

# THE FREETHINKER

EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LVI.—No. 37

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1936

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>The Confession of Dean Inge—The Editor</i>	577
<i>Faith and Finance—Mimnermus</i>	579
<i>The Greek Bible—H. Cutner</i>	580
<i>Things Worth Knowing</i>	581
<i>Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936)—G. H. Taylor</i>	586
<i>Epistolary Pearls from the Archives of Edessa— C. Clayton Dove</i>	587
<i>God as Distributor—Ignotus</i>	588
<i>Jesus's Teachings—"D."</i>	589

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

## Views and Opinions

### The Confession of Dean Inge

SOME nine years ago, Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, in the course of a sermon, said that when he went to the Temple Church, London, and found himself addressing a congregation, among whom there were few "for whom Christian dogma had any vitality." "I thereupon began to preach sermons in which I clearly set forth my own belief in doubts." I do not know for how long Bishop Barnes had harboured these doubts concerning the truth of the faith he was paid to preach; the significant fact is that it was only when he found himself in safe company, so to speak, that he began to give voice to his doubts concerning the truth of certain historic Christian beliefs. The justifiable inference is that had the Bishop not gone to the Temple Church the world would never have known about his doubts. A further query that suggests itself is, "How many more are there in the Church in the same position, and of the same type?"

And now Dr. R. W. Inge, ex-Dean of St. Paul's, has followed the example of Bishop Barnes. For many years he duly and daily (?) offered up prayers. When the country was at war he prayed for its success, when the King was ill he prayed for his recovery. He accepted as part of his duties as Dean, and as a return for the money received and the social standing attained, the task of praying for the sick, for safety at sea, for recovery from illness, for the welfare of the country, and for numerous other things. He led the people who looked to him for guidance to believe that his prayers would have some influence in securing these things, and that if they did not pray there would be some risk of missing them. How many times the Dean must have said, with that awful pronunciation of his, "Let us Pray." I do not know, but the number must have run into thousands.

The Rev. Dr. Inge has now also thrown off all disguise—at least so far as prayer is concerned. His subject at the "Modern Churchman's Conference,"

on August 21, was "What to believe about prayer," and his answer—in substance—was, "Nothing."

One by one he went over the main things for which people pray, and said quite clearly, and quite plainly, that none of the things for which most people pray ever happens. There is no answer to their prayers. You may pray for a number of things, and while this may be beneficial to the vocal chords by inducing a mild kind of massage, or soothing to the spirit, as may a dose of whisky; while it may bring something objective to the parsonry, big or little; it brings nothing that is objective to the layman.

Prayer, according to Dr. Inge, is a game that people play with themselves; it is a game that the clergy—or a large number of them—play with the people. When neither believe they wink at each other; when only one of the parties prays—laity or clergy—one inwardly winks at the other.

\* \* \*

### Science and Prayer

I fully believe that Dr. Inge is now saying exactly what he believes, for I have no recollection of his having spoken so plainly on a similar subject while he was in office. There is no mistaking what he now means. He might be quoting from the *Freethinker* of more than half a century since, or at any time during its history. He says:—

There is no subject on which Christ spoke with more downright explicitness than of the efficacy of prayer. These very definite promises seem to be contradicted by common experience. Most of us would say that they have been contradicted by common experience.

Dr. Inge, evidently, so far as the objective efficacy of prayer is concerned, ranks himself with the "most of us." He takes several instances in which prayer does *not* act, and they are sufficient to cover the whole question. He takes the case of sickness and the weather, and plainly denies that prayer has any influence in either direction. He asks whether "the husband of a loving and prayerful wife" is a "better life" from the point of view of life insurance than a man who has no Christian relative anxious for the prolongation of his existence. Everyone knows the answer to this. There is not an insurance company in the country, that, so far as its premiums are concerned, pays the slightest attention to the matter. Allowances are made with some societies if you are a teetotaler; but not if you pray. Whether you pray or curse makes no difference to the premium. Probably the King is the most prayed-for man in the country, but no insurance company would reduce its premium on the King's life because the greatest experts on prayer were engaged in asking God for his recovery. There are hospitals in the country in which not a public prayer is ever said; but the pro-

portion of deaths is no greater than those in which the Lord is asked to pay particular attention to the patients.

Prayer does not cure disease, neither, says Dr. Inge, does it affect the weather:—

The more we know about the causes of climatic phenomena, the less likely we are even to dream of changing them in order to save our hay-crop, or to secure a fine day for our garden party.

Not even the weather! One of the oldest and the most important prerogatives of the gods! Jesus Christ said that, if you prayed, all things should be given unto you. Dr. Inge, who is where he is because he has for many years been leading people to believe that praying for rain, or for sunshine, or for the recovery of a King from illness, or for victory in battle, or for safety at sea, or even for Members of Parliament to be endowed with wisdom and justice, now says that all this is absurd. It was all good enough when people were ignorant, but nowadays,

The notion that the world is governed by natural laws which may be suspended or modified at any time by divine intervention, is felt to be one of the least satisfactory of philosophies.

In other words, it is all bunkum, and the thousands of parsons, and newspaper men who write articles detailing miraculous tales of cures by prayer, are either very ignorant men or designing rogues. So far as Dr. Inge is concerned, the game is up.

\* \* \*

#### Why Pray?

But why pray at all? It is here that I begin to wonder whether my statement that Dr. Inge is now saying exactly what he believes is quite accurate. For after saying that belief has no effect in the direction of getting what people pray for, he adds:—

If we ask, why do men pray, the simple answer is that because they cannot help it. In so far as prayer is loving intercourse, or reverent homage, or thanksgiving, or meditation on the revealed attributes of God, or contrition for sin, it is meaningless to ask whether it is efficacious. *No one doubts that as an exercise it deepens character, strengthens the will, purifies the affections and brings peace, rest and blessedness.*

The italics are mine. Prayer, says Dr. Inge, cannot affect the weather or our health; it cannot prevent earthquakes or shipwrecks; prayer no more affects the health of Kings than of costermongers; microbes pursue their path unaffected by prayer, but are susceptible to anti-toxins; and, other things equal, a man with a prayerful wife is no better off than one with a wife who is a confirmed Atheist. All Dr. Inge is saying is that prayer does one good so long as one believes it will do good. That while not universally true, has enough truth about it to fool the unwary. There are a thousand and one things that have no connexion whatever with prayer that will have this effect. Bread pills will cure imaginary pains. Mere faith in a doctor will affect for the better an hysterical patient. The power of self-suggestion is well known to modern science, and to anyone who understands what is going on before his eyes every day of his life. The grain of truth that is contained in the megalomaniacal nonsense of Mrs. Eddy is of this kind. Dr. Inge calls this kind of thing, I expect, spiritual influence, and if spiritual influence is but another name for imaginary causes, or self-deception then he is right. But no one has ever disputed the power of man to fool himself, and a man

may fool himself into either goodness or badness, into being a little more sensible or a little more stupid. There is an enormous trade in lucky stones, in charms and similar things outside the Church, and the belief in the virtues of holy water and sacred candles, and the mumblings of priest and parson inside the church, and all of it rests on the fact that a man feels he is better off with some things than he is without them. Some people even persuade themselves they are better off for the parsonry.

But is this process of self-suggestion what is understood by prayer? Is it what Dr. Inge had in mind, or is it what his congregation had in mind when he said from the pulpit, "Let us Pray"? Did he really mean to say, "There is no answer to your prayers in the shape of any interference with the course of events, but if you act as if you believed that some person greater than man will alter things in response to your prayers, then you will feel better for this self-deception"? I think if Dr. Inge had acted in this straightforward manner to his congregation he would soon have found himself outside the church altogether.

Dr. Inge, in common with all religionists who have any appreciation of the position of religion in modern conditions, is on the horns of dilemma. If he claims that the effect of praying is an alteration in the natural sequence of events, he is up against the whole body of scientific teaching. If, on the other hand, he denies the possibility of affecting natural events by prayer, and at most reduces prayer to a species of self delusion, he is cutting at the very heart of religious belief, for without prayer and its assumed effect on the "order of nature," religion is useless. Dr. Inge sees this clearly enough in the following:—

Without prayer there can be no religion. Prayer is the very breathing of religion, its most essential and characteristic activity.

This is strictly true. Religion has its beginnings in that stage of human development when man believes himself to be surrounded by living agencies, whose anger is to be averted, or whose good-will may be gained by prayer and praise. The belief that there are gods to listen and are able to give, leads to prayer; the belief that gods answer prayer by affecting the course of events perpetuates religion. People have not prayed for health and strength, for rain or sunshine, for victory at sea or protection from disease because they believed it to be an interesting kind of mental exercise, but because they believed there were gods who listened, who took sides, who granted favours and who gave rewards in return for service. Let men lose this belief and religion grows weak, it becomes a mere shadow of a shade, and the god they have worshipped takes his place in that procession of discarded deities that winds like a ghostly caravan through the course of history.

But to-day general scientific knowledge has made the belief in the utility of prayer, in any sense of the expression, impossible. Up-to-date believers hardly know whether to hold on to prayer or to let it go. In terms of historic belief and doctrinal teaching they must believe God answers prayer. In terms of all scientific understanding, this is an absurdity. So, on the one hand, the Churches stand to lose the support of an army of simple-minded believers. On the other hand they stand to earn the contempt of intelligent, educated and honest men and women if they retain their original position. The belief in prayer, once the greatest asset of the Church, is now becoming a tremendous liability. It looks as though the correct answer to the problem is—Bankruptcy.

CHAPMAN COHEN.

## Faith and Finance

"A very large portion of society, and that powerfully and extensively connected, derives its sole emolument from the belief of Christianity, as a popular faith."

Shelley.

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

SIXTY-SIX millions of money is quite a large sum even in these days of gigantic trusts and get-rich-quick business. A purely commercial organization with assets to that amount, and with an annual fixed income amounting to nearly three and a half millions, excluding other fruitful sources of emolument, amounting to £16,250,000 yearly, would rightly be considered even by financial magnates, to be in the front rank of big business. The Church of England, one of a hundred sectarian bodies in this country, is in this happy commercial position. It is not only one of the most important landowners in the kingdom, but it collects royalties on every ton of coal produced from certain collieries, and extracts a sacred-tenth, or tithe, from the farmers. It possesses property to the value of millions in the heart of London, and, by virtue of its vast wealth, exerts an influence in the body politic which, in the twentieth century, is positively amazing.

Iniquitous as such charges as tithes, or sacred-tenths, or royalties levied on coal-tonnage, or even ground-rents imposed by this favoured Church as land-lord, appear to us to-day, they form but a portion of the wholesale piracy resorted to by the ecclesiastics in the Ages of Faith, when they rode roughshod over the liberties of the peoples they were supposed to befriend. In the old days the priests took care that everyone should do their share, as is proved by a list of what each parishioner should give at Easter, 1675, in a town in the Peak district of Derbyshire. It is to be remembered that the sums named represent vastly more than the same value in present-day money, for in those far-off days a sheep might be purchased for three shillings, and a fowl for twopence:—

Item: Every person of the age of sixteen pays one penny for his offering; for every horse 3d; for a cow 1d.; for every calf 1½d.; for every foal 1d.; for every swarm of bees 1d.; from every person for his trade 4d.; from every manservant 6d., and every maidservant 4d. from their wages.

Item: For every hen an egg, and for every cock two, but if they have no eggs, then the parishioner pays to the vicar one penny for 3 hens, and for two ducks' eggs one penny, and for every turkey egg one penny.

These were in addition to the tithes of wool, lamb, lead, pigs, and geese, which were paid in kind. From the Chapelry of Beeley to the Vicar of Bakewell, the following dues are registered for 1671:—

Offerings: The master or mistress or dame of a family, each	...	...	...	2d.
Offerings of all other sojourners, servants, and children above 16, each	...	...	...	1d.
Dues for the house, garden, and plough, each	...	...	...	3d.
Dues for milch cow	1d.; calf	½d.	...	1½d.
Dues for foal	...	...	...	2d.
Dues for Geese, if above 6, if under 15, but if 15,	1½d.	...	...	2½d.
Due for pigs the like.				
Due for every hen	2 eggs.			
Geese, if not agreed for, to be delivered in Bakewell Churchyard, and the like for pigs if they happen.				

Owing to the scandal of maladministration of this Church's funds, Parliament appointed a body known

as the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to supervise the Church's income and expenditure, and this body has finished the first hundred years of its work. To-day these Commissioners may truly be reckoned among the foremost business men, and this Church itself as one of the largest and most powerful commercial undertakings in the country.

When the Commissioners first took charge of this Church's financial affairs they were confronted with the amazing state of affairs by which the higher ecclesiastics wallowed in money, and their poor curates lived from hand to mouth. The then Archbishop of Canterbury drew £19,182 yearly, 13 bishops had more than £4,000 apiece, and 11 of the 27 Archbishops and bishops had fat sinecures in addition to their official salaries. For example, the contemporary Bishop of Oxford enjoyed £2,648 salary for his bishopric, another £2,000 for a sinecure deanery, £3,288 for one sinecure benefice, and £748 for another. This seems to us amazing, but it was as nothing to the still earlier time when a Cardinal lived at Hampton Court Palace, and aped royalty, and Lambeth Palace had its retinue of soldiers, and bishops lorded it with the greatest and most powerful aristocrats of the land.

Even to-day the bishops have feathered their nests very comfortably. Forty of the older ecclesiastics, including two archbishops, share £182,700 annually, and this takes no account of the remaining 250 colonial and suffragan bishops, who share quite a respectable sum of money between them, besides emoluments in the shape of palaces and palatial residences.

A number of priestly appointments are superfluous, and mere relics from other days. Within the very narrow confines of the City of London £50,000 is spent each year in ministering to the alleged spiritual needs of a very small resident population of caretakers, policemen and their families, and Jewish people, the latter never troubling the pew-openers. These churches are mere survivals, for the ecclesiastical authorities ear-marked nineteen of them as being derelict, and actually proposed to sell the sites and use the money elsewhere. The same thing happens all over England. There are at least fifty livings worth more than a thousand a year, where the parishes have under a thousand inhabitants. The rector of Stainby-with-Gunby, Lincolnshire, has £2,376 net income a year. The inhabitants of this out-of-the-way place number 216. The town of March, East Anglia, has about ten thousand inhabitants, a large number being Nonconformists. The four Church-of-England places of worship have livings worth, when added together, just under five thousand pounds a year, net. Each living is worth over a thousand pounds a year. There is so much waste in this State-Church that it may truly be said to be the church of the priests rather than that of the people. There are no less than 1,877 parishes with a population under 200; and 4,802 with a population under 500. The English people themselves are only remotely concerned with this alleged Church of England, for, some years ago, when a census was taken by a national newspaper of church and chapel attendance in London and suburbs, it was found that only one person in nineteen attended a place-of-worship, and only a portion of these attended the churches of the Government Religion.

Yet it is this same Anglican Church that has blocked every measure of reform in the House of Lords for the past hundred years. There is no denying the impeachment, for the votes of the Church of England bishops are recorded in Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*. There are many startling Feudal anomalies in present-day civilization, but the anomaly

of such a hide-bound relic of antiquity being left in charge of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice is astounding. The sooner it is disestablished and dis-endowed the sooner will this nation be rid of a national scandal, and millions of money be available for worthier objects than the furtherance of ancient ignorance and the bolstering-up of Feudalism.

MIMNERMUS.

## The Greek Bible

### III.

As I have already pointed out, the whole trend of the modern criticism of the Bible is to get at the "original" text—though why there should be so much anxiety about it, is not altogether clear. Supposing we did find out, by some extraordinary discovery, what the original writers of the books composing "Holy" Scripture really wrote—what then? Would that prove anything? Would it prove the "inspiration" of the Bible? Would the orthodox really be able to turn the tables on unbelievers and declare that, at long last, they had proved the Bible to be the Word of God? A moment's thought would show the absurdity of such a supposition. Indeed, an early discovery might easily prove the very opposite—namely, that the Bible is nothing more than a collection of myths and legends and demonstrably so.

At all events, the study of the Greek text, that is, the Septuagint, has proved beyond all shadow of a doubt that whatever is the authoritative Hebrew text, however much Hebraists, Jew or Christian, may swear it is the true one, not differing one iota from the original manuscripts, it is *not* the text from which the Greek was translated. Professor Swete, the greatest authority on the Septuagint makes that clear in his *Introduction*. Here are his words:

The text of the Hebrew Bible has undergone no material change since the beginning of the second century A.D. . . . All existing MSS. belong to one type of text, and it is, in the main, the type which was known to Jerome, to Origen, and to Aquila, and which is reflected in the Targums and the Talmud. But it is not that which was possessed by the Alexandrians of the third and second centuries, B.C. At some time between the age of the Septuagint, and that of Aquila, a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible must have taken place, probably under official direction . . . it is sufficient to warn the beginner that in the Septuagint he has before him the version of an early text, which often differed materially from the text of the printed Hebrew Bible and of all existing MSS.

One can quite understand why, if all this is true, pious critics are anxious to get at the "true" or "original" text. For Protestants have sworn so long by the "received text"—was it not the late Dean Burgon who insisted that every letter and stop was inspired?—that, if it is not the genuine one, the whole pack of cards they call their rule of Faith will fall like those made famous by *Alice in Wonderland*.

To stand by the Bible and nothing but the Bible, and then find that it is *not* the text inspired by God Almighty must be a blow from which they can never recover.

And I must strongly emphasize once again that when "Our Lord" quoted Scripture it was the Greek Version, the Septuagint, he was quoting and not the "Hebrew." Indeed, I have the strongest doubts that the Hebrew text, as we have it, is any older than the famous Rabbi Akiba, who was a great scholar, a hater of Christians, and who, for his share

in the Bar-Cocheba rising of the early second century, was foully put to death by the Romans. That Akiba had a great share in shaping the present Hebrew text is, I think, acknowledged by most critics. But to them, of course, he was the "editor"; for my own part, I feel that he did a great deal more than mere editing. But what he edited, or re-wrote, or invented, or changed, no one knows—unless it is admitted that the "original" text or texts from which was translated the Septuagint, was different from that which has come down to us in Hebrew.

Until comparatively recently, it was not easy to get a good translation of the Septuagint. True, over 100 years ago, the American, Charles Thomson, a fine scholar, spent many years of his life in translating the Septuagint Version as represented by the famous Codex in the Vatican. And here it ought to be pointed out that while there are quite a large number of copies of the Greek Bible, more or less complete, they all differ from one another in hundreds of places, sometimes very greatly indeed. In fact no one knows which is the true and original Septuagint. The text of the *Codex Vaticanus* is very different from that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the latest and greatest Biblical acquisition in the British Museum; and both differ from that of the *Codex Alexandrinus*. The result is that critics are almost as anxious to find out what the real, genuine text of the Septuagint is, as they are to find out the original Hebrew text.

Thomson's splendid translation was banned—or at least nothing was done to circulate it as it clashed too much with our Authorized Version; and it was not issued again until about 20 years ago. Even then both the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge refused to help in getting it known; in other words, it was boycotted. It would not do to let anything rival the Authorized Version or the Revised Version. Or, to put it in another way, it would not do to let believers know in how much and in how many ways the Old Testament, as used by "Our Lord," differed from that in use now.

The strange thing is that while the Roman Catholics insist upon their Church as their Rule of Faith and the Protestants, the Bible, it is the Roman Catholics who are—in my opinion—more consistent. For them, the Bible can only be explained or expounded through the Church. And while they insist it is absolutely inspired by God, they also insist that it is the *original*, not the various copies, which is (or was) inspired. The nearest to this original is their Latin Vulgate. But how did they get the Vulgate?

Well, the version known as the Italic, or Old Latin, was made from the Septuagint perhaps in the second century. This version was considered faulty by Jerome who, in the fourth century, revised it in the light of the then existing Hebrew text. That is, he is said so to have revised it, but this is by no means certain. He may only have put some of the various Old Latin versions into better shape. The Vulgate, then, is only a translation of a translation at the best; and it is not in any way a translation of the Hebrew text.

Our own Authorized Version is not, as is commonly supposed, a version of the "original" Hebrew. It is really a much emended and edited version of the various English Bibles which had preceded it. It certainly owes a great deal to Coverdale's Bible which appeared in 1535, and which was translated from Luther's German version and from the Latin Vulgate, as is admitted on its title page; that is, of course, on the title page of the first edition. But when it comes to dealing with the Bible, one can

trust Christians for hiding the truth as much as possible. I have before me a reproduction of this title page, dated 1535, and with the words "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe."

But, says Mr. S. F. Pells, in his *The Church's Ancient Bible*, "if we refer to the title page of the first modern reprint edition of Coverdale's Bible (published in 1838), we shall find the words 'translated out of Douche and Latyn' have been omitted, and that it simply reads: 'faithfully and truly translated into English.' And if we consult the second modern edition, published in 1842, we shall find that the representation has been carried a step farther, and actually reads: 'faithfully translated from the Hebrew and Greek.'" This is to give those people who cannot investigate for themselves, the idea that it is the Hebrew which is God's chosen language, and therefore must be inspired and that Coverdale used it. As a matter of fact, there could have been precious little opportunity for Christians in Coverdale's day to study Hebrew, let alone master it. How were they to find competent teachers?

I am by no means convinced that even the revisers of the Authorized Version knew Hebrew. The truth is that its language is based on the Wyclif version as well as on the succeeding ones, and is a special language of its own. How English really was written in 1611 can be seen by referring to the Preface of the Authorized Version. One can hardly imagine a more astonishing difference. Young's literal translation of the Bible (1863) is certainly from the Hebrew Massoretic text, but nobody seems to know it; while the Revised Version, which has also never caught on, is the Authorized Version corrected, as far as possible, from the same Hebrew text.

If the reader has followed me carefully, he will see in what a holy mess the text of the Bible really is. Whatever was originally written seems undoubtedly lost now; though, naturally, it may turn up one day. So far, however, the Bible, as God's Word, rests on Faith. For only faith in the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, or on the various declarations of Protestant Bishops on the other, can make the Bible true. We should, it seems, believe or be damned. For my part, I have no option but to join the damned.

H. CUTNER.

From the time Jesus bade men try his doctrine to the present day, the popular and the only effective proof of the truth of Christianity has been its success in providing at least a part of the blessedness it promises. The existence of every one of the gods in whom men have ever put their faith has been held to be proved by the test of experience. Fetiches are trusted because their efficiency has been proved. Yahve showed himself to be the true God by helping his worshippers to defeat the hosts of Chemosh. The Virgin Mary demonstrates daily her powers of intercession by serving those who address their petitions to her.—*Prof. J. H. Leuba.*

PARSONS AS SCHOOLMASTERS

Public schools are so obsolete that they yet rest upon an old monastic basis. The majority of them, even to this very day still favour clergymen as headmasters—an absolute anachronism. It is difficult, of course, to be a schoolmaster, but a clergyman is the last man in the world to be allowed to deal with growing boys. For whenever a clergyman becomes a schoolmaster, he always tends to become either severe and cranky, or playful and self-advertising.

*Osbert Sitwell ("Penny Foolish," p. 15).*

Things Worth Knowing\*

LIII.

[John Ruskin, in his *Lectures on Art*, just mentioned the question of how far art has been inspired or ennobled by religion. He left the subject with the implied promise that he would deal with it at length on some future occasion. The following was found amongst his papers after his death and was published by the Editors, Cook and Wedderburn, in the standard edition of his works as a note to the *Lectures*.—C.C.]

RELIGION AND ART

How far has art been strengthened by her employment in religious service? Many careful thinkers on this subject, and I myself, very strenuously in past years, have contended that the occupation of artists in the representation of divine histories or persons, has stimulated and purified the powers of the art so employed. It is not, of course, possible for me to-day to enter with you even on the first steps of so vast an enquiry; but it will be part of my subsequent duty to lay before you the grounds of my now fixed conviction that few of the greatest men ever painted religious subjects by choice, but only because they were either compelled by ecclesiastical authority, supported by its patronage, or invited by popular applause; that by all three influences their powers were at once wasted and restrained; that their invention was dulled by the monotony of motive and perverted by its incredibility; that the exertion of noble human skill in making bodily pain an object of morbid worship, compelled a correlative reaction in making bodily pleasure an object of morbid pursuit; and that the successes, of whatever positive value they may be, reached under the orders of Christianity, have been dearly bought by the destruction of the best treasures of heathen art, by the loss of the records of what was most interesting in passing history, by the aversion of all eyes from what was lovely in present nature, and by the birth, in the chasm left by the contracted energies of healthful art, of a sensual art fed by infernal fire.

Thus the best achievements of so-called religious art have been dearly bought, even supposing their excellence had been otherwise unattainable. But you will see further reason to regret the sacrifice, when you perceive, as I shall be able to show you by strict analysis, that the merits of sacred art itself were never owing to religion. Observe: I say, "of sacred art itself." I do not speak of the consummate art power, but of its reserved and regulated beginnings. As to its highest attainments, there has never been any question but that they were founded entirely on the beauty and love of the present world. I told you many years ago that there was no religion in any of the works of Titian, and that the mind of Tintoret only sometimes forgot itself into devotion. But I then thought that all the nascent and dawning strength of art had been founded on pious faith; whereas I now with humiliation, but I dare not say with sorrow, recognize that they were founded, indeed, upon the scorn of death, but not on the hope of immortality—founded, indeed, upon the purity of love, but the love of wife and child, and not of angel or deity; and that the sweet skill which gave to such feelings their highest expression came not by precept of religion, but by the secular and scientific training which Christianity was compelled unwillingly to per-

\* Under this heading we purpose printing, weekly, a series of definite statements, taken from authoritative works, on specific subjects. They will supply instructive comments on aspects of special subjects, and will be useful, not merely in themselves, but also as a guide to works that are worth closer study.

mit, and by the noble instruction received from the remnants of that very heathen art which Christianity had done her utmost to destroy.

The reserve and the rapture of monastic piety were only powerful in creation when they involuntarily opened themselves to the sight, and stooped to the sympathies, of common human life; and the skill which enforced with vividest imagery the doctrines of the Catholic faith was taught by spirits that had incurred its condemnation. If ever you are able in some degree to measure the skill that has been spent by Luini, La Robbia, or Ghiberti on the vision of the Virgin, you will also know it to have been received at the feet of Athena and Artemis; and from them, not as Queens of Heaven, but as Queens of Earth, permitting no idleness to virtue and promising no pardon to sin. The grace of the redeemed souls who enter, *celestamente ballando*, the gate of Angelico's Paradise had been first seen in the terrestrial, but pure, mirth of Florentine maids. The dignity of the Disputa del Sacramento was learned from the laurelled patience of the Roman and gentle bearing of the Greek.

If thus the influence of Religion upon Painting and Sculpture is determined, virtually its effect on Architecture is decided also. But as doubtless the subject is here more questionable than in any other of its branches, I will endeavour to set it before you in the form in which it may be dealt with clearly. Here, under the shadow of St. Mary's Spire, or in the front of any English or French Cathedral, it ought to be difficult for you so much as to put the question to yourselves. You would say that architecture was consummated in these. It was so. But we are not enquiring about its consummation, but its development. And to examine into that rightly, you must first separate whatever modes of architecture were learned in useful works, as aqueducts and sea-walls; then whatever was learned in war, and the forms of tower, of battlement, and window, and gateway required for defence; next, the forms dependent on the humble domestic requirements, as the gables of roofs built steep, or dormer windows enriching their slope, or turrets for winding stairs, or projecting niches of windows for looking up and down streets, or lifting of merchandise and the like; after that, whatever forms resulted from social and civic requirements; the spans required for halls like those of my own Christ Church, or of Westminster, or of the room of the greater council at Venice; the dignity of town halls and brolettos with their towers of pride or warning and arcades of state. Lastly, you must separate whatever exquisiteness was reached by completed art in palatial decoration, in loggias, ceilings, sculptured and painted saloons and galleries from Vicenza to Versailles; and then examine carefully what speciality is thus left as the result of ecclesiastical influences.

The best you will say, still; the ecstasy and perfectness of all this poured out in devotion. You will find, when you look into it, as I will endeavour partly to show you, that this power was used not so much to express devotion as to recommend and to direct it. But the point before us is, with what effects on the architecture? Mainly with these three—the introduction of spectral effects of light and shade, rendering architecture sensational instead of intellectual; the excitement of quite frantic efforts to obtain height and richness of ornament, ending in the corruption of style; and lastly, the taking away the funds and strength which would have made wholesome the houses of the poor, cleansed the streets, and cultivated the fields.

JOHN RUSKIN.

## Acid Drops

In the *Evening Standard* for September 2, Dean Inge characterizes Czarist Russia and present day Spain as follows:—

These two nations, at the opposite extremities of the Continent, resembled each other in several ways. Both were illiterate, both had remained untouched by the great movements of modern civilization; both were burdened with a rich and obscurantist Church, and in both the differences between rich and poor were very great.

That is certainly putting the state of both countries very mildly. Both countries were extremely religions, both had at their head a monarch who was claimed by the Church to be where he was by grace of God, the Russian Czar represented a form of superstition as gross as anything that existed among the most ignorant of his peasantry, and the late Spanish monarch surely represented as poor a specimen of honesty as ever sat upon a throne. In both countries Christianity had been in full power for centuries, and in both countries Church and monarchy had united in brutally suppressing every attempt to enlighten the people. In Spain, even more distinctly than in Russia, the country had been reduced from a country that led the world in science, in art and in civilization, to the brink of ruin commercially and scientifically, and that mainly by the action of the Church. And in Spain a third of the land of the country was owned by the Church. But it would hardly have done for Dr. Inge to have put the truth thus plainly.

As a kind of comment upon this statement of Dr. Inge, we may commend to our readers an article in the *Daily Mail*, for September 2, which never misses an opportunity of holding up Hitler and Mussolini for the British people to follow. The article is by Mr. Ward Price, one of the regular staff of the *Mail*. Contrasting Germany and Russia, Mr. Ward says, "Like Lucifer before the fall, Stalin may mobilize the power of darkness, but the German Michael is also fast preparing to take the field." The picture of Hitler as an angel of light, is worthy of the paper that did so much by its wholesale lying about Germany during the war to make a profitable peace impossible. In the case of the Boxer rising in China, the Boer War, and in the European War, the attitude of the *Mail*, and of the Northcliffe press generally did much to drag British journalism to the gutter. In the present Spanish trouble it appears to be living well up to a record that it is almost impossible to beat for sheer unworthiness.

The unfortunate thing is that there are masses of people who live with these yellow journals as their chief mental food, and who seem capable of swallowing almost anything. For instance, Hitler and the English branch of the Nazis are able to incite some people to the game of Jew-baiting by telling them that (a) the Jews are the backbone of Marxian Communism, and (b) that it is the Jews who are the capitalists who are ruining the world. A Marxian Communism that is aiming at upholding capitalism, is a wonderful kind of thing, but one may get it in the same article and out of the mouth of the same person.

We ought not in this juncture to leave without (dis)honourable mention that booster of religious ignorance, the founder of the "Oxford Group Movement"—as fine a specimen of religious ignorance and cheap emotionalism as one could wish. Dr. Buchman says, "Spain has taught us what a Godless Communism brings." But take the situation in Spain to be as bad as the *Daily Mail* paints it, how can that be a consequence of "godlessness" in any form? The people fighting are on both sides—if one eliminates the Mohammedan Moors, who are promised the liberty to loot and kill and rape if they will only fight the elected Government—the people fighting in Spain are Spaniards, they have been under the control of the Church for centuries, the Church has had charge of their education, and the bulk of the Spani-

ards to-day are as religious as any people in Europe. These people are surely the products of godism rather than of Atheism. The poverty and the ignorance of the peasantry has been perpetuated by the Church more than by any other single factor.

How strange it is, or rather it would be strange if it were not so usual, to find how calmly large numbers of people can contemplate the wrongs of a whole nation, but how very indignant they get when that people rise up against the established authorities and demand a better life than they have been living! Does a people ever rise in rebellion unless there are grave wrongs that provide the occasion for their rising? We do not know a single clear case of this having happened in the whole of history. A people may be misled by leaders, having risen in revolt, they may in the heat of passion or by the sedulous propaganda of an interested few, do things that were better undone, but the wrongs must be there before people rise in revolt. The fault of the mass of the people everywhere is not that they are too ready to rebel, but they are too ready to submit.

But many people can sit calmly enough while millions are robbed and wronged and tortured and degraded, generation after generation, and yet grow almost hysterical in their indignation when these wrongs issue in rebellion, and it is the privileged minority who are made to suffer in their turn! Not a millionth part of the indignation was spent on the French people for the outrages they submitted to for centuries, that was expended on the very, very much smaller number that suffered in the great French Revolution, although, as Carlyle reminded the world, there was no time in the history of France when the French people suffered less. But in the revolution they were the shrieking thousands that suffered, not the dumb millions. People could watch the long drawn out agony of the Russian people, with their yearly shootings and famines, see them killed by removable diseases, ignorant, drunken and besottedly religious, without being seriously disturbed. But when the people rise and a much smaller number of those who hitherto ruled pay the price of centuries of misgovernment, then there were and are those who grow hysterical with indignation that a *people* should dare to do what has hitherto been done by these people's rulers.

When will the world learn the lesson that revolutions are made by Governments, not by those who are only the instruments of their misdeeds. Spain, if the tales of the Rothermere Press are taken at their face value, is only passing through the phase that other mis-governed countries have passed through. Danton's golden words "Treat people like brutes and they will behave like brutes," should be an important part of the education of all. It is bad when people rise in rebellion, but the one worse thing is when people are treated as the Russians were treated, as the French were treated, and as the Spaniards were treated, and lack the courage to revolt. These men and women in Spain are not dying as they are dying, fighting and inspired by the ambition to make their country a better land. Let us even agree that they are mistaken in their aims, but the man labels himself infinitely worse than the lowest among those who are resisting the restoration of monarchy and Church, if he cannot recognize the spirit that animates them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury says that "as members of Christ's Church, they have profound sympathy with the Church in Spain, which is passing through a terrible ordeal." "Ordeal"!! Any open-minded person will regard what is happening to the Church in Spain as more of a judgment. The Church in Spain stood till to-day, for its own religious intolerance and wealth, for the preservation of the wealthy landowner as against the poverty-stricken peasant, for the supremacy of a wealthy class that gave small consideration for humanity to anything that stood in its path, and for a military clique that thought only of its own privileges. And the Archbishop of Canterbury talks about an ordeal!

The Archbishop's positive contribution to the situation is to hope that we shall maintain the strictest neutrality. We know that neutrality. It was seen in the case of Abyssinia, which paved the way for the present situation, and may land us one day in a large scale war. The Archbishop's neutrality consists in our preventing any help being given to the Government of Spain, to engage in talks while Germany and Italy are openly supplying the rebels with planes and arms, and making a number of "enquiries" as to what is meant by neutrality. When it is all over, then the Fascist States will agree to be neutral. Was ever a British Government treated as contemptuously as ours is being treated by both Germany and Italy!

We are not quite sure what moral the Roman Catholic *Universe* wishes us to draw from the following, concerning a child's prayer that her father might go to Lourdes:—

An ex-soldier applied to go with the pilgrimage. His little girl, aged six and three quarters, was asked to pray for his success.

Many people have since remarked how intent she was when she lit a candle and prayed.

Five days later the little girl died.

And on the following day the father heard that he had been selected to go to Lourdes. Archbishop Hinsley chose him.

Does the *Universe* wish us to conclude that God would not have inspired the Archbishop to select the man unless the child has asked him? Or that God got angry with the child for bothering him, and so caused its death? Or that it would help the father's recovery to know that his child was dead? Or does the *Universe* wish to exhibit the number of half-wits that are guided by the *Universe*? We leave the matter an open question, but we do wish the *Universe* would enlighten us.

Religion—continuing its old horrible intolerance, and as many of its solemnities as it can stomach—is also becoming ridiculous. At Walsingham, Norfolk, every fanatical ritualist, Roman and Anglo-Catholic is invited to come and indulge in an orgy of make-believe "Imitation of Jesus Christ" . . . in a Gethsemane consisting of thousands of the most delightful flowering plants. The "Imitators" go many a one better than their Master. They genuflect in a Garden of Flowers. They carry a cross—decorative but of no weight or inconvenience (Christ, by the way, never carried His Cross—least of all in a garden). These pilgrims also arrive in Rolls-Royce and other expensive cars—quite an improvement on the Jesus Plan.

New legends grow around the sacred story of the "Saviour of the World" (German version). This is how "Our Lord" is described by the Rev. Dr. Rosenberg, the friend of Hitler: "Christ was born in Galilee of Amorite Nordic parents. He was a stern brave revolutionist who was crucified by the Jews just like we are being to-day." Our own Christian preachers must not complain that this description is utterly unlike the gospel Christ. Except for some few insignificant fundamentalists, there is not a sect of Christians anywhere whose picture of Christ in their creeds is not at least as remote from the gospel stories as is Dr. Rosenberg's.

Mr. Leslie Weatherhead seems anxious to justify his name as indicating that he is "weatherwise." In the *British Weekly*, he writes, rather mysteriously, of some queer power possessed by human beings like himself:—

I hold that there is a human element of control in the matter of the weather. I hold that, in some portions of the earth, man is largely responsible for the devastating climate.

Mr. Weatherhead promises, in some future article, to explain how in his opinion:—

Interplay of energies which result in what we call the weather, could pass, to a large extent, into the hands of men.

We look forward with unusual interest to a disclosure as to which is the country where man controls the "devastating climate." We may yet have rainless bank-holidays, and a Summer which is not describable as happening "one Thursday afternoon."

One of the speakers at the Modern Churchman's Conference is reported as saying that he does not believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The *Church Times* is alarmed at this "public denial by a priest of a dogmatic fact which he affirms to be true whenever he recites the creed, which moreover he is expressly commissioned to teach, and on which his own official position depends." Perfectly true, but if the *Church Times* is going to insist on absolute honesty with regard to historic Christian teaching, about half the pulpits will be empty. As we have so often said, the Church to-day has to put up with the best it can get, and so has to be content with men who are intellectually well equipped sufficiently to understand modern thought, or sufficiently lacking in self-respect and honesty to profess a belief in doctrines in set terms, and then making them mean something they never have meant when they come to preaching.

Still more difficulties face the Church. There is now "a plea for a wiser selection of hymns" made by the Bishop of Chelmsford. He is "astonished at the very narrow choice of hymns to which we now seem to have restricted ourselves"; and he complains that "such a hymn as, 'O God, our help in ages past'" is worked to death to-day. Perhaps he is beginning to find out that however much God may have helped Christians in the past, this perpetual imploring of God to do his bit for them nowadays does not seem to have had much effect.

The Bishop is also against "making prevailing ignorance darker still by singing hymns which teach false views," and he gives these as illustrations:—

On that happy Easter morning,  
All the graves their dead restore;  
Father, sister, child and mother,  
Meet once more.  
But we believe a day shall come  
When all the dead will rise;  
When they who sleep down in the grave,  
Will ope again their eyes.

We agree with the Bishop that it would be hard to beat such examples for sheer unmitigated nonsense.

Moreover, he recognizes "that opponents of the Christian religion lay hold of these crude and ignorant expressions, and charge the Church with appalling doctrines of this kind." Well, of course, why not? Are we not right? Does not the Bishop agree with us? But we might also point out that our attack does not depend on the Church's silly hymns. We attack the Church on *fundamentals* as well. And to that attack, the Bishop of Chelmsford seems to have no answer.

In case some of our readers, who hear so much of the Thirty-Nine Articles, but never read them, would like a sample, here is one: "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, : and of God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." Canon Armitage, M.A., points out that "these sacraments, with their appropriate ritual, are not invented by man, they are ordained by Christ himself." All we can say is, we could scarcely have written a funnier Acid Drop than this particular Article, whether ordained by Christ or not. It is not merely that it has scarcely any coherent meaning, but what meaning there may be is the most utter nonsense.

This is how Canon Armitage describes Holy Communion: "It is the greatest [sacrament] of them all, as its riches are inexhaustible, its spiritual meaning and power beyond all telling, its glory and splendour beyond all comparison. Here we are transported utterly to the heavenly condition, the world of reality; here we share

in the very worship of Heaven, the worship of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; here we find ourselves in Bethlehem, on Calvary, in the Garden of the Resurrection, on the Mount of the Ascension," and so on, it is so easy to get lost in the exuberance of one's precious verbosity. Some of us think, all the same, there is more of a "world of reality" in a good glass of beer.

Even very religious people, like the pious writers in our church papers, are beginning to see that all is not so well as they would like to think with "advanced" Catholics, as they prefer to call true believers. One of the writers referred to says, "It is unfortunately true that there is to-day a small but vocal body of Catholics who are completely out of touch with reality. . . . They live in a narrow world of congregational religion, developing a beautiful spirit of devotion, but they seem to be entirely detached from the age in which they live." But isn't it this "beautiful spirit" which revivalists, like the Rev. "Dick" Sheppard, are boasting is soon to come about? Isn't this the *true* Christianity? If not, is true Christianity merely some particular writer's conception of it, that is, not something universal which can be simply explained?

No one would suspect our contemporary *John Bull* of being excessively religious, but it often assumes the rather ludicrous role of the Champion of Christendom. The other day it took to task Dr. Matthews, the Dean of St. Paul's, as being even "gloomier" than Dr. Inge, when he said, that "the influence of Christianity in the world steadily wanes," and that "what the Churches offer becomes less and less acceptable to the masses of Western civilization."

*John Bull* thinks this is "the most pessimistic utterance ever made by a high dignitary of the Church," and asks, "Is it true?" The answer it gives is that "Dick" Sheppard assures us that the world is about to experience a tremendous revival of religious faith." And, of course, that settles it. It does not seem to realize that "Dick" Sheppard is only repeating what has been said ten thousand times since the war, and is merely hopeless nonsense. Dr. Matthews is quite right—the Church has nothing to offer anybody who thinks, and Christianity *is* becoming less and less acceptable to civilization. And no amount of supposing that he "confuses" Christianity with "church-going" will make the Dean wrong. This kind of excuse makes the matter worse, for a Christianity without churches, that is, with priests, bishops, cardinals and popes, without prayer books and hymn-singing and mass, etc., would be almost, if not quite, as dead as the proverbial doornail.

### The "Freethinker" Circulation Drive

It is proposed to celebrate the coming-of-age of the present editorship by an attempt to create a substantial increase in the circulation of this paper. The plan suggested is:—

(1) Each interested reader is to take an extra copy for a period of twelve months, and to use this copy as a means of interesting a non-subscriber to the point of taking the *Freethinker* regularly.

(2) So soon as this new subscriber is secured, the extra copy may be dropped by the present subscriber. Until this is accomplished, he will regard the extra threepence weekly (for one year) as a fine for his want of success.

The plan is simple, and it is not costly; but it does mean a little work, and whether or not it is more blessed to give than to receive, it is certainly easier for most to give than it is to work. But in this case it is the work alone that will yield permanent benefit. There are many thousands of potential readers in the country; why not try and secure some of them?



# THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

C. MARTIN.—We shall be pleased to send your newsagent a parcel of *Spain and the Church*, with showcards. Let us know what he requires. Judging from the past week there is no doubt as to sales.

FOR Circulating and Distributing the *Freethinker*.—Don Fisher, 48.; Bayard Simmons, 108. 6d.

SOME answers to correspondents are held over till next week.

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

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

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.

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

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

Three parts of the large edition of Mr. Cohen's pamphlet *The Church and Spain*, have been sold, and we shall, within the next fortnight go to press with another larger edition. The pamphlet says nothing concerning the way in which Spain was brought to ruin by the Church that is not well known to students of history, but the education of the people in this country is so controlled in schools, colleges, and by publishers, that the main facts are slurred over or suppressed. What the pamphlet says should be familiar to everyone. The thanks we have received for issuing it is evidence that the lesson of Spain is neither known nor appreciated.

We are getting the pamphlet well about London, and now we want to see it as well done in the Provinces. We shall be pleased to hear from anyone who can undertake street sales, or who can induce their newsagents to show the pamphlet, and to hang a showcard in their windows. There is no doubt as to the sales that will follow. One London bookseller took 250 copies, to be followed up a few days later with an order for another 500. To Freethinkers the pamphlet offers an unique opportunity of introducing our literature into new hands.

A letter appears in the *Dublin Evening Mail*, from a W. J. Lee, of Sutton, Co. Dublin:—

Mr. Bradlaugh, the great Communist and Atheist lecturer, and one-time M.P., once challenged the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes to a debate on Christianity. Mr. Hughes replied with alacrity: "Most certainly, nothing would give me greater pleasure. But as conventional debates usually lead to nothing, let us have one on new lines. I will undertake to bring one hundred men and women on the platform of St. James Hall, and they shall witness to the saving work of Christ in their lives. You can examine them as much as you like. But you on your part are to bring one hundred men and

women who have been redeemed from sinful life by means of your Atheistic teaching." The debate was never held.

It is quite evident that the Christian liar still flourishes like the Biblical green bay tree. We do not believe in any meeting between Bradlaugh and the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, whose own capacity for lying where religion was concerned was exposed by G. W. Foote. If the meeting had occurred we should only say that the challenge was silly enough for Hugh Price Hughes to make, and contemptible enough for Bradlaugh to ignore. The production of such a stupid tale helps to the understanding of why Christianity still lives. And the man who could call Bradlaugh a Communist is either a fool or liar—perhaps a little of both.

Few public comments could be more worth the making than the following from Mr. J. B. Priestley, in this week's *Star*:—

This is a world in which vast masses of people suddenly and quite surprisingly lose their freedom. Last week they were citizens, and now this week they are slaves. There can be no argument about that. And what are the tactics of our modern dictators?

They turn on their press, their wireless, their films, as the rest of us turn on our taps. They contrive that their miserable subjects shall all be thinking of the same thing at the same time. Across the trails that inevitably lead to ruin and war, they draw their gigantic gaudy red herrings.

Now, what is good enough for the dictators and their victims is emphatically not good enough for us. If this is the proper method of treating a slave people, then it cannot be the proper method of treating a free people.

And, if it is beginning to work with us, if we are satisfied with it, see nothing insulting to our intelligence in these antics, then we are no longer a free adult people, but halfway towards being robots.

From Natal we received from Mr. W. T. Hawks, who is taking up the hunt for new subscribers, a year's subscription for three new readers. Many thanks for this and other letters that have come along. We hope to find by the end of the year that the number of new subscribers gained in this way will form a substantial coming-of-age gift to Mr. Cohen's 21 year's editorship.

Mr. G. Whitehead pays a return visit to Birkenhead, where he will address meetings all this week, commencing to-day (September 13). The local N.S.S. Branch will co-operate at all the meetings. A syllabus of lectures has been arranged for the coming indoor season, and full particulars will be available for the saints attending during this week. The opposition in Birkenhead is treacherous, but there are sufficient Freethinkers easily to ensure peaceful and successful meetings—if they will attend.

The effort to form a Branch of the N.S.S. at Kingston-on-Thames is being pushed with enthusiasm and vigour. The new pamphlet, *Spain and the Church*, is being sold in the street each Saturday evening, and one local enthusiast has paid for 100 copies to be distributed free. On Sunday evening, September 20, Mr. R. H. Rosetti will address a meeting in the Market Place, at 7.0, and all those wishing to help in the formation of the Branch are asked to attend and make themselves known to the speaker or chairman. It would be a good thing if those Freethinkers who can would make a special effort to be present at Mr. Rosetti's meeting.

We have advised our readers to listen when possible to certain of the B.B.C. preachers. They are better "comic turns" than most of the comedians. Now we have another preacher we heartily commend in the person of the Rev. Ensor Walters. We cannot describe him, but will only say that regularly and by design his voice is an alternation of a sob and a yell. It rises regularly from one to the other, without any necessary connexion with what he is saying. We shall certainly go to hear him preach whenever we get the chance. We promise ourselves a good laugh.

## Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936)

BRITISH philosophy suffers another loss in the death of Prof. C. Lloyd Morgan, who in the weakness of his last years took little part in the rough and tumble of philosophical controversy, though he produced a remarkable work, *The Animal Mind*. He will perhaps best be remembered, however, as the propagator of an emergentist doctrine, and his influence on the neo-Vitalist and Holist schools is acknowledged.

Himself influenced by Haeckel, he has been placed in the category of "naturalism" (*Contemporary Thought, Widgery, 1927*), but the significance he attached to purpose and deity removes him far from the materialist class. The development of Lloyd Morgan's thought is to be consulted in his *Life, Mind and Spirit, Emergent Evolution, The Emergence of Novelty, and Mind at the Crossways*. He combats "vital force" as no more relevant than chemical force; that is, it is not something outside the recognized course of events. However, his insistence that it is God who makes emergents emerge occasions Prof. McDougall to ask how, then, he can profess to reject vitalism. In the emerging of the "new" from a set of factors that did not severally contain it, Lloyd Morgan sees the hand of Purpose. It is not calculable, like a mere resultant, but unpredictable, "not there till it comes." At the atomic stage the molecular cannot be predicted, and so at each successive stage new rules come into the game, showing an inherent constructiveness somewhere.

Actually there are materialists, like Prof. H. S. Vennings (*The Universe and Life*) who agree that "novelties" are unpredictable, but who nevertheless do not postulate a purposive agency arranging or inoculating the material, and an excellent materialistic account of emergence is a feature of Dr. R. G. Gordon's *Personality* (1925). Others of the materialistic leaning, like T. H. Morgan, J. B. S. Haldane and Joseph McCabe, consider that with advances in knowledge and in instrumental technique, a fuller study of the factors (ingredients) and conditions (relationships) will make it possible to predict every emergent.

Lloyd Morgan postulates, avowedly without proof, (a) a self-existent physical world of events, matter being evolved from some unspecified forerunner, and these events, with their correlates, are the basis of the pyramid of emergent evolution, reaching at the apex the highest forms of mind. (b) The correlation of physical with "psychical" events in the cortex, the world being "psychophysical from top to bottom," with a correlated psychical system in the atom, molecule, crystal, etc. Nature contains two distinct and concomitant series, mental and physical, both omnipresent. Emergence is not from one to the other, but within each series. The novelty is a new kind of relatedness, calling for new formulae. The passing from a liquid to a solid state is an example of "original novelty." (c) A Relating and Directing Activity, Logos, whose manifestation is the evolutionary process. "I acknowledge the supreme agency of God." Asked, however, "to furnish such demonstrable and indisputable proof as must straightway convince any reasonable person, I cannot do so." Yet "one must postulate agency other than human as a basis for an adequate and sufficient explanation of all that happens or leave much unexplained."

With the latter the materialist, from his own standpoint, may well agree, while preferring to regard the "other agency" as the known natural forces, and not as a mysterious, and therefore isolated and undemonstrable non-natural existence.

Declaring himself unable to define God, Lloyd Morgan remarks that he cannot account for his own

belief in God, except on the hypothesis that He exists. This reversion to a long discredited Cartesian argument does not enhance the reputation of its propagator, and relegates him beneath the many advanced churchmen of the present-day, who have accepted what one (Prof. Webb) calls Kant's "damaging criticism" of such beliefs. Moreover, the science of cultural anthropology exhibits purely natural explanations of the existence of the belief in God.

Having acknowledged his inability to demonstrate the existence of this directive activity, Lloyd Morgan proceeds to build a system on it. "Every step in the constructive advance of nature . . . every phase of emergent evolution is an expression of God's creative activity"; he is "The fountain head and source of all agency," and "emergent evolution is the expression of divine purpose." "The agent whose act is emergent evolution is nothing less than a person; not a natural person, though, since the latter is the outcome of emergent evolution. Agency is not the outcome of natural processes, but that in terms of which natural process may be explained." Thus, though evolution is on the one hand naturalistic through and through, this is only a cross-section, to be supplemented by a purposive or "dramatic explanation," this embodying a protest against a naturalistic interpretation of naturalistic events. Though evolution is "a generalized natural history of the progress of all events," yet we have to ask who did it, and what for, questions which, he contends, are not for science. Science describes, while the concept of agency dramatizes.

With T. H. Huxley the materialist might go so far as to agree that evolution is not an explanation of the process, but only a statement of its methods and results. But what he is saying is simply that after the departmental sciences have described how the process goes on and what it produces, there is still room for a scientific philosophy to consider what is its significance, and what is man's status therein. But whether Lloyd Morgan's dramatic explanation after the manner of Aristotle's Final Cause, must apply is surely to be judged after consulting the verdicts of science, and noting whether the character of the evolutionary process is such as to suggest analogy with human purposes. "My philosophical creed," writes L. I. Morgan, "is that any event and the whole system of events, may be interpreted in terms of evolution, and that (they) may be explained as the creative activity of God." If, then, all that occurs is foreseen and intended, the problem of evil applies in full force. The philosophy of Lloyd Morgan, says B. Russell, leaves us with

a being of infinite power who chooses that children should die of meningitis, and older people of cancer. If, therefore, evolution embodies a Divine Plan, these occurrences must also have been planned. I have been informed that suffering is sent as a purification for sin, but I find it difficult to think that a child of four or five years old can sink into such black depths of iniquity as to deserve the punishment that befalls not a few. . . . Fortunately, however, the evidence of Divine Purpose is non-existent; so at least one must infer from the fact that no evidence is adduced by those who believe in it. We are, therefore, spared the necessity for that impotent hatred which every brave and humane man would otherwise be called upon to adopt towards the Almighty Tyrant" (*Scientific Outlook*).

Creative agency, in Lloyd Morgan's system, can also apply to persons, but in their capacity as agents having foreplan and free-will, they are not products of natural evolution. (He disclaims belief in immortality, however). There is here the further difficulty of

reconciling the freedom of human agency with the omnipresent activity of God, both of which are postulated.

Then, after claiming that "any event and the whole system of events" is due to the agency of God, he tells us that "such things as evil malice and regress" do not come within the Evolver's purpose. What, then, it may be asked, is their meaning? As events they have, we presume, been created by the divine agent, and are therefore part of the "dramatization" of evolution. Either the Evolver's purpose needs them, or it does not. If it does need them, the Evolver is a brutal being, since in his omnipotence he could have taken paths less cruel. If it does not need them an omnipresent all powerful creative activity who accounts for "the whole system of events" is having some cruel by-play and not attending to his purpose.

What is the answer? L. Morgan remarks, "I do not pose as one who can solve all problems." One cannot remain insensible to the rather surprising implication that his system solves *some* problems. What renders his admission farcical is the fact that the problems he says he cannot solve have only been raised by philosophies similar to his own.

G. H. TAYLOR.

### Epistolary Pearls From The Archives of Edessa

(Concluded from page 571)

TIBERIUS in the letter under notice says that because of his being occupied with a war in Spain, he is at present unable to avenge the death of Jesus by taking proceedings against the Jews. This war is unknown. But in A.D. 35, the Romans had trouble with the Parthians over Armenia; whilst a people named Iberians, who inhabited the middle of the isthmus between the Euxine and the Caspian Seas, were involved in the quarrel. It is therefore possible that the writer of the letter confused the land of these Iberians with Spain in consequence of the fact that the name Iberia was common to both countries. Of course Tiberius could never have made such a mistake, but a forger in later times might easily have made it.

The war thus mentioned in the letter is also implied in the subsequent account. Here Aristides (of whom nothing more is known) acts as an ambassador from Tiberius to Abgar at Edessa. Thence he goes to Thicuntha where he finds Claudius, the second after Tiberius, and to Artica, where he meets Tiberius himself, with Caius watching the adjacent parts. According to this statement the three most important persons in the empire were at or near the seat of war. But the history of these persons excludes the belief that at the time in question they took part in any war either in European or in Asiatic Iberia. Tiberius was then already installed on the island of Capræa in the Neapolitan Bay, where he spent the last ten years of his life in vicious pleasures.<sup>35</sup> Claudius, nephew of Tiberius, was born A.D. 10, and being a weak and sickly man, took no part in public affairs until the age of fifty, when the army put him upon the throne in place of Caligula, who had succeeded Tiberius.<sup>34</sup>

Caius, nicknamed Caligula, was born in A.D. 12, and therefore would be only seventeen at the date of

the alleged letter from Tiberius to Abgar, and twenty-three at the date of the trouble with the Parthians, which the letter evidently takes for a war in Spain. At twenty-five he came to the throne, after having been brought up with the Roman troops in Germany.<sup>35</sup> As regards the two cities, Thicuntha and Artica, no places thus named are to be found; whilst the efforts to identify them with other cities are very unsatisfactory, and even if correct do not confirm the statements of the narrative.<sup>36</sup>

The account next declares that Tiberius, when at leisure from the war, ordered the execution of some principal Jews in Palestine, much to Abgar's delight. This order, however, is not mentioned by Josephus, who certainly would have reported it, had it been given.

*The Doctrine of Addæus* is obviously composed of traditional untruths augmented at a later time by deliberate falsifications. There seems great probability that in an earlier form it simply reported the conversion of Edessa by the preaching of Thaddæus without connecting his advent with any correspondence between Abgar and Christ; and that in its present form it embodies an attempt to unite harmoniously the original myth about Thaddæus with the subsequent fiction about Abgar and Christ. The version of the alleged letter to Tiberius as given in this work varies in a remarkable respect from that given at a later time by Moses of Chorene. Here we find Tiberius saying that the Senate had contemptuously rejected his proposal to have Christ enrolled with the national deities. Now the story that Tiberius had made this proposal and met with this refusal is first to be found in the Apology of Tertullian for the Christians, a work referable to the beginning of the third century.<sup>37</sup> Gibbon, in a brief but decisive passage, has exposed the manifold absurdities of this fiction.<sup>38</sup> One of Gibbon's most cogent arguments is that a man so tyrannical as Tiberius would never be thwarted by a body so servile as the Senate. A fact unnoticed by Gibbon also comes into account, to wit, that although, according to the story, Pilate acknowledged his having committed a flagrant and unpardonable violation of justice in the case of Christ, he was not removed from office or even censured for this offence, whilst his actual dismissal took place some years later for a matter of much less importance.

As Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History,<sup>39</sup> quotes the story on the authority of Tertullian, more than a hundred years after Tertullian had reported it, we are left to suppose that the person who compiled *The Doctrine of Addæus* in its present form, either had never heard of the story or else did not believe it. This also suggests that he may never have seen the H.E. of Eusebius, which is even more remarkable than that he should not have seen the Apology of Tertullian. The probability is that he knew of the letters between Abgar and Christ from the same source as Eusebius did; that he compiled them with *The Doctrine of Addæus*; and that he forged for this compilation the letters between Abgar and Tiberius, following herein the practice of many ancient historians who provide their characters with speeches or letters suited to respective occasions. *The Doc-*

<sup>35</sup> *Ib.*, p. 138.

<sup>36</sup> Cureton says that Artica may be Ortyka, a mistake for Ortygia near Syracuse, and therefore not far from Capræa where Tiberius was residing at the time of the alleged occurrence. If this is true the writer of the account did indeed emit a frightful "howler."

<sup>37</sup> *Apologeticus*, c. 5. In c. 21 he says that Pilate reported to Tiberius the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Christ. (*Opera*, Leipzig, 1839).

<sup>38</sup> *Decline and Fall*, c. xvi. Bohn's Edition. London, 1854. Vol. II., p. 133.

<sup>39</sup> H.E. ii. 2.

<sup>34</sup> *Annales* IV., 62, 67. Smith *Dic.* p. 776.

<sup>35</sup> Smith, *Dic.* p. 179.

trine of *Addæus*, together with four Acts of Martyrdom, which I have previously examined, namely, *Sharbil*, *Barsamya*, *Samonas* and *Guras* and *Habib*, appear to have had the same author, a man who expanded traditionary lore with fictitious details of his own invention. There is no need to suppose that he wrote later than the fourth century. The affair of *Habib* occurred in the first quarter of that century. Between then and the end there were three periods, in any one of which the author might have written—soon after the Council of Nice held in A.D. 325; during the repression of Christianity by the Emperor Julian A.D. 360-363 or when the Athanasians of Edessa were suffering persecution under the Arians, supported by the Emperor Valens, who reigned from A.D. 364-378. If the writings above specified, particularly the Martyrs' Acts, appeared in either of the two periods last named the purpose of the writer would be to encourage his brethren in steadfastness by reminding them of the faith and patience which their predecessors had exhibited. Valuable evidence collected by Tillemont,<sup>40</sup> proves beyond doubt that in the fourth century Edessa was a great stronghold of the Christians. Ephraem Syrus, who was a deacon there, calls it "the mother of saints." Rufinus terms it "the city of faithful people." Sozominus declares that at Edessa the study of sacred letters preceded the study of secular letters. Theodoret says that although it was very large and very populous, the piety of its inhabitants caused it to be selected by saints, and avoided by Christ's enemies, one of whom, the Emperor Julian, refused to enter it when on his march to Persia. As the Christians long before the fourth century had distinguished themselves by the production of forged writings, it is perfectly clear that the archives of a city so devoted to Christianity as Edessa was, could easily be made to furnish material for spurious works in honour of the Christian Faith. Here Lardner's judgment on the alleged correspondence between Abgar and Christ, and on the account of its circumstances as given by Eusebius, is well worth quoting:—

The whole history is a fiction of some Christian at Edessa in the time of Eusebius, or not long before. The people of Edessa were then, generally, Christians, and they valued themselves upon it. And they were willing to do themselves the honour of an early conversion to the Christian faith. By some one, or more of them, united together, this history was formed, and was so far received by Eusebius as to be thought by him not improper to be inserted in his Ecclesiastical History. Nor could I omit to take some notice of it, as great regard has been shown to it by some. But my readers may perceive that I bring not in this thing as a testimony of the first antiquity; though it may afford good proof of the Christianity of the people of Edessa, at the beginning of the fourth century, when Eusebius wrote, or before.<sup>41</sup>

C. CLAYTON DOVE.

<sup>40</sup> *Mem. . . . Eccles.* viii. (Paris, 1713), pp. 281, 282. Theodoret the last of the witnesses died in A.D. 457 or 458.

<sup>41</sup> *Works.* London, 1835, Vol. VI. \*596-605.

There is no veil for ignorance and incompetence that is quite so effective as an assumption of dignity. Kings, Ministers of State, officials of all classes will usually affect and impress numbers of people in proportion as they are what are called "dignified." This is usually not the natural dignity of a great character, but that which originates in mere forms and ceremonies and which dare not permit familiarity lest even dull minds perceive the commonplace mind or character that "dignity" shields from criticism.

## God as Distributor

MAN laid the greatest curse upon himself when he subjected himself to ecclesiasticism, and instituted the cleric as dictatorial intervener at all the important or critical stages of life. The inevitable result has been that the self-constituted representatives of a superstitious Almighty God have all along secured for themselves precedence in public affairs, and at public and official functions. Thus, immediately after the death of King George V., we had the spectacle of three maudlin sycophants in the persons of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Ramsay Macdonald and Simon the Home Secretary present in an ante-room—the first standing, the two latter kneeling. When the present King showed his face at the door the Archbishop exclaimed "Your Majesty!" Thereupon the new King was assured that he had by divine ordinance (communicated by "Cosmo Cantuar.") ceased to be Prince of Wales and had become, by the Grace of God, King of the British Dominions.

But it is not only that from early times clerics have secured precedence to all others; but that they have in the economic aspect secured for themselves the fat of life. The most common charge against Freethinkers is that they are the victims of "materialism." It would be very interesting to put side by side the Income Tax Returns of the leaders of Freethought and the leaders of the great Ecclesiastical Corporations. We listen to most pathetic proclamations of the Fatherhood of the loving Christian God and eloquent pulpit adjurations to the pews to form a brotherhood of Man under such a loving God. But in the estimation of many, this Almighty daddy is under grave suspicion. His record smells. He has all along had about him too many favourites, courtiers and flatterers. And towards his family generally, history attests that he has been extremely neglectful. Indeed no more clamant case has ever been investigated by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children! And, historically, where fellowship has been found most firmly established among human beings, God has been found most conspicuous by his absence. But he has always been found most prominent in bitter conflicts between sections of his own family. When the guns begin to fire each belligerent makes moving appeals to God for support in testimony of his approbation of the justice of his particular cause.

Naturally, once the secular authority had conceded the super-authority to clericalism, the latter took every means to consolidate its material position. Thus the medieval monks were found established in the most fertile parts of the country with ample resources to provide themselves with every material comfort. This is not to say that every individual monk was greedy and self-considering only. On the contrary, many of them were teachers of arts, and sought to enlighten the ignorant, subject always to the proviso that their God must be recognized as the everlasting ruler and the source of all good. But with the spread of knowledge, independent intellectual rebels began here and there to appear, and students of history know very well what became of them! Fortunately, the suppression of one heretic often meant the appearance of a still greater number of intellectual rebels, who as they increased in influence eventually defied their Ecclesiastical "superiors." Unfortunately, however, the majority of these rebels while cutting themselves off from the Early Church only had in view the creation of another Church still acknowledging an Almighty God;

and in their fiery hatred they resorted to methods of violence, which destroyed many beautiful buildings and other works which were the fruits of the diligence of the early monks. Misdirected zeal was merely evidence of the most bitter animosity against former colleagues. Had true wisdom operated in the case of the majority of the rebels, they would have roused the people to throw off the yoke of supernatural authority wholly and for ever. The admission that there existed an almighty supernatural ruler of the Universe left the door open to any Church of the future to arrogate to itself the claim to speak for that ruler, to interpret his will for mankind; and to put in force his decrees as proclaimed by it by whatever means it chose. So that it was very much a case of "out of the frying pan into the fire!"

Men might forsake the institution, but they did nothing to abolish its original creator, who, while making hypocritical professions and protestations of his deep love and concern for human beings, time and again bathed the world in blood and tears.

Belief and trust in such a being have been the combined constituents of man's continuing curse. Ignorance and fear are the parents of Faith. It is not the heart of man but the heart of God that is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked! It is only now, in an age of greater enlightenment that man is beginning to see that if he made this supernatural monster for his suppression and destruction, he can also unmake him!

Complacent Christians in comfortable material circumstances never seem to have any worry about the responsibility of their God for the existing unrest and distress of the world! He "doeth all things well." His chief British medicine-man receives a stipend of £15,000 a year, with two Palaces. His subordinates have incomes ranging from £10,000 to £4,000 a year—each also enjoying a palace in addition. God is openly exhibited as the economic distributor. He exalts one to a position of great wealth; and consigns another to the ditch. And yet many human beings can be so abject in their ignorance that we find quite a number of indigent pietists! The lucky ones, however, who attain great wealth are never sure of their position. Some of them may be in the ditch tomorrow. Oh no, there is nothing capricious or arbitrary about the execution of the decrees of Almighty God! His purposes are always wise and righteous altogether!

Of course it must be seen that many poor and dependent persons profess piety for the material help they may extract from the hands of their better-off fellow-believers. But what an indignity to potentially noble and dignified men and women! Look at the patronizing and condescending almoners, and then at the cringing and submissive alms-receivers! It is only an abandoned wretch of a human father who, when his child asks for bread will give it a stone; but he has plenty of justification for doing so in the example of the Almighty Father, who appears to become more and more deaf to the piteous wails of humanity as the years pass.

Everything in the garden was going to be lovely after the New Dispensation! Men, seeing the great love of God in the face of Jesus Christ, would show the reality of the Good Tidings of Great Joy, by changing their own lives of selfishness into selflessness and self-sacrifice. No one should want the necessaries of life; and the sordid and squalid would be eradicated. Well, what of that prediction? "God as Distributor" cuts no ice!

IGNOTUS.

## Jesus's Teachings

### DO CHRISTIANS KEEP THEM

WRITING on the subject of the dispute regarding the Anzac Day service at St. Kilda (Victoria, Australia) in which some Protestant sects and Jews were involved, Archbishop Head, of Melbourne, said, "We are a Christian nation, and I do not think we should be ashamed of the fact." A few days later—April 11, 1936—the Melbourne *Herald* published a leading article on Easter, in which it observed:—

What is it that men have always sought; and sought, too, before Christ? It is perhaps a guiding creed, a blind quest for "the good life." If that be so, is there need to look further than the Sermon on the Mount, the very essence of Christianity as an ethical code?

In the circumstances it may be asked (1) what are Jesus's teachings, and (2) does this or any other Christian nation keep them? The Asiatic Hebrew, who would not be admitted to the Commonwealth under the Alien Restriction Act, propounded a number of opinions that might satisfy people living near the Dead Sea, but many are totally unsuitable for civilized and educated communities. It is interesting to review a few of the absurdities uttered by the Bethlehem hero—the average Christian does not know them.

When Jesus delivered his sermon on the mount, he taught, "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Nobody will pretend that the British Empire has been extended by meekness. The navy and the army are surely not instruments with which England displays her humility. The adventurous spirits responsible for the expansion of "the greatest empire the world has ever seen" have not been "poor in spirit," and accordingly the kingdom of heaven will not be theirs.

Jesus is also reported to have said, "Swear not at all." Is this teaching obeyed in any courts in this Christian nation?

He commanded, "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." The British Empire would not have reached its present strength if such advice had been followed; the British would have been a collection of weaklings.

Jesus said, "And if any man will sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." British commercial ramifications would not be among the wonders of the world if business magnates had taken serious notice of such a contemptible and obsequious rule.

He advised further, "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them." However, many a wealthy Christian has made sure of a satisfactory advertisement from his generosity.

The Christian hero also directed, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." Anglican Church dignitaries receiving from £1,500 to £15,000 a year clearly take no notice of this injunction. Incidentally, the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church are not distinguished for meekness, and both have acquired treasures upon earth worth many millions of pounds sterling.

"Behold the fowls of the air," said Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, "for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?" While the birds are being fed millions of human beings in this Christian nation and other Christian nations, such as the United States of America, are on the bread line, if not starving. Those

unfortunate people are also poorly clad, whereas, according to Jesus, God clothes the grass of the field.

Jesus taught, "Take therefore no thought for the morrow." If a Christian observed that suggestion, where would he land himself, particularly in these days of tax assessments, and of bakers', butchers' and landlords' bills? Insurance companies emphasize above everything else the importance of thinking of the future.

"Christian" England has disregarded many other pieces of absurd advice attributed to the Asiatic hero, otherwise she would have remained as unimportant as Pitcairn is, or Tierra del Fuego.

Melbourne.

"D."

## Correspondence

LUCRETIVS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—Referring to the paragraph on p. 533 of your issue of August 30, in which my name is mentioned, may I recommend the writer of that paragraph and the succeeding ones to study the book entitled *Lucretius Poet and Philosopher*, by Mr. E. Sikes, President of St. John's College, Cambridge? If he does so, he will find that his assertion that Lucretius denies the existence of the gods "in every religious sense" is mistaken. Mr. Sikes shows (p. 109) that Lucretius and his master Epicurus held the existence of the gods, that (p. 62) Epicurus was eulogized by his biographer Diogenes Laertius for his reverence to the gods which was sincere (p. 117) and for his asceticism (which implies renunciation); that the Epicurean religion was a kind of adoration which has been described by Cyril Baily, Master of Balliol, as "something like communion" (p. 116). But Epicurus also said that the popular religion was wrong (p. 110). His position says Mr. Sikes, was bound to be misunderstood (p. 117), as it has been by your paragraphist, and charges of Atheism were brought by Plutarch and others, though the system of Epicurus forbade strict Atheism (p. 109).

A. G. CARDEW.

[We are not concerned with reading what the President of St John's College says about Lucretius, but only with a truthful rendering of his position. Our preference is for reading the authors themselves, rather than depending upon what other people say about them. What Lucretius meant by the gods is quite clear, and a reference to the fifth book of his work will show that quite plainly. Given a knowledge of the times and the current philosophy and Lucretius is a very easy writer to follow. And misrepresentations of people who attacked religious ideas are so common with those in high places, and in charge of educational establishments, that every one who values truth should always carefully check what is said.—Ed. *Freethinker*.]

## Obituary

JOSEPH H. ENGLISH

We regret to announce the death of Joseph H. English, which took place in Newcastle Royal Victoria Infirmary, on September 4. More than forty of his seventy years had been spent in active association with the Freethought movement, and he was one of the most energetic members of the Ashington Branch of the N.S.S., which he founded in 1931. Many local saints will remember him for his kindly and useful guidance in Freethought matters. The remains were interred in Ashington Cemetery, and in accordance with his wish a Secular Service was conducted.

## 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

BETHNAL GREEN AND HACKNEY BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 3.15, Mr. E. T. Bryant.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond, Hampstead): 11.30, Mr. L. Ebury. Highbury Corner, 8.0, Mr. L. Ebury. South Hill Park, Hampstead, 8.0, Monday, September 14, Mr. L. Ebury.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 6.0, A Lecture. Rushcroft Road, Brixton, 8.0, Tuesday, September 15, Mr. H. Prece. Cock Pond, Clapham, 8.0, Friday, September 18, Mr. L. Ebury.

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

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 3.30, Sunday, Messrs. Bryant, Wood, Evans, Tuson and Carlton. 6.30, Messrs. Saphin, Bryant, Wood, Evans, Tuson, Lacey and Carlton. Wednesday, 7.30, Messrs. Wood, Bryant and Tuson. Thursday, 7.30, Messrs. Saphin and Wood. Friday, 7.30, Mr. A. Leacy and others. *Freethinker* on sale at Kiosk. Should be ordered in advance to avoid disappointment.

### COUNTRY

#### OUTDOOR.

BLACKBURN BRANCH N.S.S. (Market): 7.0, Mr. H. Hankin (Bolton)—"Religion: Why? and How?" Literature for sale.

BLYTH (Market Place): 7.0, Monday, September 14, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

CHESTER-LE-STREET (The Bridge): 7.30, Friday, September 11, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Queen's Drive, opposite Walton Baths): 8.0, A Lecture. St. James Mount, Liverpool, 8.0, Wednesday, A Lecture.

MIDDLESBROUGH (Davidson Street): 7.0, Tuesday, September 15, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

PRESTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place): 7.30, Mr. J. V. Shortt (Liverpool).

SEAHAM HARBOUR (Church Street): 8.0, Saturday, September 12, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

SHEFFIELD (Barker's Pool): 7.0, Mr. E. V. Birkby—"Fascism and the Jews."

SOUTH SHIELDS BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place): Thursday, September 10, Mr. Brighton.

SUNDERLAND BRANCH N.S.S. (Gill Bridge Avenue): 7.0, Mr. Dalkin.

### FOUR LECTURES on

## FREETHOUGHT and LIFE

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price - One Shilling. Postage 1½d.

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

### SPECIAL OFFER.

## Essays in Freethinking

By CHAPMAN COHEN.

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

7s. 6d.

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

## CREED AND CHARACTER

CHAPMAN COHEN

1. Religion and Race Survival
2. Christianity and Social Life
3. The Case of the Jew
4. A Lesson from Spain

Price 4d.

Postage 1d.

## Historical Jesus and the Mythical Christ

BY GERALD MASSEY

Price 6d.

Postage 1d.

## UNWANTED CHILDREN

In a Civilized Community there should be no UNWANTED Children.

An Abridged List (16 pages) of Birth Control Requisites and Books sent post free for a 1½d. stamp.

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

ESTABLISHED NEARLY HALF A CENTURY

## Special Offer to New Readers

### THE "FREETHINKER"

is published every Thursday, and may be ordered direct from the publishing office at the following rates: One Year, 15s.; Six Months, 7s. 6d.; Three Months 3s. 9d.

Until December 31, 1936, a year's subscription will entitle the sender to a selection of five shillingworth of Pioneer Press publications, provided that he is not already a subscriber. This offer applies to new subscribers only.

The *Freethinker* is indispensable to anyone who wishes to keep in touch with the Freethought movement in this country, or to the fearless and uncompromising criticism of religious belief.

To the PIONEER PRESS, 61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

Please send me the *Freethinker* for one year, for which I enclose 15s. Send me also the following publications to the value of 5s. free of cost and carriage. I am not already a subscriber to the *Freethinker*.

Name .....

Address .....

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

## BOOKS WORTH HAVING

### The History of Government

By SIR CHARLES PETRIE. Published 7/6. Price 3/-. Postage 4½d.

### Primitive Law

By E. SIDNEY HARTLAND. Published 7/6. Price 3/-. Postage 4½d.

### The Growth of Civilization

By W. J. PERRY. Published 6/-. Price 2/9. Postage 4½d.

### An Introduction to the Physiology and Psychology of Sex

By S. HERBERT. Published 6/-. Price 2/9. Postage 4d.

By HAVELOCK ELLIS

### Essays on Love and Virtue

The Renovation of the Family—The Function of Taboos—The Revaluation of Obscenity—The Control of Population—Eugenics and the Future, etc. Published 7/6. Price 3/-. Postage 4d.

### The Task of Social Hygiene

The Problem of Sexual Hygiene—Eugenics and Love—The Significance of a Falling Birth-rate, etc. Published 6/-. Price 2/9. Postage 4½d.

### Impressions and Comments

Essays. Published 6/-. Price 2/9. Postage 4d.

### Affirmations

Literary Essays. Published 6/-. Price 2/9. Postage 4½d.

### Authorodoxy

By ALAN HANDSACRE

A Careful and Slashing Criticism of G. K. Chesterton's *Orthodoxy*. Published 5/-. Price 1/6. Postage 2d.

All as new. Only limited number of copies

Obtainable from THE PIONEER PRESS,  
61 Farringdon Street,  
E.C.4

What the Church did for Spain

# SPAIN AND THE CHURCH

CHAPMAN COHEN

This is a pamphlet that should be distributed by the thousand

Price, 1½d. post free. 12 copies for 10d. post free  
100 copies, 6s. post free

## Paganism in Christian Festivals

BY

J. M. WHEELER

Price 1s.

Postage 1½d.

## Heathen's Thoughts on Christianity

BY

UPASAKA

Price—ONE SHILLING. Postage—One Penny

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

## THE REVENUES OF RELIGION

BY

ALAN HANDSACRE

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

## PAGAN ELEMENTS IN CHRISTIANITY

H. CUTNER

The author has here collected a number of the most striking facts about the origin of Christian institutions, such as Christmas Day, the Sabbath, Easter, the Virgin Birth, the Cross, etc., and shown, from reliable authorities, that they were all indubitably Pagan. A chapter is devoted to the Pagan origin of the Mass, with many illustrative comments; and finally there is an entertaining account of Holy Relics, thus exposing one of the grossest frauds in the history of the Christian Church. This little work should be on the bookshelves of all "fighting" Free-thinkers.

Price Sixpence

Postage 1d.

## SELECTED HERESIES

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Cloth Gilt 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

## BRADLAUGH AND INGERSOLL

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Price 2s. 6d.

Postage 3d.

Issued for the Secular Society, Limited, by  
the Pioneer Press, 61 FARRINGTON ST., E.C.4