

# THE FREETHINKER

• EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN •

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LVII.—No. 27

SUNDAY JULY 4, 1937

PRICE THREEPENCE

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
Dr. Inge Looks at Life—The Editor	- 417
A Secular Saint—Mimnermus	- 418
"The Intellect in Worship"—J. Reeves	- 419
A Little Theology—H. Cutner	- 421
Egoism—Don Fisher	- 422
Spirits—Under Proof—C. Suffern	- 426
Henry Heberington—1792-1849—Ambrose G. Barker	- 427
Thomas Paine in America—Franklin Steiner	- 428
The Bishop and the Reform Bill	- 429

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

## Views and Opinions

### Dr. Inge Looks At Life

It is not paying Dr. R. W. (ex-Dean) Inge a very violent compliment to say that he is among the very few present-day clergymen for whose intellectual ability one may feel respect. It is not a case of the superiority of a one-eyed man where the rest of the people are blind; there is with him a quality of mind that often makes one wonder why Dr. Inge was in the pulpit, and how, consistently with self-respect, he managed to remain there. It is true that Dr. Inge has often said things that involve an absurdity, or even an evasion of the issue—a far more serious offence. But whether he is evasive or absurd, or saying something that is reminiscent of the sociological stone age, there is generally an element of intellectuality about his writings that commands attention. He is not like his spiritual brother in the Lord, the Bishop of London, who all his life has never said even a moderately sensible thing without stamping it with his own quality of downright stupidity. Nor does he resemble his spiritual superior, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who shows a characteristic episcopal cunning behind mere verbiage ponderously expressed. When Dr. Inge was in the Church he was known as the "gloomy Dean," and sometimes as the "terrible Dean"; but this was because he recognized the degree of hopelessness that confronted orthodox Christianity, and how futile were the sophistries and falsifications of Christian apologetics in replying to the modern scientific attack on religion. He is not what one could call a great theologian. In this respect he cannot rank with Butler in the English or Newman in the Roman Church. But with a less direct intelligence he might easily have become a prominent politician, or have succeeded a man like Balfour, taking a leading part in political affairs with a very strong contempt for the materials with which he had to work.

### Whole Truths and Half-truths

I have been led to these reflections on Dr. Inge, by having recently read a volume of very short essays

(*A Rustic Moralist*, Putnam, 7s. 6d.), consisting mainly of articles published in the *Evening Standard*. Running through these articles (the majority are too short to be classed as essays) one can realize why many of his clerical brethren regarded him as "terrible" or "gloomy." Speaking on religion and conduct, he says:—

A solicitor or merchant, unless he is a rogue, may be a pleasanter man to do business with than a clergyman, who is sometimes difficult, partly from ignorance and partly because scrupulous fairness in business is not for him the primary virtue.

I fancy that very little pressure would have induced Dr. Inge to make the admission that where religious interests are concerned the clergy have a standard of ethical values much lower than that exercised in the world of every-day life. This is in fact admitted in the statement immediately following:—

The fanatical Churchman . . . in serving the interests of his Church thinks that the end justifies the means, and is far more unscrupulous than the ordinary man of the world.

There is a caustic comment on our public exhibitions, which might have been written with an eye on the coming Coronation show:—

We cannot swagger solemnly; our pageants are mixed with buffoonery, like the Lord Mayor's Show. London's tutelary gods are Gog and Magog.

There is also a typical Inge passage, in which he permits his hard-shell Toryism to express itself:—

The square miles of cottages in the East End are, of course, peculiar to England and very characteristic. Our people like to have homes of their own.

This is typical of Dr. Inge in his most Tory-ish humour. It reminds one of the "great landowner" (by which is meant the owner of much land) walking round the village over which he lords and praising his people for being so happy and contented with their limited means and cramped quarters; or the royal visitor to the slums, visiting selected houses and congratulating those who are living in them for their contentment, and the way in which they carry on in circumstances that threaten to carry them off. I fancy I know more of the East End than does Dr. Inge, and I confess that it would never have entered my mind to describe the slums of East London as "square miles of cottages," with its suggestion of small dwellings, probably surrounded with a garden and with roses climbing over the doorways. It might also be said by many that, in such conditions as face large numbers of slum-dwellers, "little homes" is a rather fantastic description. There is a suggestion of endearment about the expression that suggests a prettiness and a comfort in the homes of the "lowly" that ill-befits the vile hovels and dens that were so characteristic of

the dwellings of the poor up to very recent times, and which is still true of a large number. And the church to which Dean Inge belongs never failed to impress upon the poor the duty of submission to the evils of their lives. No one was more strenuous in preaching the doctrine of submission as a Christian duty than the great Wilberforce whose character was being lauded in the Christian press the other day, because of his work on behalf of the emancipation of the slaves. The slaves who were working and starving, above and below ground, did not appear to trouble him very much.

\* \* \*

#### Paganism And Christianity

One welcomes in this volume Dr. Inge's lecture delivered to the Classical Association on "Greeks and Barbarians," and despite the introduction of a passage or two which read as though they were put in to make formal acknowledgment of Christianity, there is stress laid upon the debt the world owes to antiquity. Dr. Inge says:—

Greece was very nearly lost to the world some seven hundred years. The Dark Ages were really dark, in spite of all attempts to whitewash them. Except for Byzantine architecture—Constantinople was for centuries the only civilized city in Europe except Cordova (Mohammedan)—would the world have lost much if the period between A.D. 500 and 1100 had been blotted out? Then came the revival, in which Aristotle filtered through into Western thought by way of the Arabs, and then what we truly call the Renaissance, when the West awakened from a long sleep with the classics in her hands. "Back to Greece" was the watchword of the Italian scholars, painters, sculptors, poets and men of science.

That is well said, and it must be noted that the world which had reached such a pitch between 500 and 1100, that had it been blotted out nothing of great consequence would have been lost, was a world that was more completely under the control of the Christian Church than it has ever been in its history. And the escape from this darkness was achieved, not by the influence of the Church, or by what people please to call "the spirit of Christianity," but by a return to the Pagan philosophy, the Pagan view of life that Christianity had suppressed. Civilization owes nothing to the Christian Church. It has to count against it the bitterest opposition, and the most persistent persecution.

\* \* \*

#### Substitute For Religion

Dr. Inge has reprinted here the series of articles he wrote in the *Standard* on "Substitutes for Religion." It is a pity he did not delete the judgment that "Secularism" has a "low and unspiritual standard of values." I give him quite cheerfully the question-begging word "unspiritual," but why "low"? That kind of thing is worthy of the Bishop of Durham, or the Bishop of London. As a matter of fact the chief objection to the ethics of Secularism, when it is analysed is, not that it is low, but that it is too high. The stock and orthodox criticism of Secularism is that a view which confines people's attention to this world alone can never be an incentive to decent conduct. It will never "keep them in order." If there is no other world in which virtue is rewarded and vice punished, if there is no divine authority for moral laws, how can we reasonably expect men and women to behave themselves as they should? The common expression in the mouths of Christian teachers, "moral restraints," is another piece of evidence of the same trend. A man must impose restraint upon himself if he is to be good, and he "indulges" himself if he is bad. This habit of throwing words with ill-connnotations at opponents is a very old game with Christians,

and it is unfortunate Dr. Inge did not rise above it. But as I have said many times, the virus of religion bites deep, that of Christianity bites deepest of all, and but very, very few, once having been inoculated with Christianity, ever get it completely out of their systems.

But I do agree with Dr. Inge in his rejection of the substitutes for religion that he passes in review. There is no substitute for religion, there are only things, frames of mind, teachings that are called religious, but which owe whatever they have of value to non-religious influences. The Christian who preaches liberty in the name of religion, the Christian who advocates justice and honesty in the name of religion, is merely labelling these things as religious to cover the fact that he does not like to preach religion pure and undefiled. Religion consists in the belief in the government of the world by supernatural agencies. Anything without this may be philosophy, it may be ethics, it may be sociology, it may be psychology, but it is not religion. The real evil here is that, when men outgrow their distinctively religious beliefs, they do not often lose that frame of mind which religion has created and developed. That remains, and forms a cover for some of the deepest evils of current civilization.

CHAPMAN COITEN.

## A Secular Saint

"Man's great need is boldly honest minds."

G. W. Foote.

No less a critic than Matthew Arnold has told us that Emerson's works are the most valuable prose contribution to English literature of the nineteenth century. Another keen critic, G. W. Foote, went even further, and declared that Emerson "is the sweetest memory of his land and country." If these things be true, Emerson's well of inspiration will run for many a day. Of all his famous contemporaries he is now the strongest, the most influential, the most read. More recent voices in philosophy, such as Nietzsche, simply repeat in varied language the golden message of Emerson, and have sent us back with renewed interest to the master's writings.

It is natural to feel curious concerning the evolution of a great literary force that is really original. To watch Shelley as he grows from *Queen Mab* to *Prometheus Unbound*, or to trace Shakespeare's genius, as he progresses from *Venus and Adonis* to *Hamlet* and other masterpieces of the world's literature, forms the best introduction to a re-reading of these authors. Nor is such curiosity wasteful in the case of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

This great Freethinker first saw the light in an American parsonage, and he had clerical blood in his veins. His father and his grandfather were both clergymen. At first he followed in the footsteps of his ancestors, and was ordained as a Unitarian minister. Even in those early days his preaching was ethical rather than devotional. Emerson did not care for the threshing of old straw. There is a suspicion of chafing under the harness, and the bent is already towards Secularism. The prime duty, he thought, was to be truthful and honest, and he revolted at the "official goodness" of the ministerial position.

Then his intellect rebelled. There was a question of the rite of communion, and his mind was brought to a pause. His elder brother, William, was even more rationalistic, and definitely declined to take holy orders. Emerson turned towards ethics, and his turning took a practical form. He opened his church to

anti-slavery agitators, and made the acquaintance of Thomas Carlyle, whom he visited in his far-off Scottish home. This was the germ of a great friendship, notable in the history of literature.

Emerson's first book was, characteristically, a slender volume on *Nature*, and it revealed the fact that he found the Unitarian fetters none the less real for being simple and few. From the publication of his first book Emerson became a real power, and his subsequent career is familiar to all who care for the higher things in literature. Lowell, who knew him well said:—

Those who heard him while their natures were yet plastic, and their mental nerves responsive, will never cease to say:

"Was never eye did see that face,  
Was never ear did hear that tongue,  
Was never mind did mind his grace  
That ever thought the travail long,  
But eyes and ears, and every thought  
Were with his sweet perfections caught."

Since that eulogy was written, time has only more assured Emerson's position among the writers that really matter. Those who have read his pages with attention know that his real and essential message was the religion of humanity. He says quite plainly that the day will come when churches built on supernaturalism will be superseded and left behind by the rising conscience of the race:—

There will be a new church founded on moral science, at first cold and naked, a babe in a manger again, the algebra and mathematics of ethical law, the church of men to come; without shawms, or psaltery, or sackbut; but it will have nature for its beams and rafters; science for symbol and illustration; it will fast enough gather beauty, music, picture, poetry.

A church founded on ethics! Is it not the trumpet of a prophecy? The superstitious may well be alarmed, for daily they are discarding their dogmas, abandoning their miracles, and heading their churches towards the Emersonian ideal.

What distinguishes Emerson from so many philosophers is that he had a shrewd American head on his shoulders. He was no mere student hemmed in by the walls of his study. Long before Ruskin declared: "There is no wealth but life," Emerson said: "the best political economy is care and culture of men." Years before attention was paid to ethics as a serious factor in religion, Emerson wrote: "I look for the new teachers that shall see the identity of the law of gravitation with purity of heart, and shall show that duty is one thing with science." This great American thinker dreamt of vaster accomplishments and nobler victories than man has yet witnessed. "We think our civilization is near its meridian, but we are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star." The quintessence of the Emersonian philosophy is unquestionably individual. "Be yourself" is the keynote. "Nothing is at last sacred, but the integrity of your own mind." Emerson's counsel of perfection is not unlike that which Shakespeare puts in the mouth of old Polonius:—

"To thine own self be true;  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Certainly, no writer stimulates thought like Emerson. His maxims are a perpetual antidote to the insidiousness of custom and tradition. In every sense of the word, he was a Freethinker. Golden thoughts confront us on every page of his writings:—

A world in the hand is worth two in the bush.  
Who shall forbid a wise scepticism?

Let us have to deal with real men and women, and not with ghosts.

So far as a man thinks, he is free.

Knowledge is the knowing that we cannot know.

Whoso would be a man must be a Nonconformist.

Every reform was once a private opinion

Nature is no saint.

Aristocracy degrades life for the unprivileged classes.

Mankind divides itself into two classes—benefactors and malefactors.

The high price of courage indicates the general timidity.

In Emerson we have a very notable contradiction of the old adage, which excepts a prophet from honour in his own country. He became a classic during his lifetime, and his *Representative Men* is still high in the list of worth-while books. The fragment of granite which marks his grave is a fitting symbol of his nobility of character and singleness of purpose. That grave reminds us that there were giants in those far-off days of struggle and stress. Let us take heed of this noble American, who was ready not only to die for civilization, but to live for it. His magnificent literary legacy is the best philosophy at the worst of times. He bids men to hitch their wagons to a star, and their hearts to exult at the thought of Liberty.

MIMNERMUS.

## "The Intellect in Worship"

THE developments of religious propaganda are always interesting to Secularists, if not so much so to believers. They range from the practically exclusive inculcation of theology, ecclesiasticism and other-worldliness, with the sanction of heaven and hell, to the notion contained in a newspaper article under the title quoted above.

The old type of exposition still lingers, though of the larger sects in this country it is perhaps confined to obscurantist and ignorant sects such as Roman Catholics and the Salvation Army. As regards the former the "always the same" idea is evidently held as firmly and confidently as ever, in spite of the criticism of their superstition passed by common sense, common experience, and common knowledge, by science and history. And the *Listener* recently contained an article by a priest, in which readers were told that the arguments of Rationalists had been "time and time refuted"; that they "accept without examination any argument which tells their way"; that their "faith . . . grows stronger the more absurd their arguments become"; and that they possess a "passion for denial," a "frenzy of unreason."

The "Army," equally confident if not quite so intellectually audacious, have as is well known developed a "social side," and this doubtless appeals to many benevolently-minded people who for lack of informed reflection, fail to realize that whatever good may be done by social effort is probably in the long run, if not immediately, more than counterbalanced by the inculcation of superstition.

This social claim has of late been extended to that of the civilizing influence of Christianity, in spite of the notorious facts we have about the Dark and Middle Ages, which have led us to conclude that Christianity has not "civilized Europe," but that Europe—the natural though extraordinarily slow re-development of intellectualism, and of what may be broadly called social decency—has civilized Christianity: just as the old Hebrew magico-religion was

raised from a savage-barbarian condition to a somewhat more tolerable one. (Evidence for the primitive practice of ritual killing and cannibalism is to be found in *Leviticus* xxvi. 29, and for foundation human sacrifices in *1 Kings* xvi. 24; and so on.)

The claim that emotion and will (including "religious experience") as well as intellect should play a part in the judgment of theological propositions is now familiar. But it appears that some propagandists lay more than the usual stress on the latter. The Paracletian religion, of which we hear (started by a "prophet," who says he received 170 chapters of instructions from the Lord) promises "new life in double measure," "an accession not only of spiritual, but of intellectual strength," and suggests that "those who receive such increase should give evidence of it in their success in the business of this world."

The interpolation of intellect into religion—in the true sense of ratiocination based on genuine knowledge—would appear to be a highly dangerous proceeding. But Dr. Alington, taking his courage in both hands, suggests the curious relation in the quoted title of this article, says that "the Church of to-day implores men to think," and that the recall to religion is desirable for "our intellectual needs." The article makes no attempt to show how or why intellectuality and prayer, or religion in any form, are related, but is mainly concerned to show that Lord Bacon thought that Theistic belief was necessary. The Dean admits that the belief will not infallibly succeed in the contest with human frailty, and that it was not very successful with Lord Bacon himself. But there is no mention of the important fact that in Bacon's time it was extremely difficult to achieve freedom even from some of the grosser ancient superstitions; a time when a fellow of the Royal Society, e.g., could tell at a meeting of his demonstration on a wounded servant of the efficacy of "sympathy powder" (sympathetic magic).

Passing by the hoary statement (so ignorant and stupid after the work of the great Greek investigators and Roman expositors) that it is the "fool" who says there is no God, we encounter the curious notion that Theism is a "consistent theory." Consistent with what? With science, which excludes the supernatural and negates so many long held religious beliefs? With anthropology and history, which do the same, and show that current theological beliefs are based on myths and legends of the kind which have been collected from all parts of the barbaric and early ancient worlds? With Nature, "red in tooth and claw?" With the "Martyrdom of Man," during his "upward purgatorial march"—including the Inquisition and the horrible religious wars and massacres of medieval and earlier modern Europe?

We note also the repetition of the old notion that those who reject Theism have no alternative theory to suggest—nothing to put in its place. I think it was Voltaire who gave one answer to this allegation in the following or like words: What! if I rescue a man from a tiger, do you ask me what I put in the animal's place? The other answer is, of course, that in place of myth and legend, we put genuine knowledge and the natural, rational thinking which flows from it.

Still worse if possible is the suggestion that unbelievers are "by their negations, making it impossible not only to pronounce any valid moral or aesthetic judgments, but even rationally to embark on the quest for truth itself." This is really monstrous, and argues ignorance of the fact that the quest for truth—real, natural truth as distinguished from transcendental phantasy—is constantly and successfully proceeding. Has Dr. Alington never heard of the Ethical Union, an essentially rationalist body which

has for its object the study and promotion of ethics, "morality without theology"? Of a leading Rationalist journal which prints in every issue; "Rationalism may be defined as the mental attitude which unreservedly accepts the supremacy of reason, and aims at establishing a system of philosophy and ethics verifiable by experience and independent of all arbitrary assumptions of authority." Ignorance of such things, combined with the mentally warping effect of habitual groping in a fog of unreal ideas, is, of course, one of the greatest giants in the path of rational advance in both thought and action.

No. It is not unbelief in theology that marks the "fool." If it were so we should have to include in that category a large proportion of the most eminent thinkers and scholars of our time—not only the majority of scientists, but also a large section in most other departments. E.g., we note that the two most famous men living of letters and politico-social thinkers both reject all theology. H. G. Wells, after a long period of total disbelief, had a temporary lapse into theism, but afterwards recanted and apologized to his readers. In his Autobiography we read that he "thought it pitiful that men ('looking for some lodestar for their loyalty') should pin their minds to 'King and Country,' and such like clap-trap," and was impelled to "personify and animate a greater and remoter objective." The significance of the backslide was also given: "What we have here is really a falling back of the mind towards immaturity under the stress of dismay and anxiety"; and it was added that his phraseology returned to the "sturdy Atheism" of his youthful days. George Bernard Shaw, eulogizing Bradlaugh, said: "I do not, like Lord Snell, owe my conversion to Bradlaugh, because I was ten times as much an Atheist as he was when I first met him." In the same speech Shaw said, "One of the worst crimes we are still committing is that we deliberately go on teaching our children lies... new generations of children are going into Church schools and into all sorts of schools, where the Bible was being put into their hands, not as a collection of old literature and fairy tales, as it is, but as a divine revelation." (*Bradlaugh To-Day*, Speeches delivered at the Centenary Celebration, 1933).

If further evidence on "the fool" question is needed we point to the first great outburst of intellectualism in ancient Greece, which was closely followed by the well-known "Greek Rationalism." The Roman intellectualists largely followed the trail blazed by the Greeks. And when—after the destruction by early Christians of classical learning and education, by insisting on belief in old myths and legends, with the consequent thousand years of darkness—came the renaissance of learning, it too was soon followed by the appearance of Rationalism; and in spite of persecution and obscurantism development of this feature proceeded and still continues.

As has been indicated, moral judgments are now being increasingly based on purely natural considerations, on a body of experience, knowledge and thought which is communicable (in the sense that it is calculated to command the assent of all duly trained and informed intelligences), instead of on a mass of old, exploded doctrines which are largely incoherent in themselves (grotesquely so if we include "inspired" Biblical statements and suggestions), largely opposed to scientific and historical truth, and which in so many parts of the world have generated an atmosphere of intense dissension and hatred, impelling people to war massacre and torture, and still producing, even in this country, not only verbal warfare, but outbreaks of riot and murder.

J. REEVES.

## A Little Theology

WHATEVER the sin against the Holy Ghost may or may not be, there is one sin which seems to cause a shudder of horror to pass through, not only the super-sensitive frame of the gentle Christian, but also through that of the most hardened sceptic. That is, to *misquote* the Bible. Let anybody, but particularly a Freethinker, wrongly quote the Divine Word, or attribute to it something that isn't there, or miss out a word or two, and the proverbial ton of hot bricks falling upon him is nothing to the stream of disclaimers which will rise up in all parts of the world. No excuse is allowed either. It may have been just one of those little errors which life throws up now and then to show that there is no infallibility in human nature; or a misreading of something due to pure inadvertence; or a trust in one's memory which experience must long ago have shown to be treacherous. The sin is accounted unpardonable, the finger of scorn is pointed at the unhappy culprit, and he is made to feel that his punishment should almost descend to the third or fourth generation.

I am forced to write thus because a few weeks ago one of our esteemed contributors made a mistake in quoting the Catholic Bible. It was a mistake, of course. But the avalanche which descended upon us pointing it out was astonishing. I am sure that few mistakes in science would have brought down such a downpour.

The exact words in which the error is made are:—

In the Catholic edition the commandment concerning graven images is not to be found.

And it may be said at once that the Douay version does contain the whole of the commandment—but with a difference. That difference may explain why the error was made; and it has other implications which should prove of interest to those Freethinkers who can still find time to discuss Biblical themes.

The commandment as given in the Authorized Version is:—

Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:

Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, etc.

Dr. Robert Young gives in his *Literal Translation of the Bible* almost the same words, as does our Revised Version.

The English version of the Old Testament used by Roman Catholics is the one made just before our own Authorized Version—in 1609. The New Testament had been translated in 1582 at Rheims, where there was an English Roman Catholic College. Its students went to Douai in 1593, and the Old Testament translation was made some time after.

One point must be observed about this version. It is not, as far as I have been able to find out, considered infallible by the Roman Church. The infallible Bible is the true Latin translation known as the Vulgate. Note that word *true*. Many copies of the Vulgate differ considerably, as one would naturally expect from written copies. Given a perfectly correct copy and the Church will guarantee that it comes straight from heaven—or, at least that it is divinely inspired. The real reason, however, that the Douai version is not considered literally divine is that the printed copies differ so much from one another. As the centuries passed, scores of words and phrases have been altered, very often coming more into line with our Authorized Version. The modern version is based

on the careful re-editing and revision of Bishop Chaloner. The Douai version is really a translation of the Vulgate, which was originally the Old Latin version made about the second century by nobody knows whom; and this was revised by Jerome.

The original translators—whatever they may say in their preface—had to do what they were told; and the way they manipulated the second commandment is delightful. This is how it differs from our version:—

. . . Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness . . . thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.

Do you notice the word *adore* instead of *bow down*? And the words *graven thing* instead of *graven image*?

The reason of this translation is very simple. Roman Catholics nearly always protest, and have protested, that they do not *adore* images; all they do is to *bow down* to them—not with *supreme* worship (*Latria*), but just with the honour (*Dulia*) due to the saints the images are supposed to represent. This distinction has been argued with great gravity by theologians who are by no means unanimous on the question. In fact, there are many distinct occasions given by authorities when such an object as the cross of the Pope's legate has to be carried in the right hand "because *Latria* is due to it." But there can be no question that the brainiest of our converted *intelligentsia* do bow down to idols and objects, and even to cardinals and priests in our more enlightened days. It would never do, therefore, to show a commandment coming from God absolutely forbidding this act. Hence the word *adore*—which is *not* the correct translation.

Then take the word *image*. The Douai version says graven *thing*—which can mean any subtle distinction put upon the term by wily theologians. The Hebrew word is undoubtedly *image*, and the translation from the Latin other than in the Douai version, is almost always given as *image*. But as Catholics do bow down before images it would never do to show from Holy Writ that this stupid idolatry was really forbidden.

While the commandment is given in full—though deliberately mis-translated—in the Douai version it is *not* always given in full in Roman Catholic catechisms. It is from this fact that one may have got the notion that part of the commandment was omitted from the Roman Catholic Bible.

In Butler's *Catechism*, revised by Dr. Doyle, with the authority of the Roman Catholic Church in 1842, in answer to the question, "Say the ten commandments of God," the first one is given simply as, "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have strange gods before me." The second is, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Nothing whatever is said about "adore" or "graven image" or "thing." And it is the same in Dr. Reilly's *Catechism*, and in Dr. Doyle's *General Catechism*. The *Catechisms* which are published in Roman Catholic countries, in fact, almost always omit the disputed passages. Those published here in England and in other Protestant countries, as a rule, include them. For example, *The Explanatory Catechism of Christian Doctrine* published here in London by Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., gives the first commandment as translated in the Douai version.

Dr. Doyle actually admits his omission:—

Q. Is any part of the commandments left out?

A. No—But some words are omitted.

Dr. McCaul, after examining the whole question, concludes that in 29 Catechisms coming from Rome, Italy, France, Belgium, Austria, Bavaria, Silesia, Poland, Ireland, England, Spain and Portugal, the

second commandment is totally omitted in 27; in 2 it is mutilated and only a portion expressed.

Personally, in many ways, I have a great admiration for the astuteness of the "Holy" Roman Catholic Church. It will take a great deal more than simplicity to beat it. It has a profound knowledge of human nature, and particularly of the credulity, blind belief, and fear inherent in so many people. And so long as these qualities persist, the Church need have little fear of being superseded. What it does fear, however, is Freethought. Let us intensify that by all the means in our power.

H. CUTNER.

### Egoism

EGOISM is the name given to the doctrine that we have proof of nothing but our own existence, and in ethics, Egoism means the theory of self-interest as the principle of morality.

The Ego is the "I." It is that which is conscious and thinks!

These are dictionary definitions, but in my view an Egoist goes far beyond these formal statements of principles. For one thing my conscious thinking has reference to and is possible only in the present. To events which I am conscious have passed, I apply the word memory; and to events which experience tells me are likely to occur, I use the words hope or anticipation.

It must not be thought that memory and hope do not affect present consciousness, they are part of it, and the "satisfactoriness" of the moment is bound up with both these qualities of the mind, and act as a stimulus to action. The memory of a pleasing experience leads to the desire to sway events to bring about a repetition; and in the same way memory of pain or displeasing episodes act as an index of what to avoid.

But what I want particularly to put emphasis on is that I, and all of us, I presume, live in the moment—the present—memory of yesterday, just as anticipations for the morrow are all part of a stream of experience, keeping the peak or apex of living in the very present and in the present only. Both past and future can only be manifest in and by reason of the present.

The Ego is the centre not only of space—but time.

It must not be thought that the Egoist denies the reality of the existence of other centres of consciousness, for this would be to refuse the test and experience of the senses that make living true. Still there is not or cannot be for me any interpretation of other lives, other persons save in terms of my own. My views just as each of your views are special, no two people see the same rainbow: The centre of my "inverted bowl we call the sky" is mine and mine alone, always, at any given instant of time.

This "Me-ness" forms a gulf which separates individuals and cannot be bridged. There is not now or ever will be any method by which all that goes to make up—Me—can be translated fully.

My hopes and fears, my joys and sorrows, pleasures and pains, are vividly, livingly my own; you cannot interpret them, you can only sketchily represent them in terms of your own sensations called up by words that are only a shadowy indication of what I really feel and think.

This brings me to a further point, which is that though I am individual, and must always be separate from my fellows, just as they are separate from me and all others, still I have an inborn desire (upheld by experience) to approach, appreciate and assess others that come within my ken. This desire is part of the quality of gregariousness—life in a group—that is spread throughout the species one can believe, since there have arisen educated extensions to the five senses, that are the primary channels of our sensations and impressions of reality. The extensions referred to are firstly speech, then, equally or more important, writing; these together with the vaguer arts of painting, sculpture, and music, have become of inestimable value in extending and completing appreciation of other lives, both near and distant; but they depend for

their fullest use on very clear-cut and well defined meanings.

To deal briefly with speech: It is obvious that when we use words to indicate or revive memories of concrete objects, there is likely to be a fair concordance of effect on understanding hearers. This unison is not, however, absolute, so that if I say, for instance, *Mouse*, my hearers will have a picture of an animal brought to their minds which will differ according to the memories of experiences and temperamental likes of each, and no matter how much I further particularized the animal I had in mind I could never so fully describe it as to make all my associations and memories fully partaken of by my hearers.

This limitation becomes more evident when I get away from the concrete and into the abstract, and is so well recognized that phrases have been coined such as—"There is no accounting for tastes"—"Beauty is in the eye of the beholder," or the Latin proverb—"De gustibus non est disputandum," going to show that past thinkers were aware of the defects or limited uses of abstractions.

My remarks, however, have been leading up to the consideration of another group of words that I should like to review, that is those used frequently in sociological and political discussions. These words are given in the grammars as collective nouns, and include such words as—Society—The Nation—The Community—The Proletariat—Capitalists—English—France—Germany, etc.

The egoist has to be constantly on guard lest he make improper use of words of this group. This check, present in one who realizes his separateness and individuality, is often lacking in those who are not aware of their own, or others, uniqueness; hence words that should only signify a group of separate units in a particular sphere, are distorted. Being applied both by utterers and hearers, as relating to an actual entity, a concept which is not only false in fact, but of which the pictures in the minds of the two parties are different and unrelated to reality.

So little is this distortion realized that our present social arrangements are based on this very misconception, and most of the political programmes that are being formulated by leaders of young heterodox groups start off from muddled thinking of this nature, since there seems to be failure to grasp the uniqueness of each and every unit that goes to form a group.

In this regard I mention the exposition of Marxism in the book entitled *Dialectics*, by T. A. Jackson. Even this capable and astute thinker and author is not convincing to me because he jumps about time after time from man the individual, the Ego; to MAN the race, which has meaning only as each one applies it.

The idea of God's image varied in the minds of each believer and grouping on this supposed similarity was unsound; still it made possible an exploitation and tyranny, and led to the establishment of religion as an increasingly important social and financial interest.

It is curious to note that the present Pope utters a warning (with which I agree), against a rival worship, because it clashes with his own position, though I suspect the motives which governed the issue of his encyclicals dealing with this feature. When he speaks of "Statolatry" as a danger he fails to see that the new object of veneration is no less chimerical, and no more, I agree, than that on which his religion is founded and which it is his interest to uphold, since it secures an organization of worshippers.

We see in the state of affairs in the Government of the Germans to-day, the effects and exploitation of the delusion that there is an Aryan race having recognisable reality and concrete entity, which moreover present education seeks to imbue with the attributes and qualities of an individual; if as seems likely, a clash occurs between the dupes of Hitler and the Pope, it will be made possible because large numbers of people are prepared to suspend their personal and high grade social morality when under the influence, in one direction, of the state and in the other of the papal God ideas.

To me, it is constant matter for wonder and interest to see how soon the morality which governs each man's social behaviour to his neighbours is forgotten and abandoned to support a Government which acts as though it can ignore all the laws and codes of conduct that have made a social organization possible.

JULY 4, 1937

How many of my readers are prepared to express disapproval of actions which they would condemn and resist from the individual when carried out by the ruling powers because approval is claimed from a majority of their subjects?

How many would agree with me that what is stigmatized as immoral and condemned in the individual, remains equally immoral (anti-social) even though the behaviour has received assent from a majority who give support, since they accept the delusion that it is good for the country, humanity, etc.?

Yet the belief in democracy is just that—what is regarded as wrong behaviour in the individual becomes mystically right when indulged in by a majority Government under the claim that the State, Country, People or Race will benefit.

I would ask you to note how this idea is being exploited (deliberately, I am afraid) by those who have achieved this power to behave without the constraint of the sociological rules that govern the individual.

We are told that Germany is arming; that Italy is bristling with bayonets; that France and England must re-arm to keep the peace, etc.

Is not the real meaning of these phrases simply that in the areas, Germany, Italy, France and England, the social code of morality has been dispensed with by the Governors, and they feel entitled to behave abroad with the outlawry that characterizes Government action at home?

Further than this to perpetuate their licence and seize the fruits of the industry of each of us, the rulers act as described by Thomas Paine in his *Rights of Man* in these words:—

Each Government accuses the other of perfidy, intrigue and ambition, as a means of heating the imagination of their respective nations [Subjects—D.F.] and incensing them to hostilities. Man is not the enemy of man but through the medium of a false system of Government. Whatever is the cause of taxes to a nation becomes also the means of revenue to Government. Every war terminates with the addition of taxes, and consequently with an addition of revenue, and in any event of wars in the manner they are now commenced and concluded, the power and interest of Governments are increased.

This was written about 1790; has it ceased to be the truth in the 150 years that have elapsed? I say it is true of all Governments since they have achieved power to transcend the moral code of their subjects: It is the same, whether the Government is Royalist or Republican, though there is more of sheer hypocrisy in a Kingdom with church officials taking a hand than where the Government is Secular.

Before leaving the subject of the spoken or written word by relating a composite or collective noun to an entity or reality, I would like to impress on you that Atheists fall into this trick of verbal misuse, particularly when advancing political doctrines like Socialism or Communism; in fact with some of these there is less ability to grasp the fact of the unique ego as the starting point of Philosophy than is to be found say in a Christian with ideas about a personal soul.

In them (Atheist Socialists) a belief that patriotism is not vague but well-defined has led them, it seems, to become what the Pope calls "Statolaters" of a mythical entity called the Nation.

I would draw attention, too, to the misuse of words by extending to fields of compulsion words that only have applicability when used in connexion with individual effort. Thus, Thrift, Profit, Charity, Insurance, etc., have become debased when compulsion was introduced, and what were laudable qualities in the individual become nothing more than camouflaged extortion or confiscation by taxation in one direction and character-sapping doles on the other.

It seems that the social qualities that arise by individual efforts are being neglected now more than ever in history, but unless they are conserved, and not subjected to the abuse of compulsion, there cannot be the unimpeded growth of knowledge, friendliness, trust, sympathy, and understanding between individuals; without this even the prosperity and happiness of pre-war days is unlikely.

I ask therefore that due contemplation should be given to the idea, and I think the fact, that the blessings of nation-wide and world-wide well-being do not descend from our latest God in Heaven—the State—but grow from the soil of egoistic self-interest.

W. DON FISHER.

## Acid Drops

The new Dean of St. Pauls is following in the footsteps of his predecessor. When Mr. Asquith, as Prime Minister, appointed Dean Inge to that position, he said he hoped that he (Dean Inge) would restore some of the literary reputation attached to the office. It was the only interest that a man like Asquith could possibly take in the appointment; unless he thought, and statesmen as a rule think quite differently from the way they express themselves, that a few Inges would have as a result a secularizing and humanizing of the Church. From this point of view he would hardly be disappointed in Inge.

The Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, with Dean Inge as a precedent, is striving to pull the Dear Old Church into a reputable harbour. He tackles the question of Divorce and says, "I believe that there are cases where marriages ought to be dissolved." Jesus said, "If a man ask your cloak give him your coat also," but no one, he says, takes such a saying literally. Jesus adopted the same method when dealing with marriage though his words were probably misunderstood. "We must think this out," adds Dr. Matthews.

We will accept the invitation to think it out. Why should we not take Jesus literally? Was he not a God, or at any rate, a God-man? Was it beyond the capacity of a God-man to express himself so as to be understood? Is there anything that Jesus taught—for example, self immolation, his immediate second-coming, taking no thought for the morrow and the forsaking of every family tie—that hasn't been accepted literally by numerous devout Christian bodies? Why have these beliefs not become stable? Because they were nonsensical and remote from practical politics. Pious men may read new meanings into the words of Jesus, but they do so because every day the call gets more insistent for the Church to adapt itself to modern knowledge—or perish. R. Matthew knows that; Inge knows that; the Very Rev. W. Asquith knew that; Inge knows that; the Very Rev. W. R. Matthew knows that. Of course it may be one of the things that Dean Inge thinks should not be talked about, but, such a remark can hardly come gracefully from such a quarter.

Mr. Collie Knox, in one of his numerous journalistic tilts at the B.B.C., tells us that its "Great Council" is full of "revered names of men who have become famous in every walk of life, except in that of public entertainment. Men who are brilliant in politics, in Church, in State, and in commerce, but who know, and care, as much about what Mr. and Mrs. Smith desire to brighten their few leisure hours as a hen knows about flying." Mr. Knox, however, is infected with the "bug" of religion, for he asks, "what does the Religious Council do?" And he then proceeds to talk about the "nationally popular religious broadcasts." Nationally popular, indeed! Why there are few items so hopelessly boring and unpopular. Is not Mr. Knox aware that one of the standing jokes against the B.B.C. is that as soon as these "religious" items are announced, most English listeners proceed to find a Continental light broadcast?

Mr. Knox actually claims that "the public were furious too when the Elliott man-to-man sermons were cut down." The truth is, of course, that the B.B.C. were obliged to cut down these sermons owing to popular protest. Sir John Reith is not exactly the kind of person who would be likely to give his public less religion than it wants. And the curious thing is that even Mr. Knox himself has over and over again protested

against the many hopelessly dull Sunday programmes given by the B.B.C. But religion is responsible for strange vagaries.

The columns of the *Northern Echo* have been recently opened to a severe criticism of the B.B.C. programmes by Mr. Joseph Close of Willington, Co. Durham, who takes the impregnable position that as the licence-holdings of the B.B.C. are bought for the most part, by those who "neither go to Church nor believe in its doctrines, it is only fair that the Gospel of Secularism should be broadcast at intervals by some of its well-known representatives." One good Christian, in reply, writes in accordance with his training, when he says that the best thing Mr. Close can do "is to stop paying his licence fee; likewise, if he dislikes living in Christian England, there are many other countries he could go to." This is in effect what the B.B.C. say—only that body takes care to wrap it up in verbal insincerities. If this is a Christian country, what does the Archbishop's *Recall to Religion* signify? And if Christian temples were thronged by all save a few thousands, on the democratic principle (which the B.B.C. dishonestly pretend to accept), why should those few thousands not enjoy their commensurate share of the wireless? To take the licence-fees of 90 per cent of those who do not attend Church and use them for religious plugging, is bare-faced racketeering; it cannot be justified by any line of argument which allows a person to retain his self-respect.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has been explaining once more to the clergy and laity of Hereford Diocese, the religious and national significance of the Coronation. He had been at three Coronations, and he and those with him

agreed than not before had there been such a sense of the blending of things seen and temporal with things unseen and eternal. We could not but be aware from the very first moment that there was a presence, a power among us, upholding the whole great ceremony, so that it unfolded itself with unbroken tranquility and majesty; upholding the King and Queen as I know they realize. . . . No one present, except the most callous, could have doubted that God was in our midst.

Well we will risk being termed callous. God was in their midst because the Archbishop of Canterbury was in their midst, complete with Bible, Prayer Book, Hymn Book, Magic Oil, Magic Spoon and Magic Cotton Wool. We have it on no less an authority than the Archbishop himself, that he speaks with the voice of God; the proof lying in the fact that the laying-on of hands has continued from Bishop to Bishop back to Jesus himself. Jesus! Jesus, whom, according to Holy report, the high priests of that day accused of consorting with evil companions, and, as a consequence, got one of the richest of curses in the whole of Christ's repertoire. And the Presence, be it ever remembered, was just as obviously upholding the whole great ceremony when Edward VIII. was crowned. *What! Did the Hand, then, of the Anointer shake?*

Witchcraft is increasing among South African natives, and the Church is fighting a losing battle against superstition, reports a Johannesburg paper. It continues:—

This conclusion is "regretfully" reached by a commission of investigators, appointed by the Anglican Bishop of St. John's, Umtata, to study conditions in various parts of the Union, including the Rand and the Transkeian territories, whose report has just been published in Johannesburg.

Bantu witnesses said that there was a steady increase in the power of the witch-doctor, who, in the words of one authority: "are respected more than the priest, and feared more than the chief."

Priests and Missions never had true "respect" from the African races, which always preferred their own doctors of "theology" to those of Christianity. The "original firm" is not likely willingly to give way to imitators.

"Methodism and the Paris Exhibition" doesn't at first glance establish any obvious connexion; Methodism and any form of entertainment seem natural enemies.

But a religious writer assures readers that a congregation of French Methodists "are a delight to preach to." And, with delightful naïveté, he adds, "In my own experience they give the preacher far more than he gives them." Exactly!

The *British Weekly*, announcing that any parson, or even any student for the Ministry, is welcome to a complete copy of Dr. Joseph Parker's *Pulpit Bible*, valued at thirty shillings, tells a story of Parker and the Boer War. Readers of *War and the Clergy* will remember that the Archbishop of Canterbury could not make up his mind whether God or the Devil was the author of the World War. Joseph Parker was in no doubt at all that "It is the Devil who is at the base and root of all this Transvaal agitation." But then Parker claimed: The Lord reigneth: I have a lightning message from the eternal throne.

"PRESBYTERIANS EAT AND ELECT ELDERS; ABOUT 60 PRESENT," says a Florida journal; and a tasty morsel they must have been, adds the *Literary Digest*.

## Fifty Years Ago

### BLOOD AND FIRE

"Blood and Fire" sums up Christianity. Booth is not a man of ideas, but the phrase is a master-stroke. Christian doctrine and Christian history, Christian hopes and Christian fears, are all expressed in this shibboleth. The great fact to a Christian is a future life, and the great fact in a future life is Hell. No one acquainted with the history of Christianity, or with its present characteristics, can say that the idea of Heaven has been or is very alluring. Scarcely ever has it been anything but an alternative. Its features are rather negative than positive. More than half the pleasure of this life consists in the absence of pain, and considerably more than half the pleasure of Heaven consists in the escape from the tortures of Hell. Read Christian sermons of the real ages of faith, and you will see the truth of this; or look at the pictorial history of Christianity, and you will see that for every single picture of Heaven there have been a hundred of Hell. Religion, as Lucretius said, began in terror; by terror it lives, and in the death of terror it dies.

Booth is doing what the commercial men call "good business" because he ministers to a want which is as wide as ignorance and as perennial as stupidity. Yet he knows that Hell has lost some of its power through familiarity, to say nothing of its being used for swearing purposes; so he dexterously substitutes another word, which gives the substance and essence of Hell with none of its jocularity. Fire! A capital word. It strikes terror, suggests escape, and evokes a desire for safety.

If you cry Hell Fire! to ignorant, credulous, and silly people, they shudder, turn pale, and fly every way for safety; always, in the end, rushing into the arms of the quacks who shout the warning and profit by the panic.

Then comes Blood. That is the fluid which puts out the fire. Apparently it cannot extinguish Hell, but it keeps any sinner cool when it is played upon him through the celestial hose. The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin, although the sin against the Holy Ghost is never forgiven in this world or in the next. We must all be washed in the Blood of the Lamb.

There is a fountain filled with blood,  
Drawn from Emmanuel's veins,  
And sinners, plunged within that flood,  
Lose all their guilty stains.

A blood bath! Angels and ministers of grace defend us! We prefer good honest soap and water, or a plunge in the sea. Nor can we relish a religion whose supreme word reeks of the slaughter-house. We like a cleaner system and better language. The blood-cure is disgusting. Without shedding of blood, says Paul, there is no remission of sin. Very well then, we will let the sins go unremitted.



# THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

- J. HUMPHREY.—Address received. Papers will be sent.
- J. SHARPLES.—Pleased to hear of the success of Mr. Shortt's lectures. Other matter receiving attention.
- R. OGILVIE.—We have read your letter with great interest. Your lengthy service in the Freethought movement, recalls to our mind all the names you mention. It is a pure accident whether one is remembered in the history of Freethought by name. The best record is in the broadening of thought, and to that you have contributed your full share.
- E. J. MORSE.—We are familiar with Father Lambert's criticism of Ingersoll. We do not recall any formal "reply" by Ingersoll, but the great Freethinker did not bother to reply to all his critics.
- A. CLUNAS.—The attitude of the Clydebank Municipal Council with regard to Sunday games does not surprise us. In such matters a large number of "advanced" politicians are fairly certain to act with a view to conserving their seats rather than on any principle of justice and common sense.
- K. HOWES (Norwich).—Thanks very much for cutting. See "Acid Drops."
- J. T. BRINGTON.—The official letters from the Federation of N.E. Secular Societies, in the Northern Press, are valuable work. The *Recall to Religion* can be relied upon to take shabby forms, and the publicity you are giving these, is the last thing desired.
- For Advertising and Distributing the *Freethinker*.—W. Don Fisher, 4s.
- 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.
- When the services of the National Secular Society in connexion with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the Secretary R. H. Rosetti, giving as long notice as possible.
- Friends who send us newspapers would enhance the favour by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.
- Orders for literature should be sent to the Business Manager of the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon Street, London E.C.4, and not to the Editor.
- The "*Freethinker*" will be forwarded direct from the Publishing Office at the following rates (Home and Abroad):—  
One year, 15/-; half year, 7/6; three months, 3/9.
- All cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to "The Pioneer Press," and crossed "Midland Bank, Ltd., Clerkenwell Branch."

## Sugar Plums

Some of the older Freethinkers will remember the prosecution of this paper for Blasphemy in '883, as a result of which the printer, publisher and editor received terms of imprisonment. The prosecution did not, of course, stop the publication of the *Freethinker*, nor did it make any difference in its policy. It is not the habit of real Freethinkers to wilt at either the threat or the fact of a prosecution. But we are reminded of the change in public opinion by the publication in *Everybody's* for July 3, of a front page cartoon depicting God as an old man with the traditional long white beard, and St. Peter standing at the gates of heaven with one of the gates hanging off one of its hinges. Peter is explaining, "It was a woman driver—she knocked it off coming in."

We do not imagine for a moment that the journal named runs any risk of a prosecution. The work of the *Freethinker* and of the Freethought movement has made it possible for those who wish to do so openly to laugh at the absurdities of beliefs that were then treated with the utmost gravity, and are still by large numbers of the population. But the right to laugh and joke about religious beliefs is now so common, that another prosecution would certainly be a good step to removing that disgrace to the country, the blasphemy laws.

A hundred years ago it cost twopence to get into St. Paul's Cathedral. A suggestion then made that this charge should be removed was received with alarm. The reasons are of interest. Even when subjected to the homely charge of tuppence, 10,000 people, and sometimes double the number, visited St. Paul's every day, and according to the Rev. Sydney Smith:—

If the doors of St. Paul's were flung open, the church would become, as it has been in times past, a place of assignation for all the worst characters, male and female, of the metropolis. . . . Even now, with the restricted rights of entrance, we see beggars, men with burdens, women knitting, parties eating luncheon, dogs and children playing, loud laughing, talking. . . . On one side of a line the congregation are praying: on the other side is all the levity, indecorum, and tumult of a London mob squabbling with the police. . . . The monuments are scribbled all over, and often with the greatest indecency.

Smith thought that, with the small charge removed, even greater disorders would occur. The Home Secretary of the day said he would do his bit if the tuppenny charge were removed by supplying additional police in the interior of the church. "The whole thing," wrote a minor canon of the period, "more resembles a promenade in a ball-room than a congregation in the house of God." At one time there would be, to quote Sidney Smith again, two or three thousand people "with their hats on, laughing, talking, walking, eating, and making an uproar." It is evident, writes a *Times* correspondent, that in 1837, the cathedral kept a good deal of the character of old St. Paul's, which, before the Great Fire, "was a resort of idlers, hucksters, the gay and the wanton."

Criticize the Victorian Age as much as one chooses, it did seem to possess more of "something we haven't got" in this. Where were the protests against the Vandalism perpetrated by Administrative authority in our parks as an accompaniment to the coronation? Will any be made against the latest outrage on public right—the practically entire closing of Hyde Park in order to hold a review of ex-service men? We cannot call to mind any precedent for this last impudent expropriation of public amenities, for the Park has seen many reviews and displays, which always left free and open the greater part even of the Eastern (Park Lane) side. Victorians would have protested till they secured some satisfaction, even to storming the House of their so-called "representatives." Or sought satisfaction in suffering for the common cause. High-handed action on the part of Government authority without any respect whatever to Parliamentary control is becoming a danger to democracy here as it has become on the Continent. Even when Hyde Park was cleared of the parades and paraders, the Marble Arch platforms were not permitted to open—until 8 p.m. Under what and whose powers were these unconstitutional and actually illegal acts done? Will someone responsible answer?

Mr. G. Whitehead will be on Tees-Side territory this week, and with the co-operation of the local N.S.S. Branch, will hold meetings each evening commencing to-day (July 4). The usefulness of the Federation of N.S.S. Branches in the North-East Area, has been well marked during Mr. Whitehead's visit, and this should stimulate the effort to form similar Federations in other areas where a group of N.S.S. Branches exist.

## Spirits—Under Proof

"Reason is the power of using experience, of appealing to facts as a touchstone. It is the capacity to adapt his life to his history that distinguishes man and especially civilized man. This capacity is the flower that comes to fruit as Science."

*Times Literary Supplement*, July 18, 1936.

"Man's superstitious fears are found to be in the exact ratio of man's ignorance."

*Crawley, "Mystic Rose,"* p. 21 (1902 edition).

THE aims of philosophy and religion are the same, the definition of a final cause of the universe, and it is in that definition that lies the difficulty.

The methods, however, of philosophy and religion are very different. Religion pretends to solve the mystery of the universe by the postulation of an even greater mystery as its cause, whereas philosophy proceeds by way of analysis, calling in science to its aid. This analysis has progressed a long way, but it is as yet by no means complete; therefore philosophy cannot and does not pretend to solve the mystery, although philosophers may theorize.

Religion, on the other hand, generally disregards science, and does not theorize but dogmatizes about something of which it knows nothing. As Virchow said, "Belief begins where science leaves off and ends where science begins."

Religious systems are usually bound up with ethical systems, but the two kinds of system are really separate. Ethical systems can exist and be practised quite apart from religion. Indeed, when they are independent of religion, they must be of higher moral value than are ethical systems dependent upon belief in a divine providence, hell's torments for the wicked, rewards for the good and design in the universe.

Religion postulates a hereafter, a sort of "heavenly" dwelling-place for "souls," which are a sort of *post mortem* extension of men's bodies. The "soul," then, is a very important hinge in religion. Without a "soul" there would be no point in religion. Whether there is such a thing as a "soul" is a very different question.

Nature has no hard and fast boundaries. All life is interdependent. Physical and mental life are interdependent with no real dividing line between them. There is no real dividing line between man and the lower animals; none between animal and vegetable (e.g., bacteria); none between animate and inanimate nature (e.g. certain colloids); none between organic and inorganic chemicals; none between chemical elements. There are only artificial separations made by man for the convenience of classification. Such an artificial separation has man made concerning himself. He has grouped together certain of the more abstract qualities and functions of himself and alludes to the group as the "soul"—a mere figment of the imagination. For the purposes of language, so that man can communicate his thoughts to his fellows, such an artificial grouping is quite legitimate, but it is certainly not legitimate to regard this grouping as anything other than artificial and having no reality in life.

"Mind" is an abstract term expressing the sum of mental phenomena, while "soul" is another abstract term expressing certain "spiritual" phenomena, and these abstractions are confusedly regarded as entities, although in reality the abstractions have no independent existence and are merely man-made. The alleged entities are in turn mistaken for the causes of their own phenomena. The mind is said to think, whereas, of course, thought is a function of physical brain matter. The soul likewise is merely descriptive of certain functions of matter. There is nothing of

independent spirit about it. Physical and psychic are two different *aspects* of the same thing, like the obverse and the reverse of a coin. Neither exists alone, even when dead.

This unity of life is most unacceptable to the majority of mankind, swollen as they are with conceit and thinking themselves as little inferior to their imaginary gods and much above the rest of creation. They refuse to acknowledge with the scientists that what they look upon as spiritual in man is merely a complication of organic activity. Monotheists in their anxiety to preserve their one and only god, the only begetter of all things, dare not acknowledge the unity of life—a sorry pass!

The method of science is measurement, and its success is due to the fact that definite knowledge is added gradually to definite knowledge and order is created out of apparent disorder, until everything is shown to hang together consistently (as far as science has yet progressed). Science and philosophy unweave the rainbow, which religion still believes to be a mystic sign from God to man.

The known, however, is abhorrent to religion. Religion prefers a mystery, an unknown.

A man is in a constant state of flux. His tissues are continually breaking down and being built up, katabolism and anabolism together producing metabolism. The body never remains the same. External things, such as air and food, are continually being converted into the tissues of the body, which in turn gets rid of its effete tissues, returning them to the air and the earth. As the whole body is continually changing, so must change continually that part of it called the "soul." The question arises: how can a separate "soul" change? Does it make use of external physical ingredients such as air and food, or does its metabolism depend on the "souls" of air and the "souls" of food or their spiritual equivalents? If the "soul's" metabolism depends on physical properties, then it is obvious that spiritual and physical are not different but the same in kind (although the smaller may be contained in the greater). But if the "soul's" metabolism depends on spiritual particles, then man is not the only possessor of a soul. Everything else has a "soul." The air we breathe has a "soul," and our food has a "soul"—even our excrement has a "soul," and man need not give himself a self-satisfied pat on the back and say that he is the only one of God's creatures to possess a "soul."

It is obvious that there are not two different things (physical body and spiritual "soul") attached to everything, animate and inanimate, but that the physical and the spiritual are but different aspects of everything, varying in complexity from the air we breathe and the food we eat to the highest forms of animal life, including ourselves. As Maudsley said: "What are inseparably joined together in nature let us not vainly attempt to put asunder."

As the physical body and the spiritual "soul," twin aspects of man, are never the same, but constantly changing, it shows that there is no such thing as an entity. No man is an entity (except as a legal fiction); no living or not-living thing is an entity; there is no such thing as an unrelated fact or an unconditioned existence. Everything is a focus of reaction to circumstances and a product of its precedents. Anaxagoras, who is said to have taught Socrates, said: "Nothing comes into being or is destroyed: all is an aggregation of pre-existent things; so that all becoming might more correctly be called becoming-mixed and all corruption becoming-separate."

If mind or "soul" is a fact, it must be the product of other facts. If it is a phenomenon, it must be the function of its conditions.

The highest product of mind is reason. As long ago

as 500 B.C. Parmenides rightly warned us that to see truth we must rely on our reason alone and not trust to our senses which lead us merely to human opinion.

C. SUFFERN.

(To be concluded)

## Henry Hetherington—1792-1849

(Continued from page 407)

As the *Oracle of Reason* was nearing its end a series of penny pamphlets commenced under the general title of the *Library of Reason*. It was edited by William Chilton, who was at that time the editor of the *Oracle of Reason*, and was to "consist of reprints of rare and valuable works, which were either out of print or too expensive for the general reader." This purpose, with one or two exceptions, was carried out. It met the fate, however, of most modern advanced publications—it never paid one half of the cost of its publication. It, really, would never have appeared had not W. J. Birch, who for a long time defrayed the loss incurred by the *Oracle of Reason*, immediately upon hearing of Chilton's proposing the publication of the *Library of Reason*, generously offered to bear one half the cost, if the printer would incur the other. This arrangement was maintained for the early numbers, after which period, Chilton writes, "they appeared at the entire cost of Mr. Hetherington, whose loss must consequently have been very heavy." This is the only publication of its kind ever issued in England and this must be the excuse for mentioning it at some length. Number one was *Essay on Superstition*, by Plutarchus, translated by Julian Hibbert. This writer, who has already been mentioned, was a friend of Hetherington and Watson, had printed at his own private press, in 1828, a work, published at a guinea, entitled *Plutarchus and Theophrastus on Superstition; with Various Appendices, and a Life of Plutarchus*. He employed James Watson as compositor, who fell ill with cholera, typhus and brain fever. Of this Watson writes, "I owe my life to the late Julian Hibbert. He took me from my lodgings to his own house at Kentish Town, nursed me and doctored me for eight weeks, and made a man of me again. After my recovery, he employed me in composing under his directions, two volumes, one in Greek and the other in Greek and English." In 1831, Hibbert gave his press to Watson.

Number two of the *Library of Reason* contained Hume's *Essay on Liberty and Necessity*. Then followed numbers on *The Life and Doctrines of Spinoza; Natural Theology Exposed; The Argument, a priori for the Being and Attributes of God, paraphrased by Southwell; On the Supposed Necessity of Deceiving the Vulgar*, by Julian Hibbert. This was one of the many appendices to his work, *Plutarchus on Superstition*. What interests us here is No. 9, *Is Man a Free Agent or is he subject to a Law of Necessity?* by Henry Hetherington. This essay is unique, and quite a work apart from all other of Hetherington's writings. It is to be hoped that one day it may be rescued from its obscurity, and again see the light of day.

Number 23 of the *LIBRARY* is a reprint of Voltaire's *Comments on the Writings of the most Eminent Authors who have been accused of attacking the Christian Religion*.

As has been stated, Hetherington carried on the publication at considerable loss, and here he reached his limit, for this Number 23 concludes in the middle of a sentence, and the *Library of Reason* came to a sudden end.

Hetherington as a Freethought publisher must not remain unmentioned. His Freethought publications were not inconsiderable. A few may be here given. His *Cheap Salvation*, and the Report of his Trial for Blasphemy were issued by himself. *The Questions of Zapata* was published in 1843. This first appeared in English in 1766, "translated by a lady." It remained practically unknown for three quarters of a century, when Hetherington brought it out in 1843. After that it sank into obscurity for more than another three quarters of a century, when it was included in McCabe's Selections from the writings of Voltaire, published by the Rationalist Press Association a few years ago.

Hetherington published Robert Cooper's *Infidel's Text Book* in its thirteen twopenny numbers, and afterwards in book-form. When that issue was exhausted it was published under the title, *The Bible and its Evidences*. A few other publications were *Babeuf's Conspiracy for Equality; The Yahoo; Carpenter's Political Text Book; Atheism Justified and Religion Superseded*, by Diagoras Atheos, very rare now; *Library of Reason; The New Ecce Homo*, by J. C. Blumenfeld. These publications show the nature of the works issued by Hetherington. The crowning piece of his publications was *A Few Hundred Bible Contradictions, A Hunt After the Devil, and other Odd Matters*, by John P.Y., M.D.; 1843, published at twenty-seven shillings. This is by far and away the largest work ever published by the Freethought movement. It came out in three volumes, with continuous pagination. It runs to 1,180 closely printed pages. It is now very scarce. The author was Peter Lecount, a railway engineer in the early days of railway construction, and who wrote a book upon that subject, which was a standard work of the time. An anecdote about him must here be recorded. Lecount was engaged in some work connected with the construction of the Great Exhibition buildings of 1851. One day when busy at his work, a bishop came up on horseback, and dismounting, called out to Lecount, "Hold my horse, my man." Lecount, looking up from his work, and seeing who it was giving the order, poured forth a torrent of profanity, which so shocked the bishop that he must have forgotten he had come on a horse, for he walked away, leaving, for the moment, the animal standing there, but soon after returned and led his steed away. We may imagine the feelings of this humble follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, who at the best of times could only afford to ride on an ass, and had not where to lay his head.

On the evening of Monday, April 10, 1848, the day of the great meeting at Kennington Common, about a hundred persons met at Farringdon Hall, to elect the Council and Officers of the People's Charter Union. Most of them had attended the Kennington Common meeting, and had been more or less active as members of the National Association, which had been evolved in 1841 out of the "Working Men's Association," under the direction of William Lovett, assisted by Hetherington, Moore and Watson, but which had fallen into decay. Watson was unanimously chosen President, but at his own suggestion recommended Thomas Cooper for that position, to which the meeting agreed, and on the council elected were Hetherington, Watson, Holyoake and Collet.

The People's Charter Union finds a place here, not on account of its exertions on behalf of the People's Charter, but because, by a process of evolution, it grew into the Association for the Repeal of the Taxes on Knowledge, and is therefore an important part of the narrative of Hetherington's life work for a free and untrammelled press. An Organizing Committee was formed, consisting of Hetherington, Watson, Hyde,

and Moore; and Dr. Black was co-opted on the Committee. His counsels were of great use at the time, and it was by his advice that the Newspaper Stamp Abolition Committee was appointed to act as an independent body. On this Committee were Hetherington, Watson, Moore and Collet. This was the last association that Hetherington was officially connected with. On March 7, 1849, this Committee met at the house of Richard Moore, 25, Hart Street, Bloomsbury, and drew up a plan of campaign. Though in very indifferent health, Hetherington attended the first four meetings of the Committee, and a fifth on May 30, 1849. This was the last meeting Hetherington attended before his death on August 24, 1849.

We are now most regretfully compelled to come to the last days of Hetherington's life. The strenuous life he had led, the sufferings he had undergone, began to have the inevitable result. It distresses one to have to state that there is too strong reason to conclude that his decease was hastened by a want of proper care. His strict temperance—for he had been almost an absolute teetotaler for many years—warranted him in believing that he was not very likely to fall a victim to the prevailing cholera epidemic. Early on Tuesday morning, August 21, 1849, Holyoake was apprised that Hetherington was ill. Knowing his anti-medical views, he took some medicine with him and gave him some instantly. His favourite physician, Dr. Richard Quain, was sent for, but was most unfortunately out of town. Next, Dr. Epps was summoned, who promptly sent some medicine, but was unable to come. The next morning Dr. Ashburner was called, who generously attended and saw him twice. Mr. George Bird, surgeon, paid friendly visits and rendered his usual and unwearied aid. Mrs. Emma Martin, whose courageous nursing and intelligent resources might have saved Hetherington at an earlier stage, also attended till a late hour on Wednesday night. Most of this day he was unconscious. On Thursday morning, August 24, 1849, about four o'clock, he expired. AMBROSE G. BARKER.

(To be continued)

## Thomas Paine in America

As the Editor of the *Freethinker* has recently put forth such worthy efforts to honour Thomas Paine, and given us so much valuable information concerning him, let me tell of a few efforts made to honour him in America, the country for which he did the most. Alas! Most of these efforts were failures.

It was in 1842, I believe, when one of our pioneer Freethinkers, Gilbert Vale attempted to raise the money to purchase the Paine Farm, near New Rochelle, New York. He raised part of the purchase price and paid a deposit, but was never able to raise the balance, so the farm reverted to the owners. Mr. Vale was a teacher of navigation in New York City, edited a Freethought paper called *The Beacon*, and was the author of a *Life of Paine*, which was considered the best prior to the publication of Dr. Conway's work in 1892. Mr. Vale also erected the obelisk monument to Paine near the place where he had been buried. It was of granite, but by 1882 had been so mutilated by Christian sportsmen using it as a target that it was necessary to repair it extensively. In 1904 it was surmounted by a bust of Paine, by the well-known American sculptor, Wilson Macdonald. This was the occasion for a big turn-out of Freethinkers. Ingersoll made one of his incomparable orations, as well as did others. Samuel P. Putman read an original poem, and there was music and singing. This occurred on Decoration day, 1894. A few later cele-

brations were held on the same spot. The city of New Rochelle purchased the land on which the monument stood, and the spot was called "Paine Square." Here is a lasting memorial. While speaking of New Rochelle, I will say that the Huguenot society of that place has purchased the old house in which Paine lived, placed in it a Curator, and it is open now to the public. Yet they do not tell people that Thomas Paine once lived there, if they can avoid doing so, as the Huguenot Society is very much Christian.

Some twenty-five or thirty years ago a Thomas Paine Memorial Society was formed by Freethinkers in New York and vicinity. The late Wm. Van der Weyde was Secretary, apart from Dr. Conway, the best informed man about Thomas Paine in America. Mr. Van der Weyde edited a fine set of Paine's complete works in ten volumes, including a biography. A wealthy Freethinker left a sum of money to establish a Paine Museum in New Rochelle. Half of this sum was to be used to erect the building, and the other half for maintenance of the museum. As there was not enough even to pay for the building, Mr. Van der Weyde obtained permission of the Court to use all the funds for this purpose. The building was erected, but bearing a debt of \$3,000, which a generous Freethinker paid. Mr. and Mrs. Van der Weyde took charge, as there were apartments for the caretaker. I visited this museum in 1926. It stands within a stone's throw of both the house and the monument. But funds were wanting for equipment, and while Mr. Van der Weyde had collected many interesting Paine relics, he was without means to display them properly. Finally he died, and since I have been unable to obtain information of the museum. The beautiful granite building still stands, and there was a rumour that the Daughters of the Revolution, an organization with an abundance of funds was about to take it over. Whether it has I cannot say. Another attempt was made to raise a statue of Thomas Paine in Chicago. In 1882, Ingersoll delivered a lecture in that city, donating the receipts which amounted to \$1,100 for that purpose. An Association was formed, but it did nothing. Finally in 1914 all of its directors had died but one. He was old and asked the court to relieve him of the trust. A new Association was formed, which like the old one did nothing. The funds were invested and have grown, but we have heard nothing of the Thomas Paine Monument Association or of the monument for years. The directors did, however, do one thing. They were fooled into paying a high price for a copy of the Romney portrait of Paine, on the representation that it was a Jarvis portrait. The portrait itself does not claim to have been painted by Jarvis, whose name appears in brass only on the frame. But all who are familiar with portraits of Paine know well that it is not only not a Jarvis portrait, but not even a copy. It is, however, a good copy of the Romney picture. One good thing accompanied this transaction. The picture was accepted by the Chicago Historical Society, and it now adorns the walls of its new building.

In 1932 a Mr. Horace W. Corey organized a Paine Memorial Society in New York City. I had considerable correspondence with Mr. Corey, who has since died, and I can get no information about the society.

Perhaps the best known attempt to honour Paine in America was the erection of the Paine Memorial Building in Boston, Massachusetts. The well-known Freethinker, James Lick, the founder of Lick Observatory in California, set aside some property to be sold and the proceeds applied to the Boston building, which was also to be the home of the Boston Investigator. This was accordingly done. An attempt was made to increase the funds, but they fell far short of being

sufficient, so the building, a beautiful structure, was dedicated bearing a mortgage. The original plan was a failure, and for over sixty years it has been in private hands. It is now used chiefly as a headquarters of labour unions and is greatly run down, though Freethinkers are still permitted to use its halls free of charge for lectures.

In an issue of the *Truth Seeker*, of September, 1880, I advocated the erection of a statue of Paine in Philadelphia, where his great work for America was accomplished. The last time I was in that city, I decided that Independence Hall Square was the place, where there are statues of other Revolutionary notables. My suggestion seems not to have interested any one but myself. Our trouble is that we have among us many men who will not assist a movement not inaugurated by themselves. Then we have not yet recovered from the depression. Our best financial supporters have, during that period been driven to the wall. I am now old, and whether I will live to see Thomas Paine honoured in America as he should be is a question. I only have the satisfaction of knowing that I have always worked for it.

FRANKLIN STEINER.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

### The Bishops and the Reform Bill

[This is the leading article of *The Times*, of October 12, 1831. Not only valuable as affording another example of the historic attitude of the Bishops on Reform questions generally, it serves to emphasize the comparative dishonesty and ineptitude of our Free Press of today.—T.H.E.]

SHOULD we rejoice at any conduct on the part of the Bishops which is in its nature of a tendency injurious to the Church of England? We flatter ourselves that no such criminal exultation can be imputed to us. Had it been our desire to entrap the Bishops—had it been our scheme of dark and murky mischief to “trip up” the reverend Lords, as somebody has insinuated that it was their plan to “trip up His Majesty’s Ministers” by their mode of proceeding on the Reform Bill, we should have scrupulously forbore to trouble them with our apprehensions, our warnings, or advice. But it was, in truth, our honest and conscientious solicitude for even the temporal well being of the Church (which, at the same time, we beg leave to disclaim all notion of confounding with its spiritual welfare)—it was that habitual anxiety which led us on more than one occasion, before the second reading—before, indeed, the introduction of the Reform Bill to the House of Lords—which led us to address the right reverend Bench in accents of deep alarm for the consequences of its not unforeseen indiscretion.

The very case which has happened, the identical case, was most distinctly, and we might add curiously, presupposed by this journal, as a circumstance fraught with calamity—we mean the circumstance of the Bill being thrown out by the Bishops... Yea, it has happened in the very form, and to the precise extent which we prophesied; for the fact of the Bishops being friendly or adverse to the Bill, has just made the difference between its being sent to a committee or at once rejected.

The effect, too, which we foretold as that which would inevitably follow the indiscretion of these Prelates, has been too completely verified. The people everywhere regard the Bench of Bishops as enemies to the civil rights of Englishmen, and no man opens his mouth upon the fate of the Reform Bill without asking, “why are the Bishops suffered to meddle in any manner with legislation?” In short, whatever support the political privileges of the Right Rev. Bishops may have derived from custom, or from traditionary policy—from the presumed connexion between “Church and King,” and so forth—that support is hourly falling from under it.

But it is not merely the vote of the Bishops, and its hostility to reform, that has of itself been the means of alienating men’s minds from their order. A pretty ex-

tensive suspicion and imputation exist that there was something not far remote from a mixture of Machiavellism in the proceedings of certain individuals of their body. In private conversation it is alleged that many of them had expressed opinions favourable to the Bill. Is it not true, it has been confidently asserted, that the learned prelates of Lincoln, Bath and Wells, and Llandaff, had absolutely promised to vote with Ministers, while he of the pamphlets—the *quondam* northern Archdeacon—had hinted the probability of his supporting the measure, on the familiar score (to him very familiar) of expediency? One Archbishop was openly an approver of reform; another disapproved of the opposition to it. Thus the Ministers had actually, and in sober fact, “their heels tripped up” by the confidence into which the wary bench had lulled them. They did not recommend to His Majesty to create Peers, because they reckoned on at least the neutrality of the reverend Bishops. Had they declared their hostile purposes, the King’s Government would have known what to do; but on the very evening of the debate the Bench was as serene and smiling, and as full of *agrémens* towards His Majesty’s Ministers, as ever; nor, had a ghost ascended from the vaults below, could astonishment have been more excited than by the appearance of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the floor—like the evil genius of the patriotic Roman at Philippi, announcing to him that the battle would be lost. That the majority of the Bench were all the while pledged to the opposition, and had determined to retard their blow until it would be too late for Government to meet it by calling up a reinforcement from any quarter, is the conclusion to which many persons have been driven by the events of that inauspicious morning. Nor can the tactics of time-serving men be much wondered at, by those who were themselves not satisfied as to the intrinsic strength of the King’s Government. Things had taken place, and had not taken place; from which it was, perhaps naturally inferred, that due respect had not been shown to the advice of Ministers in an elevated quarter. Lord Howe, for instance, at the head of a particular household, and enjoying, as was incidental to his station, the countenance and indulgence of a Royal personage, had taken no pains to conceal his animosity to the bill. Yet Lord Howe was permitted, as Queen’s Lord Chamberlain, and busy himself with manœuvres against the Bill, and, still unmolested in his office, gave a bitter vote against the advisers of his Royal Master.

Hence, perhaps, the apprehension that Lord Grey’s was a feeble Government. Hence, perhaps—for we pronounce nothing—the idea, that Bishops that were so inclined might heard the sick lion with impunity. That material of error has since been removed, and Lord Howe, as we have elsewhere stated, dismissed from office.

But what a temper has since been displayed, by one, at least, of these mild Christian potentates! Was there ever such an exhibition of lamb-like charity and placidity as by Dr. Phillpotts, of Exeter, in the House last night towards Lord Grey? Was this from pure disappointment at the non-arrival of the change of Ministers, in the expectation of which, it may be conceived by a few, that certain individuals may have voted?—or was it another illustration of that fate which leads some men, by an unhappy sort of gravitation, into follies, whence they seldom escape without discomfiture. “The Phillpotts” will not again, we should conjecture, run headlong into a collision with Lord Grey; though it is not easy to answer for a pamphleteer, who first exposed himself to one class of suspicions by his little, scrupulous attacks upon the Catholics, and then to another class; we fear not much more creditable—by writing up measures which he had so recently written down, and with such relentless virulence. Verily, from the last night’s specimen of this anti-reform champion, there are those who will allege that his mitre is but gilded foolscap.

Under such circumstances, we cannot help feeling some forbearance towards those who think that the Bishops ought to be bowed out of the House of Lords, with as much respect and courtesy as was possible. For their own sakes, and for that of religion, it would be infinitely better. If the clergy are thrown into the temptation of politics, they are sure, like Dr. Phillpotts, to misconduct themselves. Because, as even Lord Clarendon,

to whom they owe (at the restoration) their seats in the House of Lords, says of them, "There are no class of men who take so erroneous a view of human affairs as Churchmen."

But there are traits of character which belong to all times. Lord Clarendon, against all the other Ministers of Charles II., insisted on restoring the Bishops to the House of Lords. What was the result? When the Court turned against Lord Clarendon, and a bill was brought in for exiling him, every Bishop voted for it, which made John Holles, Earl of Clare, as he passed by them in the House of Lords, say to them—"You have all voted one way this day, my Lords, and yet you shall not all be Bishops of Canterbury."

## Correspondence

### FREE SPEECH

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—While entirely endorsing your editorial comment which lays down the right of every one to express opinions which may be distasteful to us, I must challenge Mr. Bransby Carlton's strange assertion that the Public Order Act was "the law for which the Socialists clamoured." The law, prior to the passing of this Act, was perfectly adequate to put a stop to Jew-baiting, assaults and intimidation, if impartially enforced. Unfortunately, the most outrageous anti-Semitic insults by Fascists (constituting the legal offence of "insulting words and behaviour likely to cause a breach of the peace") have been permitted by the police. Socialists demanded that the existing law be enforced against this campaign of racial hatred and violence.

Mr. Carlton is very wide of the mark when he suggests that the left-wing organizations in the East End of London carry banners with "provocative slogans" and shout insults and provoking challenges to political opponents. The man-in-the-street understands by the word "provocation" something racially provocative, such as the Fascist slogans "Down with the stinking Yids." "Perish Judah," and "Roll on Pogrom." Such slogans as "Down with Fascism," "Fascism means Hunger and War," and many others, if provocative at all, can be so only in a purely political sense. There is nothing in these inciting to racial hatred and physical assaults. If your editorial space permitted, I could enumerate from my personal knowledge a very large number of incidents of Jew-baiting and intimidation carried out by the Fascists.

It is not "the right of the Fascists to march in orderly procession," which is called in question, but their right to organize semi-military anti-Jewish marches through the Jewish quarter of London. Prior to October 4, no one disputed for a moment that the march on that date was certain to lead to serious breaches of the peace; not even the Home Secretary disputed it when the Mayors of East End Boroughs placed this proposition before him on a deputation. In the famous *Wise v. Dunning* case, 1902, it was held that a Protestant speaker had no legal right to go provocatively into the Catholic quarter of Liverpool and insult Catholics and the Catholic faith. The Magistrate ordered the Protestant speaker to be bound over for twelve months to keep the peace and to be of good behaviour or, in the alternative, to be imprisoned for three months. The Lord Chief Justice subsequently upheld the Magistrate's decision.

The well-recognized meaning of free speech is not freedom from inconvenient heckling, but freedom from unnecessary police and Government control. There is no interference with civil liberty when an organization is prevented from organizing semi-military parades to the accompaniment of offensive racial incitement. It is emphatically not one of our hard won democratic rights to organize a virulent campaign of slander and intimidation.

RONALD KIDD.

## IMMORTALITY

SIR,—In his article in last week's *Freethinker*, Mr. G. H. Taylor contends that the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul is unreasonable because no dividing line can be fixed between the human and the sub-human.

What seems to introduce an uncertain element into the reasoning is the difficulty of solving the riddle of continuity and discontinuity. Yellow passes into green by imperceptible gradations; yet yellow and green are distinct colours, whilst the intermediate shades are not. In a more fundamental form, the same enigma is illustrated by the problem of the infinite divisibility of a curved line (after Einstein!), and Zeno's celebrated argument against motion.

Even if we take the Neo-Darwinian rather than the Mutationist view of organic evolution, we are faced with the fact that differences in degree, when they have accumulated or diverged sufficiently, produce a difference in kind.

I do not wish to suggest that the well-known argument in question is invalid, but only that it is not so effective as it appears at first sight.

R. A. HANLON.

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

### LONDON

#### INDOOR.

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1): 11.0, Moritz J. Bonn, D.Sc.—"Propaganda and Intervention."

#### OUTDOOR

BETHNAL GREEN AND HACKNEY BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 6.30, Mr. P. Goldman.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES BRANCH N.S.S. (Kingston Market): 7.0, Mr. R. H. Rosetti.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Highbury Corner): 8.0, Saturday, Mr. L. Ebury. White Stone Pond, Hampstead, 11.30, Sunday, Mr. L. Ebury. Parliament Hill Fields, 3.30, Sunday, Mr. L. Ebury. South Hill Park, Hampstead, 8.0, Monday, Mr. L. Ebury.

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Brockwell Park): 7.0, Sunday, Mr. L. Ebury. Rushcroft Road, near Brixton Town Hall, 8.0, Tuesday, A Lecture. Cock Pond, Clapham Old Town, 8.0, Friday, Mr. H. Preece.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park): 3.30, Sunday, Messrs. Bryant, Barnes and Evans. 6.30, Messrs. Bryant, Barnes, Leacy, Connell and Tuson. Wednesday, 7.30, Messrs. Bryant and Tuson. Thursday, 7.30, Messrs. Saphin, Bryant, Carlton and Tuson. Friday, 7.30, Messrs. Barnes, Perry and others. *The Freethinker, Age of Reason* and Mr. Chapman Cohen's latest pamphlets on sale outside Marble Arch Tube Station every evening.

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Corner of Deanery Road, Water Lane, Stratford, E.): 7.0, Mr. A. Connell—A Lecture.

### COUNTRY

#### OUTDOOR

BIRKENHEAD BRANCH N.S.S. (Well Lane Corner): 8.0, Tuesday, Mr. J. V. Shortt.

BLACKBURN BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place): 8.0, Monday, Mr. J. V. Shortt.

BLACKBURN MARKET: 7.0, Sunday, Mr. J. Clayton.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Grant Street): 8.0, M. Whitefield. Albert Road, 8.0, Wednesday, M. Whitefield. Albion Street, 8.0, Friday, M. Whitefield. Subject for each meeting—"Historical Evidence for Christ's Existence."

HETTON (Font Street): 7.30, Wednesday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Queen's Drive, opposite Walton Baths): 8.0, Sunday, Mr. W. Barry and Mrs. Thompson. Corner of High Park Street and Park Road, or in near vicinity, Thursday, 8.0, A Lecture.

LUMB-IN-ROSSSENDALE: 7.30, Friday, Mr. J. Clayton.

(Continued on page 431)

# PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS IN MODERN THOUGHT

CHAPMAN COHEN

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

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

# THE MIRACLES OF ST. MARTIN

BY

C. CLAYTON DOYE

Price post free . . . 7d.

# LETTERS TO THE LORD

Chapman Cohen

This work shows Mr. Cohen at his best  
and his wittiest.

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

Issued for the Secular Society, Limited by  
the Pioneer Press, 61 Farringdon St., E.C.4  
LONDON

(Continued from page 430)

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (Eccles Cross) : 8.0, Friday,  
Mr. J. V. Shortt. Alexander Park Gates, 8.15, Saturday,  
Mr. J. V. Shortt. Platt Fields, 3.0, Sunday, Mr. W. A.  
Atkinson. Stevenson Square, 7.30, Sunday, Mr. W. A. At-  
kinson. Subject for the two Sunday meetings—"The Threat  
to Freedom To-day."

NORTH SHIELDS (Harbour View) : 7.0, Thursday, Mr. J. T.  
Brighton.

PADHAM : 7.30, Tuesday, Mr. J. Clayton.

PRESTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place) : 7.0, Saturday,  
Sunday and Monday, Mr. J. T. Brighton. Wednesday, 8.0,  
Mr. J. V. Shortt.

SUNDERLAND BRANCH N.S.S. (Gill Bridge Avenue) : 7.0,  
Mr. N. Charlton—A Lecture.

TEES-SIDE BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Cross, Stockton) : 7.0,  
Sunday. Market Cross, Stockton, 7.15, Monday. Market  
place, North Ormesby, 7.15, Tuesday. Davidson Street,  
Middlesbrough, 7.15, Wednesday. Market Street, Darlington,  
7.15, Thursday. Market Place, Stockton, 7.15, Friday.  
Mr. George Whitehead will speak at each of these meetings.

BLACKPOOL 2s. 6d. per night, 2 persons 3s. B. & B. (no  
extras). Vacancies only after August 14. Home for  
Freethinkers—AVIS, 62 Woolman Road, Blackpool.

# The Secular Society Ltd.,

CHAIRMAN : CHAPMAN COHEN

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office: 68 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4  
Secretary: R. H. ROSETTI.

THIS Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to  
the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# SOME CHRISTIAN TYPES

by

CRITICUS

Price 4d.

By post 5d.

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

Wit and Beauty combined by BAYARD SIMMONS,  
the ATHEIST POET, in his two companion  
volumes—

Minerva's Owl and Other Poems  
The Pagoda of Untroubled Ease

Obtainable from the *Freethinker*, 61 Farringdon  
Street, London, E.C.4, at 3s. 9d. each, post free.

*The Book That Shook The Churches*

# The Age Of Reason

THOMAS PAINE

With Critical Introduction by CHAPMAN COHEN

or more than Thirty Years Men and Women went to prison to vindicate the right to publish and circulate this book

This is a complete edition of Paine's immortal work, and covers, with introduction (44 pages), 250 pages of close type, well printed on good paper with portrait cover. Price 4d., postage 2½d., or strongly bound in cloth with portrait on plate paper, 1s. 6d., postage 3d.

This is the cheapest work ever published in the history of the Freethought Movement. No other book ever shook the Churches so thoroughly, and its wide circulation to-day will repeat the effect it produced more than a century ago. It is simple enough for a child and profound enough for a philosopher. Paine's book appealed to the people in 1794; it appeals to the public to-day.

## MOTHER OF GOD

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Post Free

2½d.

A New Propagandist Series  
by CHAPMAN COHEN

## PAMPHLETS FOR THE PEOPLE

- No. 1. Did Jesus Christ Exist?
2. Morality Without God
3. What is the Use of Prayer?
4. Christianity and Woman
5. Must we Have a Religion?
6. The Devil

OTHERS IN PREPARATION

Each Pamphlet contains Sixteen  
Pages

Price 1d.

Postage ½d.

NOW READY

## THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CHURCH WHAT IS RELIGION?

By

COLONEL R. G. INGERSOLL

Price 1d. each.

Postage ½d.

A list of Ingersoll's pamphlets published by  
The Pioneer Press

<i>About the Holy Bible</i>	- - -	3d.
<i>Oration on Thomas Paine</i>	- - -	2d.
<i>Household of Faith</i>	- - -	1d.
<i>Mistakes of Moses</i>	- - -	2d.
<i>Rome or Reason?</i>	- - -	3d.
<i>The Christian Religion</i>	- - -	2d.
<i>What is it Worth?</i>	- - -	1d.

The above will be sent post free 1s. 6d.