marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants, Birrell added pleasantly: "The severer spirit now dominating Roman Catholic councils has condemned these marriages; but the practical politician cannot but regret that so good an opportunity of lubricating religious differences with the sweet oil of the domestic affections should be lost to us in these days of bitterness and dissension."

John Bull does not escape the eye of this genial critic. The following remark on nationality is irresistible: "No foreigner needs to ask the nationality of the man who treads on his corns, smiles at his religion, and does not want to know anything about his aspirations." Another example of Birrellesque humour is well worth quotation. "The attitude of his countrymen towards John Ruskin was amusing. The *Times* newspaper alternately ridiculed his doctrines and demanded his burial in Westminster Abbey. He was, the great newspaper thought, so glorious an impostor, so supreme a humbug, so paradoxical a preacher, so false a reasoner, so dangerous a character, that there was only one place for his bones—Westminster Abbey."

Only once did Birrell permit his urbanity to degenerate into urbane insolence, and that was in his extraordinary essay on Thomas Paine, which was published originally in a periodical as a review of Moncure Conway's standard life of Paine. It is passing strange, for a perusal of that work would have saved Birrell from most, if not all, of his misconceptions. What is more serious, however, is the odium theologium displayed in the essay, and the fact that, years after, the whole tirade was reprinted exactly as first written in a volume, entitled: *Self-Selected Essays*. In its original form this attack on Paine was very questionable, but reprinted verbatim in more permanent form it reflected a lack of judgment which one least expected from a writer of reputation.

Birrell displays in this egregious essay a child-like ignorance of Paine, although he had in his hands Conway's vindication, and a still greater ignorance of the Freethought Movement, with which Paine's name is inseparably associated. "Nobody now," Birrell wrote, "is ever likely to read the *Age of Reason* for instruction and amusement." As a plain statement of fact, Paine's book is a Freethought classic, has never been "out of print" for over a century, and always had a steady annual sale. Birrell also attacked Paine's literary style, and dubbed him "a coarse writer without refinement of nature." Whether Birrell really thought that Paine was "coarse," or whether he was merely tickling the ears of the pious groundlings, it is a truly amazing criticism from a critic who had gone out of his way to praise William Hazlitt, and who

defended, more than once, old Sam Johnson's very vigorous dialectics.

It cannot be too often emphasized that Thomas Paine was a really fine writer, and the proof is that his written words roused men like trumpets that sing to battle. It was the virile pen of Paine, no less than the sword of George Washington, that made the American Republic a possibility. It is silly to pretend that Paine's works lack the ordinary graces of imagery and metaphor. Many of his phrases are immortal, and have survived the winnowing of generations. "These are the times that try men's souls," was quoted extensively during the Great War, and is often seen in the present industrial crisis. So great a stylist as Edmund Burke himself might have envied the illustration of his own too exclusive compassion for the sufferings of the Royal Family and aristocracy in the troublous times of the French Revolution. "Mr. Burke pities the plumage, but he forgets the dying bird." The poet, Shelley, a keen and discriminating judge of literary artistry, thought this so excellent that he used it as the motto of one of his own pamphlets.

Another of Birrell's objections to Paine was that he was not a teetotaller, although he lived in an age of hard drinking. Gibbon, be it remembered, described the dons of Oxford University as being "sunk in prejudice and port," and Paine's many activities should absolve him from any serious accusations of debauched living. Men who make loose accusations of like nature should ponder a story told of President Lincoln, when some Puritan Nosey-Parkers reported to him that General Grant was intemperate. "Find out what he drinks," said Lincoln, "and I will send some to the other generals."

Writers boast of the glories of a fifth edition, but very few authors achieve uninterrupted sales for over a century. Yet this amazing thing happened to Paine, who, while alive, was treated like a mad dog, and the destruction of whose books was attempted time after time by his opponents. Paine's fame is quite secure, for he has written his name too deep on history's page for it to be erased. In a generation of brave men, he was in the vanguard. He used his pen of flame not only for the democracy which might reward him, but for animals and slaves who could not. Poverty never left him, yet he made fortunes and gave them to the cause he loved. *The Rights of Man* was a brave book for any man to write, but *The Age of Reason* was the bravest book ever written, for it challenged the entire priesthood of Christendom to a duel to the death. Not only was its author threatened with damnation in this world and the alleged next, but men and women were imprisoned for selling it. Paine himself was libelled and lied about to such an extent that his very name was threatened with an immortality of infamy. Yet his was the hand that first wrote the arresting words, "the United States of America," and who declared, proudly, that "the world is my country," and "to do good is the only religion." Paine is not yet an extinct volcano. There is still need in the world for a writer who proclaims the supreme value of individual freedom and individual expression.

MIMNERMUS.

I find that Evangelical religionists are not those on whom I can rely. To whom have I naturally looked for the chief aid? Why, undoubtedly to the clergy, and especially those of the trading districts. Quite the reverse; from them I received no support, or next to none. And this throughout my whole career, I have had more aid from the medical profession than the divine profession.—Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury.

## The Little Shop in the Side Street

MR. H. G. WELLS has told us in his *Experiment in Autobiography* how, as a youth, his mind teeming with religious doubts and curiosities, he stood before "an obscure but spirited newspaper shop in a side street," and encountered, for the first time, a copy of the *Freethinker*.

Each week had a cheerful blasphemous caricature which fell in agreeably with my derisive disposition. I looked for this very eagerly, and when I could afford it I bought a copy. In regard to the religions it confirmed my worst suspicions.

Many of us know that newsagent's shop. It will bring back memories to numerous readers of this paper who were introduced to it in almost identical conditions. It would be nearly forty years ago when the writer stood outside a similar shop in the North of England and read through the window pane with some difficulty one of G. W. Foote's first page articles. It was entitled "Mother Told Me So," and, young as I was, I became at once aware of the fact that this kind of writing was not to be met with everywhere. The points startled, they were made without circumlocution, and left me hungry for what lay beyond the first page. Twopence was a grave consideration, as with Mr. Wells, but the matter seemed to warrant it. Shyness also had to be overcome, but luckily that was managed, and behind the counter was a spirited news vendor indeed. That was soon learnt, but time was to teach me more about Peter Weston. Peter was a Scot and a dour Scot. He was possessed of most of the virtues except the dubious business ones. It would surprise me to learn that he had ever experienced for an hour anything approaching to comfort in his life. But if he knew all about hunger he knew nothing of fear. He was of the stuff of martyrs—to have been the central figure in a burning would have been to him a "ground" culmination. And Peter had brains and judgment as well as passion. To feed and stimulate any Tyneside youngster who showed a "coming on" disposition was to him real work. Peter presents a first-class problem to the theist. How does the theologian explain why God in his wisdom manufactured Peter Westons and Jack Bartrams, who held it a life well spent to have done their damndest to diminish his Kingdom, his Power, and his Glory?

That day the *Freethinker* entered my life, and it has never left it. Life presses hard upon one at times, and during these times of stress things of the mind have perforce to take second place. At such times, it would get hastily scanned—I think the correct modern idiom is, "it got the once-over." But I think I have the right to claim that I have been tolerably faithful, and that I have always been genuinely appreciative. I can see clearly now, after this lapse of years, that what the *Freethinker* did for me in my teens was a very substantial service. It probably saved me from reading in an atmosphere of reverential calm, scores of ponderous works of special pleading, when, as Mr. Wells sees very clearly now, the subject was not worth the time. Foote was a cultured man, and a scholar in the best sense of the word. His scholarship had not dulled his wisdom or left him without the power of making useful generalizations. He knew that few, if any, argue themselves into religion. People are religious because of their legacy from the past (particularly from FEAR); and through the weight of their domestic, business and other associations. Foote knew that religion crouched behind seriousness, and he firmly refused to play the theologians' game. He could and did reason with the best of them when the

occasion called for it, and brought to the task a mind steeped in the world's best thought. But I think he was happiest when he was making people laugh at Religion. For he knew that wherever laughter had once entered there was little fear of another delusion, similarly based upon fear and awe, walking into the place once occupied by Christianity. To me then, the *Freethinker* served as a short cut; it got me there at the double, and looking back I cannot see that it has in any way misled me. When Mr. Wells writes, "I could as soon love a field scarecrow as those patched-up 'Persons' in the Holy Trinity," and again,

Why do people go on pretending about this Christianity? At the test of war, disease, social injustice and every real human distress, it fails—and leaves a cheated victim.

one knows enough about Mr. Wells to know that he writes this way because he thinks it is better in these matters to get his meaning over plainly and directly. At the same time I know of no other journal that would encourage anyone to write in such a fashion save the one he bought as a boy from an obscure news vendor in a London mean street, edited by a man who went to gaol for the privilege of editing it, a man who could never be made to see that the sale of ideas was but another branch of business such as the trade in bananas, soap and underwear. All you had to do was to give the public what they want, for the customer, look you, is always right!

It would have been easy for the *Freethinker* to get out of the back street on those terms. At the time H. G. Wells was wistfully turning over his coppers, a school-fellow of his was springing into prominence by offering to the great public One Pound a Week for Life for putting their brains in steep, and hazarding a guess at the amount of bullion in the Bank of England at a given date. The State stepped in and interfered—it was an illegal lottery. But Alfred Harmsworth had achieved publicity thereby, and was already "great," and following *Answers*, there came from him *Forget Me Not*, *Comic Cuts*, and a score of other journalistic successes. As Lord Northcliffe, he lined up with Selfridge and the other business houses. He raised the slogan, Give the Public What they Want. It was a straightforward device for extracting pence from the pouches of the populace. It was not, of course, the ideal of those who derived satisfaction from the thought of journalism being the Fourth Estate, and happily there are still journalists who consider that simply to give the public the ideas they clamour for is despicable. But these exceptions you will always find, have a bee in their bonnets. They will not hold that circulation is everything, and that whatever is financially remunerative is right. They are therefore unpractical, and, in an age when Ballyhoo is the only wear, negligible.

Those who wish to see the *Freethinker* prematurely heaped up on Station Bookstalls, must see clearly what it means. It means lining up with recognized journalistic procedure. Some little thought must be given to this question of What the Public Wants. The Press have thought hard upon this point, and come to quite firm conclusions. Tables of *Best Sellers* have been drawn up in order of precedence. At the head comes *Early War*. A war in a few years time it is found, does not stimulate the great public to the point of "parting." Then come such *Best Sellers* as *Crime* and *Religion* and so on. Every budding journalist knows his table as well as or better than the multiplication table. Worst Sellers need no tabulation; it is clear, for instance, that anything in the nature of sustained argument must never soil the pages of a paper wishing to live. Something for

Nothing must be freely offered. This means, on investigation, that a great deal is taken from the public, and a percentage of it returned to them. Modern Journalism is, in fact, closely allied to the business of the Commission Agent. Sport must, of course, be catered for. Writers of incredible versatility write as experts on every sport which happens to come along, write with a magnificent spirit of partisanship (loyalty is the term they prefer), and these can be relied upon to gratify any instinct (save that of sportsmanship), which will draw forth the pence. Humourists will be informed (they generally need no telling) that Religion (Best Seller No. 3) will be gratified by gibes at Science and Scientists, and the leaving alone of any popular superstitions and follies. Permissible butts for their humour will be those who object to manly sports, such as fox, hare and deer-hunting, and those who object to manly ever-eating and over-drinking. If Manchester disagree with Nottingham, the writer of an article in the London edition must have the sense to re-write his article to suit the readers of the Manchester edition, and thus prove how excellent a journalist he is. Recently, at the Dinner of the Institute of Journalists, Mr. J. B. Priestley sturdily suggested that the Union of Journalists would be well occupied in taking up the cases of those journalists who refused to write as "cads" at the editorial bidding.

These are a few of the things the *Freethinker* must do in order to rival other journalistic successes. Then, of course, the paper wouldn't be the *Freethinker* at all, which is most unfortunate. For the *Freethinker* to remain as it is, it seems inevitable therefore that it must continue to languish for a little longer, for the most part, in mean streets, sold to the mentally curious by the spirited newsagent. It will at least give them something which the journal of commerce does not and cannot give, and that is all to the good.

T.H.E.

## The Armenians and Their Cult

In pre-war days the Armenians were a widely dispersed people, and to-day they are more extensively denationalized than ever. With a population of about three millions dwelling between the Euphrates and the Kura, these sectaries formed a powerful and well-knit community. But during the World War and its sorry aftermath, the major part of the Armenians resident in Turkish Armenia were driven from their homes. Thousands perished while wandering over the mountains, while at least a myriad were massacred by their hereditary enemies. In 1921, the Armenian Republican State of Erivan in Transcaucasia became a Soviet, and remains a member of the Federated Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. An immense multitude of Armenians found an asylum in Syria, Mesopotamia and Russian Transcaucasia, as well as in Greece and Russia. While under the dominion of the Turk, many reports of their merciless treatment were published in the European press, but, although there may have been some truth in these stories of systematic murder and outrage, there are sound reasons for concluding that the Moslem was not so black as he was painted.

From prehistoric ages Armenia has been the theatre of trial and suffering. Never secure from foreign aggression, the native race was constrained by fire and famine to seek safety in flight. Religious hatred and intolerance of an internal character also conspired to make them a migrant race. During the eighth and ninth centuries many thousands settled in

Bulgaria. Centuries later, the atrocities of the Tartars under Tamerlane led to another migration to Poland and Russia, while, subsequently, there was an extensive settlement in Persia. In India there were considerable colonies in the sixteenth century, and large numbers dwell to-day in the Dutch East Indies. Also, Armenian groups exist both in London and Manchester, as well as in Paris and other capital cities. They are pre-eminently a commercial people and are, or recently were, the chief storekeepers in such centres as Tiflis and Constantinople.

Armenia forms a natural highway from East to West, and this in large measure explains the successive invasions that have laid waste the land. From the Scriptural legend the Armenians derive their belief that their country was the scene of man's creation, and they assert that on the summit of the neighbouring Mount Ararat, where Noah's Ark is supposed to have rested, the remains of that weird vessel still survive. But, owing to supernatural exclusiveness no mortal is allowed to view it. For, according to local tradition, a devout Vartabed (teacher) long since aspired to scale the mountain, and the legend runs that: "While yet far from the top drowsiness came upon him, and he awoke at the bottom in the very spot whence he had started. Another attempt resulted only in the same miraculous failure, whereupon he betook himself more fervently to prayer, and started a third time. Again he slept and awoke at the bottom. And now an angel stood before him with a fragment of the ark, as a token that his pious purpose was approved and his prayer answered. . . . The precious gift was thankfully received, and it is to this day carefully preserved as a sacred relic in the convent."

In turn dependent to Assyria and Persia it was only about 100 B.C. that Armenia became an independent State, when Mithridates in concert with the King of Armenia strove to erect an Empire in Asia Minor on the ruins of Alexander's conquests. But these ambitious endeavours were nullified by Lucullus and Pompey the Great, whose Roman veterans proved victorious in conflict. For three centuries Armenia then became a buffer state between the contending powers of Parthia and Rome.

After the proclamation of the Christian creed as the official faith of Rome, the conversion of the Armenians was merely a matter of time. The new religion appears to have been introduced into Armenia both from Syria and Cappadocia. To Gregory, a Christian missionary, is attributed the enlightenment of the heathen. By miraculous means this evangelist convinced the sinful and much-suffering King Tiridates, with the usual edifying results. After this truculent monarch had turned away from his wickedness in slaying and persecuting God's elect, 200,000 of his obedient subjects became excellent Christians. Gregory was then despatched to Caesarea for full ordination by the Greek Bishop of Cappadocia as Catholicos of Armenia.

While in the full ardour of recent conversion, the Christianized Armenians sought the salvation of the Albanians and Georgians, the fierce and sanguinary barbarians around them, and these were ultimately brought within the fold. Then the conversion of the Huns was projected, but as these predatory people took Christian professions of peace at their face value, little imagining how arrogant and pugnacious the disciples of the meek and lowly may prove in practice, they refused the proffered faith, and the missionary, another and a younger Gregory, suffered an ignominious death. But Gregory's faithful followers recovered his remains and reverently conveyed them into Albanian territory and interred them "near the church which had been built by the first Gregory,

surnamed the Great. And every year the inhabitants of the Cantons meet together to celebrate his memory and the day of his martyrdom."

Yet, in sober truth, Christianity was confronted with a serious obstacle in the older religion, and the foreign faith was compelled to compromise. Thus, the earlier rites and ceremonies were retained under new names. When the hereditary priesthood heard that the Christian deity demanded no sacrifices they inquired of the King how they were to make both ends meet if they accepted the new teaching. For, like the Hebrew ministry, these heathen priests subsisted on the remains of animals sacrificed to their gods, supplemented by other perquisites allowed them by native custom. The accommodating Gregory therefore set their minds at rest by assuring them that, when they embraced the true religion, not merely should sacrifices continue, but that their perquisites should be increased. With this satisfactory arrangement, the sacerdotal caste promptly deserted the old faith for the new, and persuaded their flocks to imitate their example.

The ancient cult of sacred stones and trees was easily transformed into cross worship. The chief goddess, Anaitis, became the Virgin Mary, and sacred spots dedicated to heathen deities now bore the names of Christian saints. Amid all the convulsions of centuries' duration the priesthood improved its position. Armenian monarchs were alternately the puppets of Greek and Persian overlords. The Huns were ever in mischief, and plundered to their hearts' content. Yet, despite all this distraction, the power of the clergy grew and, when Armenia as a political entity ceased to exist, it was around the Patriarch that the people rallied. Religion and race were regarded as identical, and any Armenian adopting another creed was, and is, a criminal of the deepest dye.

Originally practically a branch of the Greek Church, the Armenians became involved in bitter controversy concerning the nature of Christ and the Trinity, and this ended in separation. Now, both the Eastern and Western Churches are anathematized as heretical, because they "do not clearly distinguish in their Credo between the divine and the human character of Christ." In common with the Roman and Greek Churches, the Armenians have seven sacraments. But infant baptism is immediately followed by confirmation and, in accordance with the custom of the Eastern Churches, the administration of the sacrament. The priest performs this function by placing his finger in the vessel in which the bread has been soaked in wine and wetting the child's lips. When the laity receive the Eucharist the wine is not reserved, as in the Roman communion, for the priest alone. Penitence and auricular confession are customary, and during their many lengthy fasts no solid food is permitted.

In the crusading period Rome attempted the conversion of the heretical Armenians, and in 1307 the ruler of Cilicia acknowledged the authority of Boniface VIII. Then was concocted the tale that the Armenian Church had originally derived its spiritual powers from Pope Silvester in the fourth century. Many fraudulent documents were soon in circulation, which decreed the subjection of the Armenian Church to Papal authority.

At the close of the eighth century there arose a movement in Southern Armenia, which travelled to Bulgaria and later influenced religious thought throughout Europe. This more enlightened teaching was met with terrible persecution, and its martyrs numbered hundreds of thousands. So disunited became the State, when Armenian orthodoxy combined with the Greek Empire to extirpate the heresy, that

Moslem invaders soon conquered Byzantium and all its subject territories. In this so-called Paulician heresy the Jewish God was depicted as an evil divinity, while the God of Love was made manifest in Christ. Then there were the discords of iconoclasm, and the Paulicians were among the most zealous image-breakers. The conflict raged with relentless fury until 842, when, in the words of Conybeare, "a compromise was arrived at in all the Eastern Churches, Greek, Armenian and Coptic alike forbidding actual statues, but allowing pictures."

The Paulicians were the pioneers of modern Protestantism. Their tenets were adopted by the Albigenses, who became so numerous in Northern Italy and Southern France. The doctrines of the defamed Cathari were very similar. Vilified, persecuted, and almost exterminated by the Roman Inquisition, the sufferings these sectaries endured are almost inconceivable.

Armenian orthodoxy is the inveterate enemy of progress, but the opinions of the Paulicians, which resemble those of the Quakers, were destined to play a part in the mental development of later times. They rejected Mariolatry; like the Marcionites, they repudiated the Hebrew Scriptures as the product of the evil one. Even the Prophets were denounced as thieves and falsifiers. But to the Gospels and Pauline Epistles they were deeply devoted as writings of supreme value and importance. Again, the Paulicians denied the sacred character of the Eucharist, and they asserted that spiritual and not material bread and wine were given by the Redeemer to his disciples. Baptism and the worship of the crucifix were alike repudiated. Sacerdotalism they utterly condemned; as they admitted no sacrifices they needed no priests. Preachers only were permitted, and these must be clothed in ordinary attire. Of their sincerity there can be no question. A very hostile orthodox witness, Petrus Siculus, however, discerned nothing but baseness in their conduct, and he speaks of their "sending missionaries to Bulgaria to seduce the orthodox to their own damned heresy," and continues by stating that "these miscreants boldly underwent all trials and dangers in order to disseminate their doctrines." Thus do religious speculations engender peace and love.

T. F. PALMER.

## Acid Drops

A correspondent of the *Star* complains that in the trains men do not appear to be taking much interest in the King's Jubilee. But really no one need be alarmed. A very intensive advertising campaign is on foot, and although in the absence of this, the Jubilee might have passed away with the average man and woman saying, "Oh I see that King George has been King for twenty-five years? Well, as Kings go, he hasn't been at all a bad sort of chap," by May the campaign will have done its work, and the majority of the inhabitants of the country will feel somehow that if King George had not been on the throne the country would have been in ruins, and any development that has taken place ought to be placed to the credit of George the Fifth. When the Saar was voted back to Germany, General Goering announced that a "spontaneous demonstration" was being organized by the Nazi Party to celebrate the occasion.

The Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church has written Mr. Ramsay Macdonald protesting against brewer's horses being used for the Speaker's coach in the Jubilee procession on May 6. We understand that Mr. Macdonald has replied stating that in deference to the wishes of the Irish Presbyterian Church, only tectotal

horses are to be used, no beer is to be allowed the Speaker during the ride, and all advertisements of beer, bottled or draught, are to be covered up during the procession with advertisements of the National Government and its indispensability to whatever and whoever cannot exist with it.

The B.B.C. has been getting into trouble again. This time it permitted one of its entertainers to say that "He is the sort of a man who addresses a Southend audience as ladies and gentlemen." So a number of Southenders to whom humour is evidently as foreign as silver sand is to the Southend Beach. (I expect now no more *Freethinkers* will be sold in Southend) wrote complaining of the insult. One of these gentlemen wrote explaining that it was an insult, because (1) Southend had the second largest residential population in the United Kingdom, (2) It has a rateable value of £1,300,000 (3) It has 20,000 season ticket-holders (4) It has land valued at £10 a foot frontage, and at £30 close to the sea. Now this is indisputable evidence that Southenders are all ladies and gentlemen. What they will be if the figures are doubled, the Lord only knows! Visitors will then be expected to travel down the High Street "on the knee" as a mark of their respect for a town which has the marks of fine character indicated by the above figures.

Dr. A. J. Macdonald, the Rector of St. Dunstan-in-the-West, Fleet Street, is, we note, a whole-hearted admirer of Hitler. The great German *Fuhrer's* magnificent devotion to religion is one of the strongest points of his character to which Dr. Macdonald gives his fullest support. As thus:—

Hitler is the first great revolutionary leader to maintain the Christian religion as an aid to his policy. He saw as clearly as any experienced parson, that without religion there can be no social morality, no lofty political idealism, no effective reform. So he concluded a concordat with the Vatican, and attempted to secure the co-operation of a united Evangelical Church in Germany.

Some hopes!

But there are quite a number of other marvels all united in (Our Lord) Hitler and Dr. Macdonald gives his pen the fullest scope in praise. "Indeed," cries the Rector, "so consistent has been the achievement of this remarkable man, that the time has come when the British nation, famous for fair-minded treatment of others, should extend to him unqualified approval and trust." The way in which Hitler and his devoted followers have treated the Jews—not, it may be mentioned in passing, the ordinary Jewish business man or tailor or common worker alone—but some of those who stand out pre-eminent in science, music, literature, medicine, and art, which surely are international, commands Dr. Macdonald's profoundest admiration. It is such "lofty political idealism." And the same may be said of those Germans against whom there was merely the faintest suspicion of Socialism or Communism—where they have not been murdered they have suffered the foulest and most brutal treatment in concentration camps. But "religion" covers a multitude of sins.

The Religious Tract Society intends to be quite up-to-date. It has published a booklet, entitled *The Cinema for Christ*, which "gives a list of suitable reels for missionary service." One can obtain a film called *Christus*, which gives the life of "Our Lord" in three reels; and there are also reels dealing with equally authentic Old Testament "history." If to these were only added the "living" voice of "Our Lord," we cannot see how any hardened sinner could persist in his unbelief. What about a few prayers to the Saviour asking him to blot out all but genuine Christian films?

The *Sunday Graphic* was hardly kind last Sunday to its contributor, the Bishop of London, or indeed just to

the intelligence of mankind. In the middle of the Bishop's article was sandwiched (in what printers call a "box") a quotation from the Rev. R. D. Canadine, who said "Many people get their idea of God from the claptrap in the Sunday papers." Certainly the Bishop's article was "claptrap" and was in a Sunday paper. But nobody ever got any "ideas" from it! One did however get an impression that the Bishop had delegated a moron of six years old to write his article for him. Here is an "anecdote" characteristic of its "arguments":—

I remember a story told me by a retired colonel. There was a young officer who from time to time in the mess-room used to break out into vehement attacks on the credibility of the Bible.

"I found out soon, however," said the colonel, "that these attacks always occurred on certain mornings, and instead of arguing I used to ask the apparently irrelevant question: 'Where were you, sir, last night?'"

This is not the first time the Bishop of London has told this piece of truly Christian blackguardism. It is as true as the bulk of the tales that the Bishop has been repeating concerning his experience with Atheists in the East End of London. Winnington Ingram's tales about unbelievers are characteristic of the man. Most parsons with any pretention to intelligence and regard for truthfulness would be ashamed of them. But they are good enough for the Bishop of London.

The steeple of the Streatham Methodist Church is said to be in danger of crumbling to dust, and has been "put in splints." It is not a pretty sight, but at least it suggests that the exterior of some of the churches can be subjected to architectural surgery. An operation of mental surgery inside the church might be tried sometimes—unless an explosion is feared.

There have been great doings at the Methodist Hall at Highgate. Jack Hulbert and Mickie Mouse on the screen, and the Rev. Charlie Hulton and Gipsy Smith doing the ordinary stunts on the platform. There was present "a Russian lady who was a refugee," and was even now "inclined to agnosticism." Mickie Mouse seems to have converted her, for the *Recorder* claims that "as soon as the service began she said 'When that man prays I feel he has God with him.'" And after sermons, prayers, "commandments" and pictures were all over, "Mr. Broadbent sang 'Jesus gave her water.'" Well, well!

The process of "debunking" dead heroes usually consisted of finding spots in the fairest sun. Prof. Findlay reverses the procedure. He is determined to prove that Mary Magdalene was not (to use a euphemism) "one of those." The Professor says "The use of the term 'Magdalen Hospital' for a home for fallen women involves a libel upon a dear woman friend of Jesus, and ought to be given up." But, surely, this very superior Professor cannot mean that we must go so far as to "give up" the idea, based on the scriptures, that Jesus was the "friend of sinners." Or is it allowable for "Our Lord" to have been the friend of male sinners, but never by any chance the friend of a lady sinner?

Canon Talbot Easter asked the Church Assembly, the other week, "to consider the production and presentation of films definitely in the interests of Christian morality and religious teaching. The cinema had converting power, and his desire was the capture of its influence for Christ and his Church." Canon Easter also suggested that "his proposed committee might co-ordinate resources in the censorship of the films." We think the best thing would be to hand over the whole film industry *en bloc* to the church—or rather, the Churches. A committee, consisting of Mr. Hilaire Belloc, General Eva Booth, a staunch disciple of Johanna Southcote, the Head of the Catholic Apostolic Church, the Bishop of London, Mr. Athlestone Riley, whoever represents

Mrs. Eddy, a sound Calvinistic divine, and any other members of the remaining churches and sects of Christianity, should be given full power to produce films entirely in the interests of Christ. Nothing else ought to be allowed. And if the public don't want to be "uplifted" this way—well, hark back to that good old Christian way—"compel 'em to come in!"

Dr. Nicholas Butler, the President of Columbia University of New York, has stated that the "tax-supported schools of America were ruining religion." Though he admitted that "the separation of Church and State" was fundamental to the United States,

yet so far as religious instruction is concerned, this principle has long been departed from in practice as to put the whole force and influence of the tax-supported school on the side of one element of the population, namely, that which is pagan and believes in no religion whatsoever. The Courts held that even to mention God in a tax-supported school is to teach a sectarian tenet.

And to complete his woe, Dr. Butler added that "in America to-day, despite statistical statements, the Church, at least as represented by Protestant churches, is falling behind year by year." All this is splendid, and shows how Secularism is invading the religious world and *conquering*.

A very clear example of the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas is given by a correspondent to a Church paper. It should appeal most particularly to those "rank and file" Christians who get "hot and bothered" when asked to explain exactly what "Human and Divine" in conjunction mean. Here it is:—

Since the soul of Christ is a part of human nature, it cannot possibly have omnipotence. By union with the Person, the Man receives omnipotence in time, which the Son of God had from eternity; the result of which union is that as the Man is said to be God, so he is said to be omnipotent; not that the omnipotence of the Man is distinct (as neither is his Godhead) from that of the Son of God, but because there is one Person of God and Man.

We have nothing but contempt for any Christian, who, after mastering that marvellous and precious example of great theology, is still "flummoxed." But what exactly does it mean?

All does not seem too well for Christianity, even in our Universities. The other day, in Cambridge, the Dean of Wells preached—according to a pious reporter—a most "inspiring sermon," on the right approach towards unity. The attendance, we are told, "at the University sermons is usually quite lamentable in view of the almost consistently high standard of preaching." Well, the *preaching* may be quite good, but what about the *matter*? Are University students expected to believe the supernatural basis of Christianity, and believe what they are taught of science at the same time? We venture to say that the more one is taught philosophy, history and science in our Universities, the less one believes in religion; and therefore there ought to be no surprise at the "lamentable" attendances at sermons whenever is the preacher.

Canon Deane has written a book—it would be quite impossible to count how many have been written on the same theme, and still they come and will continue to come—on *The Valley and Beyond*. He examines the evidence for the Resurrection, which he claims "immensely strengthens the instinctive hope of mankind," whatever that means. It seems that there are three reasons why the Resurrection took place. The early Christians believed it literally. The trained sense of a man familiar with life and letters "assures him that the gospel narratives ring true." And, thirdly, there is the moral and spiritual test—that is, that "Our Lord Himself" speaks with confident authority about eternal life. One has only to put these three "proofs" down in

cold print to see their utter inadequacy to prove anything except the hopeless and stupid credulity, not only of the early Christians, but of the modern ones—who, at least have not the same excuse of crass ignorance.

Dr. Oldham, the Secretary of the International Missionary Council, suggests that "the Church ought to consider the dangerous possibilities of modern inventions." For example, in the hands of a "definitely unreligious Government," the wireless could be used "as a most formidable enemy of Christianity," not to propagate Atheism exactly, but by showing that "religion is of no interest whatever except to half-wits," and therefore could be utterly ignored. Well, why not? Isn't it true? In any case, the Church has almost gobbled up the wireless in its own interests now, and is too frightened to allow anything from the other side to be broadcasted. Would Dr. Oldham meet "over the air," a militant Atheist in debate? Would not such a proposal cause Sir John Reith and his religious followers almost to faint in sheer horror?

"A Ministerial Parent" writes to the *British Weekly* complaining that at many Free Church Schools "boys are permitted, it might almost be said encouraged, to indulge in rigger games, fives, roller-skating, etc., on Sunday afternoons." How terrible! And these students are "sons and daughters of office-bearers in our churches," to whom "the Fourth Commandment is a dead letter. For them the Son of Man has no Lordship over the Sabbath." The correspondent's remedy is the old one—"compulsory discipline." And yet he pathetically adds, "This is no plea for the making of priggish saints," but what other result can this parent foresee?

Mark Twain tells us of his amusing misadventures when editing an ordinary agricultural newspaper. He would be interested in the announcement that a new weekly is to appear, called *The Christian Farmer*. We shall study with pleasure, if not with profit, the Advice Column, where no doubt the Bishop of London will write about asparagus, and Dean Kitchen on spring onions. We presume no plants will be allowed to grow on the Sabbath Day. The main feature will be the sort of prayer most suitable for eliminating worms and the usual garden pests, to say nothing of prayers for different weathers for various crops in the same garden. All the same we still think the right kind of manure is much more important than any prayers.

The "village Atheist" of a century ago constantly produced proofs that Peter and Paul and other inspired apostles and writers always contradicted one another. The Rev. Professor W. D. Niven, in a *British Weekly* article, incidentally refers to "Canon Bigg's learned work" on Peter and Jude, in the "International Commentary Series" as "of course outstanding and no scholar will be without it." Canon Bigg, he says, "finds Petrinism radically different from, if not antithetic to Paulinism." The main difference between the uncultured Atheist of long ago, and the "scholarly divine" of to-day is that the Atheist spoke better English and made himself understood by his hearers.

Discussions about the dogma of the "Virgin Birth" continue to amuse the readers of the *Methodist Recorder*. We have much sympathy for the indignation, if none for the intelligence of the many who protest against this silly and hackneyed miracle being relegated to the dustheap where it belongs. There is much to be said for the views of the Rev. Dr. E. J. B. Kirtlan who writes that if he disbelieved this particular story he would reject all the rest of the creed of Christianity. But he does not seem aware that most of the other religions of the world tell exactly the same—story, let us call it. Mr. Kirtlan, in his eager, childish credulity cannot possibly intend to embrace all the other religions too, as would seem to be the logic of his insistence on the truth of this testing tale.

# THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE.

EDITORIAL:

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

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

R. BAXTER.—“Emergent evolution” is a strictly scientific conception. It is an extension of the plain fact that when two substances are combined there emerges a product that is not identical with either of the constituents. The strictly materialistic statement that mental phenomena is an outcome of physical, chemical and biological factors is an example of what is meant by “emergence.” You have been confusing scientific “emergence” with the ordinary dictionary description of a man emerging from a doorway, or a fish emerging from the water.

“PUZZLED.”—What does it matter whether or not someone existed around whom the New Testament legends gathered? If the Jesus of the New Testament never existed nothing else matters—so far as Christianity is concerned. This clinging to a name after the actuality has departed is a first-rate example of muddled thinking and a moral timidity that lacks even the courage to confess itself.

S. RICHARDS.—You are mistaken. Mr. Cohen never debated with the person mentioned. Neither did he challenge him to debate, nor did he ever challenge Mr. Cohen to debate. In fact Mr. Cohen, in the whole of his forty-five years’ work on the Freethought platform, has never challenged anyone to debate, and does not intend to alter his policy in this respect.

A. HEPWORTH.—We saw Sir Ben Turner’s reference to the late Mr. Jessop. To call him a “true Christian,” is one of those examples of bad taste and bad manners that Christianity so often leads a man into displaying. How often was Bradlaugh insulted by being told that he was a true Christian without knowing it?

C. F. RUDGE.—You have overlooked the word “records” in the passage cited. And many customs exist that go back beyond the recorded history. But human society does not begin with its records.

N. WILLIAMS.—No one dislikes Roman Catholicism and Fascism more than we do, but we would fight for both getting a fair hearing. I know of no one who will not howl for freedom for himself.

H.C.—Regret to learn that you have been unwell. We missed you at the dinner, but shall hope to meet you soon.

H. J. HEWER.—Thanks for your very generous opinion. We shall be publishing a brief note on Mr. Mann by his son.

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

## Sugar Plums

To-day (March 3) Mr. Cohen lectures in the King Edward Hall, Church End, Finchley. He is taking for his subject, “How Science Explains Religion,” and it will be the last lecture Mr. Cohen will deliver in London this season. King Edward Hall is in Regent’s Park Road, Church End, Finchley, which may be reached from various points. From Golder’s Green Station a No. 2 Bus to Hendon Lane, Church End, or any tram to North Finchley or Tally Ho Corner. From London Bridge a 143 Bus to Church End, Finchley. There are L.N.E.R. connexions at King’s Cross and Finsbury Park Stations for Church End, Finchley Station. The meeting commences at 7 p.m., and admission is free.

In spite of the bad weather of Sunday last at Liverpool the Picton Hall was well filled for Mr. Cohen’s lecture, and no speaker could have had a more attentive and interested audience. There were a few questions at the end, and all went out into the rain in excellent humour. Mr. Shortt occupied the chair, and we hope that his appeal for members and general support met with the response it deserved. There was, we believe, a good sale of literature.

The Dinner on the Saturday evening was a very pleasant gathering, and the speeches were much enjoyed by all. Quite an unexpected vein of humour developed, and it was evident by the remarks of the speakers that the members have developed the art of going for each other with perfect good humour. That is as it should be. No body of men can always be without differences, but when they are discussed with perfect confidence in each other the strongest form of union is the result.

The new edition of Colonel Ingersoll’s *Rome or Reason?* is now ready, and we strongly commend it as one of the finest propagandist pamphlets published. No more complete exposure of the claims of the Roman Church exists, and, as is to be expected, the case as stated goes beyond the Roman Church. It affects all churches. But bearing in mind the increasing threat the Roman Church offers to all liberal views the circulation of this booklet is a useful piece of propaganda. The work is issued by the Secular Society, Limited, at the price of threepence, postage 1d. It can be ordered through all newsagents or from any railway bookstall. Needless to say the work is published at a loss, but the loss incurred by the Secular Society is small compared with the cost it is to the Roman Church.

We have been asked what is the attitude of the N.S.S. and the *Freethinker* towards the question of the teaching of religion in schools. That should have been quite well-known by this time, but it will bear restatement. The N.S.S. stands for the complete secularization of the State. This involves the exclusion of religious tests and ceremonies from all State and municipal institutions, and from all State-supported schools. Religious instruction should be left to those who desire their children to have it, but in their own way and at their own cost. If church and chapel-goers wish their children to be taught religion, no genuine Freethinker desires to interfere with them. But it is another thing when these religious folk insist on the State providing such instruction.

Unfortunately we have in this country a dual system under which one set of schools is wholly provided by the State, and another class of schools which are maintained for the purpose of denominational religion but which are subsidized by the State on account of the secular instruction given. So long as the State does not provide the whole of the schools, this system of definite religious instruction will continue in the non-provided schools. The proper and the just plan would be for the State to provide the whole of the schools, and restrict the teaching given therein to secular subjects. Those who wish their children to have religious instruction should be

left, unmolested and unpenalized, to provide it in their own way.

One final point to remember, and one that is too often forgotten, is that religious instruction in the provided schools is permissive, it is not compulsory. Any Council may decide on abolishing religious instruction. If we can make enough Freethinkers in any constituency to return a majority of members pledged to the policy of secular education, religious teaching could be dispensed with. That is another reason for working hard to make Freethinkers.

The Leicester Secular Society celebrates the 54th anniversary of the opening of its hall to-day (March 3). The meeting is a special one, and Mr. Joseph McCabe will be one of the speakers.

On Sunday next (March 10) Mr. Cohen will speak in the Secular Hall, Humblestone Gate, Leicester. The lecture will commence at 6.30.

The Birkenhead Branch N.S.S. can look forward with every confidence to Mr. G. Bedborough's first visit when he speaks in the Boilermakers' Hall, Argyle Street, Birkenhead, to-day (Sunday) on "Is Religion any Benefit to Mankind?" If the local saints will fill the hall, Mr. Bedborough's pleasant manner and wit will add the remaining factor necessary for a successful evening. The lecture begins at 7 p.m.

## More About Marcus

(Concluded from page 125)

FROM the fourth letter we learn that Marcus did come to Formiæ. Therein he says that he re-read at the Formian Villa, the letter in which Faustina had urged him to treat the accomplices of Cassius with great severity. The word here used by him does not necessarily imply that he got the letter before coming to Formiæ, and read it again in that city, for an alternative signification exists, to wit, that he got it there, and read it then more than once, in order to give it due consideration. What happened next is not described.

We are left to suppose that Marcus, whilst still at Formiæ, was met by his wife and daughters, and that he took them all back with him when he departed to rejoin the army. Almost close to Formiæ was the fine harbour of Caieta, and from here the party could easily take ship for some port near the spot where the army had orders to await the emperor. From other sources, however, we learn that somewhat later in the year, when on the way to Syria with Marcus and his army, Faustina died at Halala, a village of Lycia, at the foot of the Taurus range. In this connexion it is worth recording that in the third of the above letters, she complains of her ill-health at a time which would not be many weeks before her death. The foregoing remarks offer a reasonable explanation of how it comes to pass that the visit of Marcus to Italy, which is mentioned in the last of these four letters, is not elsewhere recorded.

We have now to face a contention that the four letters display features and make references which bring their authenticity into suspicion.

1. There is the pun on the name of Verus (*Verum*—*verum*. Verus—verity), which occurs in the first letter, and which is censured as unworthy of Marcus both as regards the gravity of his character and the dignity of his position. But the letters of Marcus to Fronto contain various puns, and even his *Meditations* occasionally exhibit a play upon words. If it be urged that the event dealt with in the letter was far too grave for the writer to make it the subject of a

pun, I will adduce Shakespeare, whose personages, even great monarchs, show no such scruples; besides which it must be remembered that Marcus was desiring to reassure one whom he loved, and who was intimately acquainted with the playful tenderness which irradiates many epistles indisputably from his pen.

2. There is the use of the word *rebelliones* in the first of Faustina's two letters. This term does not occur in works written before the age of Diocletianus (284-305), whom Gallicanus addresses in the book which contains the aforesaid letter. It is, however, an unquestionable fact that the material necessary for tracing the history of the Latin words used in the second and third centuries is very inadequate for the purpose. A great many works have perished,<sup>10</sup> and very few have survived. Hence it is quite possible as regards works of this period that a term which after once occurring does not occur again for a good while may yet have occurred more or less frequently in the meantime. It should also be recalled that new words, and new meanings of old words, are often used in ordinary conversation and in familiar writings long before being used in formal speeches and in regular works.

3. There is the quotation from Horace in the last of the two letters from Marcus. Regarding this it is contended that as Marcus had once said that to him Horace was dead,<sup>11</sup> he would not be likely to quote anything which Horace had written. But thirty years elapsed between the time when Marcus in his youth discarded Horace, and the time when in his maturity he is said to have quoted him on the above occasion. Such changes of taste are by no means rare, and besides this Horace was a poet whom a person with the temperament of Marcus could not be expected to appreciate before the passing years had afforded him a fuller knowledge of human life. Finally, the poem from which the lines were taken was one very unlikely to have escaped the memory of Marcus, whilst the lines themselves breathe a sentiment peculiarly appealing to his religious mind.

4. In her second letter, Faustina mentions a man named Celsus as having rebelled against her father, Titus Antoninus. The fact that no rebel of this name is referred to in this connexion increases the doubts of some critics as to the authenticity of the present correspondence. But although the reign of Titus Antoninus is very briefly reported, yet there is mention of two rebellions as having therein occurred. The rebels named are Attilius Tatianus, and a certain Priscianus,<sup>12</sup> who perhaps had Celsus for his other name.

5. In her second letter, Faustina also makes use of the term *puella* in describing her daughter Fadilla with respect to age. It is said—I know not on what authority—that Fadilla, at the date of this missive, was twenty-five years old, and thence it is argued that she had passed the time of life wherein the description *puella* could be given her with accuracy. But, although *puella* often means "a young girl," yet Horace, and other good authors use it for "a young woman," or "a young wife."<sup>13</sup> Besides this, Fadilla's mother, when terming her *puella*, qualifies the word by adding *virgo* to it in apposition, which she

<sup>10</sup> Fl. Legay in his preface to Panckoucke's edition of Spartianus cites from Schoell's *Latin Literature* a list of twenty-seven authors, who within the above period, from the time of Septimus Severus onwards, had, like that emperor, courted the Muse of History in lucubrations now completely lost. The other Muses during that age had many no less ardent wooers whose tributes have likewise vanished.

<sup>11</sup> Naber's Fronto (Leipzig, 1867) p. 34.

<sup>12</sup> Cap. Ant. p. 7.

<sup>13</sup> See the examples in Andrew's *Latin-English Lexicon*.

would never have done if Fadilla were then below nubility, but which she would have been very likely to do if Fadilla had already reached that state, and, more so still, if she had got into it several years previously.

6. In his second letter Marcus tells Faustina that he has designated their son-in-law, Pompeianus to be consul for the following year. The fact that Pompeianus does not appear on the consular list under the year in question, may be explained by the theory, that he was unable to become consul at that time in consequence of ill-health or some other hindrance. The matter, however, presents far greater difficulty. For Gallicanus adduces what he affirms to have been the letter which Marcus wrote to the Senate about the treatment of the Cassian conspirators; and, at the beginning of this letter, Marcus, after saying that he has designated Pompeianus to the consulate, goes on to say that the age of Pompeianus would long ago have been thus "remunerated," but for the intervening number of able men, upon whom the office had had to be bestowed in payment of the debt owed to them by the State. These words would make it appear as if Pompeianus was now being made consul for the first time, whereas he had already been consul on two occasions since his marriage to Lucilla, daughter of Marcus.<sup>14</sup> The first of these consulates was probably a substitutionary one in 169, date of his marriage to the emperor's daughter, whilst the second is known to have been an ordinary one continuing throughout the year 173.<sup>15</sup> Between the end of 169 and the beginning of 173, Pompeianus was much occupied with military service under Marcus in the second Germanic War. The point of importance is that as the senators in 175 would all know that Pompeianus had been consul in 173, and also in a still earlier year, it would be impossible to Marcus, who had appointed him on both these occasions, to tell the Senate in 175 that Pompeianus was then getting the consulate for the first time. This fact has caused the authenticity of the present letter to be firmly denied, and by implication it has thrown discredit upon the other four letters, the last of which mentions the same designation of Pompeianus to the consulate. The difficulty, however, can be met by the theory, that the letter as it now stands is not in its original form, the short part about Pompeianus having been prefixed to the long part about the Cassian conspirators. The reference to Pompeianus, if it occurred in a speech or a letter dating from his first designation to the consulate would be quite accurate, whereas in its present position it is obviously false. Every student of the Synoptic Gospels knows that remarks attributed in any of these three works to two or more different occasions are often referred in another to one and the same occasion. The writers of the *Historia Augusta* bear no slight resemblance to the Synoptic Evangelists, and the missive before us appears to be an example in point.

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

<sup>14</sup> Cap. M. Ant. 7.

<sup>15</sup> Liebenham's *Fasli*, p. 24.

The Church of England was, in the view of James II., a passive victim, which he might without danger, outrage and torture at his pleasure; nor did he ever see his error till the universities were preparing to coin their plate for the purpose of supplying the military chest of his enemies, and till a bishop, long renowned for loyalty, had thrown aside his cassock, girt on a sword and taken the command of a regiment of insurgents.—*Macaulay*.

## Pre-War Germany and Religion

GERMANY and England were the two pillars of "the great truths of the Reformation." During the Franco-Prussian War the clergy here strongly emphasized the moral superiority of the Germans and their piety. Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, M.A., a Presbyterian, said that a considerable proportion of the population of France had ceased to believe in Christ—"it is God who has weighed her and found her wanting" (*Words About the War*, 1870, p. 60). This utterance is typical of the English attitude at the time. France was then an "infidel" country, and after the complete secularization of the schools her moral degeneracy could hardly be talked about in decent society in England. As recently as 1912—two years before the Great War—the Hon. Mrs. E. M. Gell, in her book on *The Menace of Secularism*, has no word of censure for anything German, but declares that "the results in France of banishing religion from the schools," had wrought disaster on the moral life of the community (pp. 54-5).

In view of the dire effects of Atheism and the Higher Criticism on German national character, it is interesting to note how largely Christian apologists in England were dependent on German writers for the means of combating Freethought. During the decades 1870-1890, the English translations of C. F. Luthardt's *Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truth of Christianity*, and Theodore Christlieb's *The Best Methods of Counteracting Modern Infidelity*, were considered masterpieces of popular apologetic, and very frequently quoted.

Here are some pre-war references by the English clergy to the strength of the religious sentiment in the German people, and particularly to the care and attention given to religious instruction in the schools:—

From a speech delivered in 1873, by James Fraser, Bishop of Manchester, under the auspices of the National Education Union:—

Further, I desire you to remember that the most perfect national system in the world—the German—is distinctly religious, and entirely denominational. Mixed schools are almost unknown. The clergyman, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, is at once manager, inspector, and teacher of the school. . . . The religious education in the public schools is under the guidance of the respective religious bodies.

In the same year, the Rev. J. H. Rigg, D.D., a well-known Nonconformist, wrote:—

The Church and the School have, since the Reformation, been indissolubly associated. For three centuries this has been the case, not only as respects Protestant, but Roman Catholic Germany. To this day the rule is that wherever possible, the fact is that almost everywhere, the school in Germany is associated with the Church and congregation. (*National Education*, p. 197.)

Capon W. H. Freemantle, of Canterbury, in 1888, in a sermon on "The Maintenance of the Faith," referring to other Protestant countries, and especially to Germany, said:—

The Protestants abroad and at home love Christ as we do; they hold the faith as earnestly, they work as successfully.

The Rev. Bernard Reynolds, Prebendary of St. Paul's, having vigorously criticized the attitude of the French Government on the question of religion in the schools, adds:—

In Germany religious instruction is given in all State Schools. Ethical teaching is recognized as a substitute for dogmatic theology, but no child is excused from all religious or moral training. The

system does credit to the country, but in practice it produces some anomalies. (*National Education*, 1901, edited by L. Magnus, p. 46).

Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., now his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote in 1906:—

The teaching of the school will lose half its value unless from first to last it is a preparation for the life of the Church. The Germans, the masters of educational method, are in this respect, as in so many others, wiser than we are. The State in Germany expressly declares that the object of all the religious teaching in its schools should be to lead the child to identify itself with the life of some religious body. (*The Principles of Religious Education*, p. 26).

The Rev. A. F. Mitchell, in his book, *How to teach the Bible* (1906) seems to agree with Matthew Arnold that the free criticism of the Bible in German schools had "excellent results." He strongly recommends Dobschuetz's *Christian Life in the Primitive Church* to "all who are concerned in religious education." (p. 95 and 113).

Recently, in England, the Higher Criticism has been held partly responsible for the "moral degeneration" of the German people. It is interesting to note that the Rev. G. C. Bell, M.A., in 1898, knew of cases in which a study of the Higher Criticism had removed perplexities, and led to fresh admiration of the Hebrew Scriptures. (*Religious Teaching in Secondary Schools*, Preface). Professor Fritz Hommel, of Munich, wrote *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition* as "a protest against the modern school of Old Testament criticism." This book was translated into English by the Rev. Edmund McClure, M.A., Hon. Canon of Bristol, and Mr. L. Crosslé. The former, writing in 1914, speaks of Professor Ruckert as "emphasizing the transcendence of Spirit," and "making religion, and especially the Christian religion, the most important consideration for humanity." (*Modern Substitutes for Traditional Christianity*, pp. 4, 5). In *Germany's War-Inspirers*, however, published the same year, he says that the mind of the nation had become "filled with war-ideals," and that Nietzsche and Treitschke contributed largely to the creation of these ideals. What is the value of a religious faith as the sustainer of the "spiritual life" if, occupying a privileged position in the national education for decades, it cannot hold its own against a Nietzsche and a Treitschke?

The extracts given above should be read in the light of the clerical utterances to be found in Mr. Bedborough's *Arms and the Clergy*. But emphasis on the privileges accorded to Church and pastor in the German schools was not confined to the English clergy. Mr. R. E. Hughes, M.A., B.Sc., wrote in 1902:—

The power of the clergy, indeed, over the school is so great as to be one of the most serious grievances of the German teacher. The teacher complains of their unsympathetic attitude, their power of writing unfair and private reports to Government officials, thereby seriously prejudicing his chance of promotion, and their abuse of their position for furthering the interests of the Church—favouring teachers who are good church-goers, fatiguing the children with early church services before morning school, etc. (*The Making of Citizens*, pp. 66-7).

Mr. T. C. Horsfall, of Macclesfield, devoted considerable attention to the question of religious instruction in our own schools. He says that the religious instruction in the German school has "failed to influence for good a large proportion of the mass of the people"; but he leaves no room for doubt as to the importance attached to this subject in Germany:—

It is a principle accepted by the Prussians and all the other German Governments, that every religious association has a right to demand that the elementary school shall so train the children of its members that at the close of their school-life they shall be able to take part intelligently in the life of their Church. . . . The clergy, both of the Protestant and of the Roman Catholic Church, take a very large part in the supervision of the elementary school system. (*Professor Rein's System of Religious Instruction for Schools*, 1905, pp. 6-7).

Our modern English defenders of "the great principles of the Reformation" might even have strengthened their case by pointing out that in pre-war Germany there was a vigorous agitation for compulsory religious education in the evening Continuation Schools, and that for a time such instruction was actually given in some of these schools.

X.

## Genesis In New Guinea

The Story of Eden as told in Pidgin English.

In New Guinea the missionaries resort to pidgin English. An American traveller to that Island recently received permission from one of the missionaries to make an exact copy, to which the following glossary is supplied:—

Saccac : Sago.  
Kumara : A kind of sweet potato.  
Kaikai : Food; to eat.  
Along : To.  
Scrap : Scrape, scratch.  
Mary : Wife, woman.  
Two folla : Together, with, two.  
Sinake : Snake.  
Sipoon : Spoon.  
Seleep : Sleep.  
Boekis : Box.  
Banis : Fence.

Here is the story:—

Long time before, long long time before you me fella come up, one big fella Master he stop. Him he big fella Master too much. Him he Master belong all. Name belong him God. Now God he make him big fella garden belong him. He plant him plenty taro, plenty saccac, kumara, altogether plenty good fella kaikai. Now God he got no man belong lookout in garden belong him. Bimby he find him one fella man. Name belong him Adam. God he bring his Adam along garden, now he speak allasame : Adam, you savvy me, me God. Now me, me give him big fella garden along you. This fella garden he got plenty good fella kaikai. Work belong you. You look out him good. Now God he go.

Now Adam he walk about along garden all a time. He walk about, tassall. Him no savvy kaikai. He allasame sick. Now God, he look him Adam, him he no savvy fashion belong this fella man. He scrap his head belong him. Now he think strong too much. Now bimby he speak : Ah, no savvy along Adam, him he like him Mary.

Now God he make him Adam seleep, now he take away one fella bone belong him, now he make him one fella Mary along bone. Bimby Adam he got up again. he look him this fella Mary, now he speak : What name? Now God he speak : This fella Mary belong you, name belong him he Eve. You two fella you stop one time along garden. He got plenty something, enough along you two fella. Das all, this fella garden he got one fella fruit, he tambu along you two fella. You no kaikai this fella apple. Suppose you kaikai this fella, me cross plenty too much.

Now Adam two fella Eve he step along garden. Altogether he number one too much.

Now along one fella day Eve he sit down underneath one fella tree. Now one fella sinake he come up now he speak all allasame along Eve : What for you fella you no kaikai apple? Now Eve he speak : What name you no savvy this fella something he tambu along God. Now

snake he speak : Ah, God he gammon, he no look him you.

Now Eve he come up along Adam, now he speak allasame along him. Adam I think more good fella along me good fella try this fella apple. Adam he cross, he speak allasame : No can, this fella apple tambu along God.

Now allatime Eve he talk, talk, talk along this fella something, allatime he cross along Adam. Allasame boy now Mary. Adam he no like him Mary, he cross allatime. Head belong him he pain along this fella talk.

Now Eve he come up along Adam again, he speak : What for me two fella me no kaikai this fella apple? You no like me, eh? Adam he speak : Yes, me like him you plenty too much. Dasall me fraid along God. Now Eve he speak : Ah God he gammon, he no can look him me two fella. I think more good me two fella kaikai. Now Adam he speak : Alright! Now two fella Adam now Eve he kaikai plenty too much. Now two fella he run kaikai finish he fraid along God. Now two fella he run away, he run away now hide along bush.

Now God he cross too much. He come up along garden, now he sing out strong too much : Adam!

Adam he no speak.

Now God sing out strong fella more : Adam!

Now Adam he fraid too much he speak : Yes, Sir.

God he speak : You no hear him me sing out?

Adam he speak : He seleep too much, Master.

God he speak : You kaikai this fella apple?

Adam he speak : Ah, what name?

Now God he cross he speak : You fella kaikai?

Now Adam he speak : Yes, Master, me two fella

kaikai plenty too much.

Now God he cross too much, he speak : What

for you no hear him good talk belong me?

He talk you no kaikai this fella fruit. Now you no hear him. Alright. You two fella Eve you

catch him bockis, blanket, sipoon now altogether something belong you. Now you rouse along garden. You get to hell along bush!

Now God he make him big fella banis along garden

now he catch him plenty police boy, now he give him musket along altogether, now he speak allasame along

police boy : You fella, you hear him me talk belong you.

Suppose him two fella Adam and Eve he like come back along garden, you fella must rouse him. Suppose he no like go, you shoot him along musket belong you!

From "The New York Times Magazine."

## Correspondence

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER."

### CHASING SHADOWS

SIR,—Because I believe in substance I have a trace of theology. By similar reasoning, or lack of it, I might say the same of you, because you believe in experience. However, I prefer argument, e.g., you say "permanent possibility" may be taken as "permanent actuality" of sensation. So that in pre-living times, according to you, matter was sensed actually, and as there was no human or living organism to do it, you are obliged to posit some Mind (like Jeans's) whose sensations give the universe existence. It is thus your own theory, sir, which leaves room for a God.

And what is the way out? Either (1) to deny the existence of matter before the evolution of sense-organs, (2) to grant something which is not exhausted by sense-effects, or (3) to become an Idealist. The first is to be blind to science, and the others surrender your whole case. That the 3-horned dilemma is a genuine one is shown by your repeated assurances that when we take away sense-effects there is nothing left, and I demonstrated that sense-effects only make the phenomenon an object; that they do not affect its existence in substance.

You say, you have trouble in trying to think of a substance unlike anything known. Spare yourself the pains, Sir, for I offered (as near as physics gets as yet) electrons and protons, as facts of experience. But you say this is

not true (par. 5), and that electrons are only *conceptions*. Very well; you are now, I suggest, deeper in the hole than ever, for you must now believe that a conception can be weighed. Yes, besides having mass and size, an electron has weight, and a proton is approx. 1,845 times as heavy as it.

Instead of the rejoinder reading as an answer to my article the article often reads as an answer to the rejoinder, e.g., you persist in saying weight and other qualities are "affections of the organism," and the article says qualities and their perceptions are not the same, i.e., the organism *perceives* weight; it does not create it; it *feels* hot, does not *cause* the heat. So far from being organic affections, heat is molecular movement; weight is gravitational pull. But as you played heartily on the word "pull," and utterly demolished a position I had not even mentioned, much less affirmed, I had better substitute "attraction."

Then, once again, you accuse Bradlaugh of "positing an existence apart from modes" (par. 3), whereas Bradlaugh emphatically repeated (e.g., in the Lawson letters) that he *did not* separate them.

You acknowledge that some non-Materialists hold Determinism, but fail to see that any rejection of their philosophy carries with it affirmations which overstep Determinism, since the latter is common ground.

Finally, you charge us critics with not understanding you, but the position you are defending is not original, having been held by other writers, who have been understood. Others see difficulties in your philosophy, e.g., Medicus, but his objections re the time factor in causation are overruled by Einsteinian space-time units which replace fixed point-instants by mobile events, with quanta of duration. Columns could be filled with authoritative support for "substance," but I leave Mr. Cohen to be comforted by a host of imaginary psychologists not named in par. 7.

G. H. TAYLOR.

### NOTE ON THE ABOVE

I do not see that any good purpose will be served by continuing this discussion. Mr. Taylor does not appear to understand my arguments, which may be entirely my fault. I may not have made myself clear. So I will just restate my position, which may be helpful to others as well as Mr. Taylor, and leave it at that.

(1) The main purpose of science—as distinguished from the accumulation of mere knowledge—is to provide us with a working model of the world.

(2) It does this by using, in the main, conceptual creations, which are to be held until some better working model is provided. Such things as the atom, in its old form as a hard indestructible and indivisible particle, or in its present use of the "ether" or the atom as a small planetary system, or as a product of a "space time continuum" belong to this order. Protons and electrons are not, as Mr. Taylor appears to assume, "facts of experience" as are pineapples or bricks—unless the phrase is used as including conceptual experience. The remark that the weight of a proton is so and so, would be fully expressed by any capable scientist as "if we assume a proton to exist," then, if it is there, its weight may be calculated as so and so.

To this order also belong all scientific "laws." Literally, it is wrong to say that Galileo and Newton discovered the law of gravitation. They created it. What they observed was the movements of matter. What they created was a formula enabling us to describe the behaviour of matter in all its movements. This is true of all scientific laws, physical, chemical, biological, etc.

(3) Science is concerned only with "behaviour." In science a thing is what it does. That remains true on any scientific view. This is why the statement so often made by scientists like Lodge and Thomson, that we do not know what gravitation is in itself, or what life is in itself, or what electricity is in itself, is arrant nonsense—hopelessly unscientific in thought and expression. As Professor Andrade says, the right way to put the question is, "What *does* electricity?" not "What is electricity?" (This may help Mr. Taylor better to realize what is involved in the question of "substance," or the

thing-in-itself. At present his arguments do not touch the point at issue.)

(4) The method of science is that of what has been well called "As If." Science says, in effect, "Let us assume that such and such is the case, that the ultimate state of matter is so and so, or that light is transmitted in such and such a way, and then if the facts agree with what we observe then we can go on constructing a world-model on that plan. If new knowledge brings something else to the front, then we will reshape our model." This is the reason for the adoption of the hypothesis of a universal ether, which some so-called popularizers of science have written about as though it were an actual objective thing that could be handled as one handles apples. It is purely conceptual, and as Sir Oliver Lodge said, was created at a known time and place.

(5) Thinking is impossible except in terms of likeness and difference. We know a thing as being what it is by separating it from things which it is not, and placing it with other things previously cognized. "Substance" must mean the substance we know, whether it is an apple, or a cabbage, or a brick, or anything else. And matter must resemble the "matter" we know. But I do not know in what way a "matter" that is not identical with the matter I know, or a substance that is not identical with the substance I know is, miraculously, transformed into the matter or the substance I know. I am here up against my old difficulty—that of conceiving how two things that are not identical can be the same, or how two things that are identical can be different. ("Know," in this connexion, of course includes the unknown, but theoretically knowable.) Mr. Taylor looks to me like attempting to state the Athanasian creed in terms of science.

(5) In philosophy "substance" has always had a distinct meaning. If Mr. Taylor means by substance the things we know, then there is nothing to dispute about on this point, and he need never have laboured it. But if he means that, parts of his other arguments are futile. There is nothing gained in substituting "attraction" for "pull." Both are figures derived from human feeling. Mr. Taylor's argument amounts to an appeal for animism in science.

(6) I think that any scientist, if consulted, would inform Mr. Taylor that heat can never be anything but a feeling, although he would say that the physical accompaniment was molecular motion. But a child would never know that a red thing burned, unless feeling had instructed it to that effect. And only an animist could infer that the feeling was in the object. "Hot" apart from the feeling of heat is as unusual as a "three-horned dilemma."

My fault appears to be that of trying to keep my statements within the world of the known.

C.C.

#### A CORRECTION

SIR,—Glancing over the *Freethinker* for January 20, I find that in my notes on books, by passing a misprint, unconsciously did the author, Mr. Geoffrey West, an injustice. This is the passage in its correct form:—

To inspire was good; it was creative action, spontaneous, positive; to compel was evil, negative, destructive. The leader appealed to a man's *selflessness*; the dictator, if at all, to his self-interest.

The word italicized was unfortunately printed "self-interest"

This note, however, gives me a further opportunity to express my admiration for Mr. West's use of good clear English, and also, it gives another chance for reflection to the thinker who is in any doubt about choice in such a vital matter as leadership or dictatorship.

C-DE-B.

So long as you suffer any man to call himself your shepherd sooner or later you will find a crook round your ankle.—H. G. Wells.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

### LONDON

#### OUTDOOR

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

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

#### INDOOR

FINCHLEY (King Edward Hall, Church End, N.3): 7.0, Chapman Cohen—"How Science Explains Religion."

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (New Morris Hall, Hall No. 5, 79 Bedford Road, Clapham, S.W.4): 7.30, Mr. D. Capper, B.A.—"Ethics and the Class Struggle."

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Oliver Goldsmith School, Peckham Road, S.E.): 7.0, Howell Smith, B.A.—"Impressions of Egypt and Palestine."

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

STUDY CIRCLE (68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4): 8.0, Monday, March 4, Mr. A. D. McLaren—"Is History a Science?"

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (No. 5 Room, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10): Miss Pocock—"Voluntary Eugenic Sterilization."

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. ("The Laurie Arms," Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.): 7.30, H. Stewart Wishart—"The Free Thinker and all the Isms."

### COUNTRY

#### INDOOR

BIRKENHEAD (Wirral) BRANCH N.S.S. (Boilermakers' Hall, Argyle Street, Birkenhead, opposite Scala Cinema, entrance in Lorn Street): 7.0, Mr. G. Bedborough (London)—"Is Religion any use to Man's Welfare?"

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Shakespeare Rooms, Edmund Street, Birmingham): 7.30, H. W. Cottingham—"Biology—Embryology."

BLACKBURN BRANCH N.S.S. (Cobden Hall, Cort Street, Blackburn): 7.0, Musical Programme, followed at 8.0, by a lecture from Mr. W. Ashton (Salt Lake City)—"The Existence of Spirit apart from a Physical Organism." Study Circle on Thursday evenings at 7.30.

BRADFORD SECULAR SOCIETY (Godwin Commercial Hotel, Godwin Street, Bradford): 7.0, Miss N. Levine—"Judaism and War."

EAST LANCASHIRE RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION (28 Bridge Street, Burnley): 2.30, Mr. Kenneth Hunt (Read)—"Gods and Dogs."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (East Hall, M'Lellan Galleries, Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow): 7.0—"Eve or Evolution." *Freethinker* and other literature on sale at all meetings.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone gate): 6.30, 54th Anniversary of the opening of the Secular Hall, Speaker, Mr. Joseph McCabe.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Milton Hall, 12a Daulby Street, Liverpool, off London Road, by the Majestic Cinema): 7.0, W. Hartley Bolton, B.A. (Liverpool)—"Materialism and Idealism."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Clarion Cafe, Market Street, Manchester): 7.30 C. McKelvie, Jnr.—"Elements of Free-thinking."

MIDDLESBOROUGH (Bizacta Hall, Newton Street): 7.0, Tuesday, March 5, Mr. J. T. Brighton—"Visions."

PLYMOUTH BRANCH N.S.S. (Plymouth Chambers, Drake Circus): 7.0, Mr. Speare.

SOUTH SHIELDS BRANCH N.S.S. (The Labour Hall, Laygate): 7.30, Friday, March 1, Mr. J. T. Brighton—"Salvation."

STOCKTON (Labour Hall, Yarn Lane): 7.0, Thursday, March 7, Mr. J. T. Brighton—"Blood, Fire, Self-Denial"

SUNDERLAND BRANCH N.S.S. (Co-operative Hall, Green Street): 7.0, Mr. G. Hudson—"Religion and History." Unitarian Church, Bridge Street, 7.30, Thursday, March 7, Debate: *Affir.*: Rev. W. Beer. *Neg.*: Mr. Allan Flanders—"Is Belief in God Reasonable?"

KING EDWARD HALL,  
CHURCH END, FINCHLEY,  
N.3

ON

Sunday March 3rd, 1935

**CHAPMAN COHEN**

President of the N. S. S.

WILL SPEAK ON

'How Science Explains Religion'

Doors Open 6.30 p.m. Commence 7 p.m.

Questions and Discussion Invited

ADMISSION FREE

**SELECTED HERESIES**

BY

**CHAPMAN COHEN**

Cloth, gilt 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

THE SEX EDUCATION CENTRE exists to provide information, books, lectures, personal consultations and guidance to expert help, on all aspects of sexual experience. Director: JANET CHANCE, Century Theatre, Archer Street, Westbourne Grove, W.II. Open Mondays during February and March 7 to 9 p.m. Programme sent on request.

**ACADEMY CINEMA,**

Oxford Street.

Ger. 2981

WILLY FORST'S

*Viennese Sensation of Europe*

"MASKERADE" (A) with Paula Wessely

**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 Hanny, Wantage, Berks.**

ESTABLISHED NEARLY HALF A CENTURY.

*P*rimitive *S*urvivals  
in  
*M*odern *T*hought

By

CHAPMAN COHEN

*In this work the Author traces the power of the "dead hand" in science, philosophy, religion and social life. It is a book that challenges criticism from both friends and enemies, and for that reason cannot profitably be ignored by either.*

Cloth, gilt, 2s. 6d. Postage 2d. Stiff paper  
1s. 6d. Postage 2d.

THE PIONEER PRESS,  
61 Farringden St., London,  
E.C.4.

**Arms & The Clergy**

By

**George Bedborough**

The War Years are now 16 years behind us and a new generation has arisen that is not familiar with the attitude of the clergy during the strenuous period 1914-1918. To day their talk is of peace and the barbarisms of war. Then there were no greater cultivators of the war-spirit than the clergy. Mr. Bedborough has in "Arms and the Clergy" produced with marked success a handy and effective piece of work. This is a book that everyone interested in the question of peace and war should possess.

Price 1s. By post 1s. 2d. Cloth, gilt, by post 2s. 3d.

The Pioneer Press,  
61 Farringdon Street, London,  
E.C.4

**JUST ISSUED****DAMNABLE OPINIONS***by Llewelyn Powys*

"Written with manifest sincerity and with considerable eloquence. Even better than that, nearly every page either commands assent or arouses fruitful questioning, and no book that does this should be missed."—*Freethinker*.

**Cloth, 3s. 6d. net**  
(by post 3s. 9d.)

**PROBLEMS OF DESTINY***by William Romaine Paterson*

In this work the author has set down, in a style which is a delight in itself, the rare fruit of long reflections on the problems of life and happiness which vex the hearts of all thinking men and women. A book to be read and re-read.

**Cloth, 7s. 6d. net**  
(by post 8s.)

**DID JESUS EVER LIVE ?***by L. Gordon Rylands, B.A., B.Sc.*

"We cannot think of a better book for those who wish to get a conception of the strength of the case in favour of the new Testament Jesus being a wholly mythical character."—*Freethinker*.

**Cloth, 2s. 6d. net**  
(by post 2s. 9d.)

**RECENT BOOKS****LIBERTY TO-DAY**

By C. E. M. JOAD

"A noble little book. *Liberty To-day* ought to be circulated by the hundred thousand."

—SIR NORMAN ANGELL, in *Time and Tide*.

Cloth, **2s. 6d. net**, by post 2s. 9d.

**THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE TO-DAY**

By JOSEPH McCABE

"Should do a deal towards pricking the bubbles that are constantly being blown by religiously-minded scientists."—*Freethinker*.

Cloth, **5s. net**, by post 5s. 6d.

**A MARTIAN EXAMINES CHRISTIANITY**

By ARTHUR LEVETT

A Martian, totally ignorant of the entire subject, and with an unprejudiced mind, seeks information on many points concerning the Christian religion.

Cloth, **2s. 6d. net**, by post 2s. 10d.;  
Paper cover, **1s. net**, by post 1s. 3d.

**THE MYSTIC ROSE**

By ERNEST CRAWLEY

Deals exhaustively with the taboos of sexual life and their application to adolescence, marriage, child-birth, and so on.

Cloth, **2s. 6d. net**, by post 2s. 10d.

**THE UNIVERSE OF SCIENCE**

By Prof. H. LEVY

"It is a work which we cordially recommend..... Professor Levy has really given the world an important work on the philosophy of science."—*Freethinker*.

Paper cover, **2s. 6d. net**, by post 2s. 11d.

**FACT AND FAITH**

By Prof. J. B. S. HALDANE

Knowledge on the great problems of life is here summarized by one of the most acute thinkers and entertaining writers of the day. A book that Freethinkers will much appreciate.

(No. 44 of the Thinker's Library.)

Clothette, **1s. net**, by post 1s. 3d.

LONDON : WATTS & CO., 5 & 6 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4