

THE FREETHINKER

• EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN •

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIX.—No. 7

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1939

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
Determinism and Free Will—The Editor	97
"The Church of England"—Minnermus	99
Anti-Semitism in Medieval Times—T. F. Palmer	100
Flashbacks on Tyneside—T. H. Elstob	101
Astrology—F. Kenyon	106
Nature Notes of a Freethinker—Nicholas Merc	107
No Pasaran!—"Pensadora"	108
What is Christianity?—T. Darley Allan, D.D.	109
Putrescent Print—D.	109

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

Views and Opinions

Determinism and Free Will

THERE has been a fortnight's break in the series of notes I commenced some time ago dealing with current arguments connected with Freethought advocacy. But as each article has been complete in itself, the hiatus does not matter very much. This week I purpose dealing with some of the misunderstandings connected with Determinism and Free-will.

Soon after the publication of the first edition of my book *Determinism and Free-will* (1912), one of our leading psychologists wrote me that he considered it the best statement of the case he had read in English. So flattering an opinion from such a source, called for a reply, but in writing I said that whatever merits the book had was due to what it left out rather than to what was put in. What I did was to clear away the irrelevant matter that had previously overlaid the real questions at issue, and so left the case for Determinism clear of a lot of accumulated misunderstandings. Actually I wrote the essay because of the popularity of a certain book which accepted many of the misconceptions upon which the opponents of Determinism depended. Perhaps it was in recognition of the way in which the case for Determinism had been stated, the way in which many defenders of that principle took for granted things they should have repudiated, that led William James to say that there was no other subject on which an inventive genius had a better chance of breaking new ground. I make no claim to being an inventive genius, but I do claim the ability to see an issue once it is put before me, on being free from the vice of allowing my opponent to state my case, and always to be on my guard against being led away on false issues. These be simple qualities, but very useful ones, and it is with the aim of encouraging their development in others that I have been writing these notes. I have the satisfaction of knowing that in many cases my ambition has been realized.

Will and Freedom

What I have to say this week will be mainly by way of definition. Some time back a gentleman who turned out to be a nephew of Matthew Arnold came to see me on some matters, and in the course of conversation, he said, "Of course, as a Determinist you do not believe in free-will, or freedom of choice, or that a man is responsible for his actions." I surprised him by replying, "On the contrary it is because I am a Determinist that, so long as these terms are used properly, I do believe in freedom of the will, freedom of choice, and that a man may be held responsible for his actions." It is all a matter of definition, but if the anti-determinist means one thing by these terms, and that the wrong thing, and if the avowed Determinist accepts these definitions, the inevitable result is confusion.

The main position of the Determinist is that human conduct takes its place in a causal category as part of a series of events in which one event cannot be considered apart from those to which it stands in immediate relation. The opposing position is (generally) that if Determinism is accepted then freedom of "will" is a delusion, freedom of choice is impossible, and "responsibility" a myth. But all these key words are in common currency all over the world, and it is just possible that the anti-determinist has given these words an unwarrantable interpretation, and that the ordinary Determinist has too often accepted them without examination.

Let us begin with "Free" and "Will." In the animistic use of the word, "will" appears to be a kind of first cousin to the "soul" and to consist of some determining factor which operates out of all necessary relation to the habits, education and heredity of the human organism. In that sense it may be placed on one side. Psychologists—scientific psychologists—have for long discarded it as being useless and confusing. "Will" as a descriptive name for those impulses or motives—or impulses and motives—that emerge in action is admissible. As a name for an independent entity it is just nonsense.

"Freedom" is a term with a definitely limited application. In physics and chemistry it has no application whatever, or at least, if used as when one speaks of a free gas, it has a meaning borrowed from sociology. Alexander Bain pointed out many years ago that "freedom" came into use in connexion with social life. We can speak of a free-man when he is not under coercion to act in a particular way, of a free people or a free country when the way in which a people decide as a whole to act is not dictated by some outside society. In each case, as in other cases that might be cited, to be free means the absence of non-necessary force. "I am free to go or to stay," "I am free to eat or not to eat," and so forth, all have this significance—that I am free just so long as I may act as my choice between this or that is decided by myself and not by someone else. But it is only because my actions, my choice to do this or

that is *determined* by myself that I can talk of my will being free. If actions are not determined by my tastes, my inclinations, my judgment, then I cannot talk of them as being free. "Freedom" is only conceivable if Determinism is assumed. In the absence of that you have—? Really, what the indeterminist has in his mind is "uncaused." If he said that he would soon recognize his absurdity. It is an unthinkable situation.

* * *

Freedom of Choice

And what about freedom of choice? Choice is a question of alternatives. If there is only soup for dinner no choice is possible, assuming that I must have some dinner. If there is both beef and mutton, then the possibility of choice arises. Freedom is also a question of alternatives. I am free when I may do either this or that; I am not free if I must do one thing and one thing only, and do that at the order of an outsider. Now freedom of choice is an indisputable fact. Hume thought that no one could be so absurd as to deny that man had the capacity for freedom of choice. He was, of course, thinking of philosophers, not of the "man in the street." Otherwise he would have opened his eyes at the number of self-styled determinists who have questioned the fact.

The truth is that two things have been confused by those who have denied the possibility of freedom of choice. The existence of freedom of choice is an observable fact, the manner in which my choice is determined—why I prefer lemonade to whisky, pork to beef, jazz to grand opera and so forth—is a further and distinct question. And the alternatives are, the belief that why I choose beef to mutton or a walk to sitting in an arm-chair reading a book is due to perhaps incalculable differences in education, in training, in the chemical constituents of my body, and a number of other factors, or one must decide to accept the determining factor to be some unknown, inconceivable "self" or "soul" which is pooh-poohed by science, unknown to anybody, and quite useless as an explanation.

What of "responsibility?" Well the meaning of this is so clear that only sheer misunderstanding can assert that Determinism destroys responsibility or anti-determinism makes it possible. The truth is the exact reversal of both statements. What is meant by "responsible"? The meaning is given in the word. It is to be answerable to some one, at law, to court, in intercourse to one's fellow-men. The equivalent of responsibility is accountability. The law will help us here. — A child who empties a bottle containing poison into a cup of tea and kills its parent, would not be held accountable to a court. A lunatic who set fire to a house would not be considered accountable for his actions. Responsibility means, then, the possibility of recognizing the consequences of one's actions whatever those consequences may be. It says nothing whatever concerning the cause of my acting as I do; it says only that provided I am capable of realizing the consequences of what I am doing, I am responsible, and the question that is constantly before a tribunal—whether it be a legal tribunal, the tribunal of one's neighbours or fellow citizens, or the tribunal of one's conscience, turns in each case on how far I am capable of realizing what are the consequences of my actions. That is quite clear on lines of Determinism, but how can responsibility exist if what I do is not bound up with the inevitable consequences that follow my actions? I could not even take the consequences of my actions to-day as any reliable guide as to what I shall do to-morrow; for if they do act as a constraining force to-morrow to that extent I come within the category of Determinism.

Determinism is the one thing that makes responsibility intelligible.

* * *

Determinism Inevitable

There are a number of other terms that would repay examination, as well as questions that arise from the Deterministic position. I must refer readers to my *Determinism and Freewill* for a discussion of these issues. But how often does one come across the statement that if Determinism be true then praise or blame is ridiculous. A man does what he must, and there is an end of it. The reply to this kind of unadulterated nonsense is that it is only on deterministic lines that either praise or blame is defensible. What is the use of one or the other if what man has done has no effect in modifying his character for good or ill. If there are two things certain here they are—there is no more powerful factor that operates with average human nature than the approval or disapproval of one's fellows, and that praise and blame have with all some influence in determining their conduct. And even though we were to cite the man who, as it is said, seeks only the approval of his own conscience, the conscience of man is born of social intercourse, and is, therefore, an illustration of the truth of what has been said. And one only need ask what benefit would be the use of either blame or praise if its effect on character is nil?

The prevalence of confusion on this question of freedom of choice is seen in a quite recent book by Julian Huxley, H. G. Wells, and G. P. Wells, *Man's Mind and Behaviour*, 1937, p. 2. It is stated:—

We choose continually, but it does not seem to us that our choice is conditioned. . . . This freedom of choice may be a delusion, but it is a delusion woven into the very stuff of the weighing machine (the mind).

But, as we have already said there is no delusion, and no room for it to one who understands the situation. We do choose; that is an indisputable fact, and "freedom" does not refer to or involve the determination of our choice, it governs only freedom to gratify. The question of the determination of choice is quite another question. I think we have here one more lesson that something more than a familiarity with the actual work of science is essential if we are to deal with philosophical questions properly and profitably.

I have space for only one other observation. It is a foolish notion that Determinism is a theory that one may either accept or set aside. One might as well say that because a man does not believe in the circulation of the blood therefore it does not operate. Determinism is not a theory that one may definitely set aside as one refuses or accepts an invitation to dinner. Whether a man believes in gravitation or not he cannot help illustrating it in practice. So with Determinism. Whether one believes in it, or not Determinism is implicit in practice even when it is not explicit in theory. One cannot talk to another unless the assumption is made that the words used will carry a more or less common and definite significance. One cannot employ a shop-boy without the assumption that the lad is controlled by motives of a certain definite character. No one can praise or blame without taking it for granted that he will arouse certain feelings in the mind of the one he is addressing. We cannot understand the past, understand the present, or forecast the future, save on the assumption of the uniform operation of known motives. Dismiss Determinism in words and the words themselves bear testimony to its reality. Professor Eddington in the very act of putting in a plea for indeterminism ad-

mits that he can think of world process in no other way than on deterministic lines. Determinism is not a theory that one may dismiss or even adopt; it is essential to, and inherent in, all thinking.

CHAPMAN COHEN

"The Church of England"

If I had been a bishop with an income of five to fifteen thousand a year, I should have had an inexhaustible source of rejoicing and merriment in the generosity, if not in the credulity, of my countrymen.—*John Bright.*

THE one certain thing concerning the Church of England is that it has never been for a moment the Church of England. It has never been the real church of England, in the sense that the Roman Catholic Church was in the Ages of Faith. The Protestant State Church, despite Government support, had a hard struggle to supersede Catholicism. No sooner was this accomplished than the Reformed Church was faced with the ever-growing power of the Nonconformist Churches, and the challenge of Freethought. To-day the Anglican Church is in a parlous condition. Sixty per cent of the priests and ecclesiastics are Anglo-Catholic, her leaders are fourth-rate, and her congregations are lower than ever before in her history. At a liberal estimate it is calculated that one person in nineteen attends regularly a place of worship, and only a portion of these belong to the Established Church. In what sense is this conglomerate mass to be regarded as a national church, except that it retains its endowments and money-bags, and still enjoys State protection. It is but an old actor, lagging superfluous upon the stage of life.

The contention that this Anglican Church is the original and only genuine form of the Christian Religion is sheer nonsense. For that particular form of Christianity known as the Church of England is the creature of Parliament. It was manufactured by Parliament, and from time to time has been under the hands of its creator for alterations and repairs. The actual creator is a cynical political association known as the House of Commons, having no religion in particular, and looking upon the ancient Oriental theology which it patronizes as a special constable, whose duty it is to frighten folk from attending too much to the affairs of life by promises of rewards or punishment when they are no longer alive.

In the ranks of the clergy are a number who pretend that this Church of England represents a religion independent of Parliament. Most clergymen are notoriously ignorant of the culture of their own sorry profession, but this ignorance is unpardonable when they see from time to time the recital, government, and doctrines of their own Church being declared by mundane Acts of Parliament, framed by Freethinkers, Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, Jews, Unitarians, and other religions or non-religions professed by the six hundred members of the House of Commons.

Just think for a moment what Parliamentary control of religion means in actual practice, and that a debate is taking place on prayer-book revision. The prospect is indeed amazing. The House of Commons, rightly comprising Jews, Freethinkers, heretics, and all kinds of religionists, schismatics of every shape and shade, will be invited to undertake the work usually reserved for ecclesiastics. The language of prayer will be revised by philosophical radicals. The creeds will be overhauled by men, some of whom have greater interest in Ruff's *Guide to the Turf*, and the *Racing Calendar*. The observation of the "Lord's Supper"

will be discussed by men who care more for a Lord Mayor's banquet, and an old Parliamentary hand may prove that "before the table" actually means behind it. Is there any sect in the world, the tiniest and the weakest—the Muggletonians, the Sandemanians, the Four-Square Gospellers—who would view such proceedings without realizing that it tended to bring religion itself into utter contempt.

Indeed, this so-called reformed Church of England has never been really popular with the English people. The limits of space forbid going back so far as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but at the opening of the nineteenth century this Church was far more in touch with the governing classes than the people. The Anglican clergy were dubbed the "Black Army," and the Rev. Sydney Smith said, "in England (except among ladies in the middle rank of life) there is no religion at all. The clergy of England have no more influence on the people at large than the cheesemongers of England."

This aloofness from the people is also shown by the attitude of the Bishops in the House of Lords, where they had an opportunity of helping the working-class, if they had the mind. As it was, their votes in that assembly incurred an amount of hatred which is scarcely believable. These Fathers-in-God were defenders of tyranny, negro slavery, and the blood-thirsty penal code, which then hanged a man for stealing a sheep or five shillingworth of goods. They were the resolute opponents of every political and social reform, and refused civil liberties to all outside the very narrow circle of the Established Church. The conduct of the Bishops did not pass unnoticed by the people. The Bishop of Bristol had his palace sacked and burnt; the then Bishop of London could not keep an engagement to preach lest he be stoned. The Bishop of Lichfield had to run for his life, and the effigies of many other ecclesiastics were substituted for Guy Fawkes and burned publicly.

Apologists for the State Church ignore all this. In order to bolster the claims of this Anglican Church to be the genuine Church of Christ, preposterous measures have been taken. Not content, as their predecessors were, to parcel out England into bishoprics, modern ecclesiastics take bolder measures, and map the world into spheres of influence. Hence there are Bishops of Gibraltar and Zanzibar, and other sees scattered over our far-flung Empire. But comedy broadens into farce when one finds a Church of England bishop presiding over "North and Central Europe," the home of Nazidom, and one of the few remaining strongholds of the Romish Church. It is all as alluring as the reports of the doings of "Chinese Presbyterians" in Bible Society publications, which tend to open the hearts and the cheque-books of those of the faithful who possess bank-balances. But none of it proves that the so-called Church of England is in living touch with the nation itself, if are included in our idea of the nation.

The armies of the homeless and unfed.

But this Church remembers the sufferings of Royalty, for no less than 105 Anglican places of worship held services this year in memory of "King Charles the Martyr."

No reform of this antiquated, sectarian church, for that is all it is, is needed. It should be disestablished and disendowed, and permitted to reform itself like any other society. And why has the disestablishment of this Church been dropped out of the Labour programme? The Established Church absorbs so much money and so many offices and dignities, but it is actually of no more value to Democracy than the Primrose League, an organization founded to perpetuate the memory of one of the most Machiavellian of modern statesmen.

Elsewhere one knows what a Church stands for. You say this obeys blindly the Romish Pontiff and the College of Cardinals; that is faithful to the Westminster Confession, and another yields homage to the Eastern Patriarchs. But ask what this precious so-called "Church of England" stands for and who can tell you? Protestant, Anglo-Catholic, Broad Church, or Evangelical? Some point to the "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion," and all smile in their dainty white sleeves at the amazing simplicity of mere laymen.

His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has sounded a recall to religion. It cannot be done, for you cannot put the clock back in this easy fashion. The great forward movement of Democracy has shown a way for the uplifting of the common people of England, which must in the long run result in a happier and more contented nation. Gone for ever are the patronizing methods of the bad, old days, in which it was sought to placate the submerged tenth by a very judicious distribution of coals and blankets and tickets for soup. The very prosperity of a country depends upon the masses of the people. Priests have had their chance of helping the people, and they have shut their eyes. Now the time has come when they must make way for better men. They are indicated in their own cathedrals as preachers of mischievous nonsense, and defenders of an old-fashioned Toryism. There can be no revival of such a religion. When you have got rid of a boil on the neck, you don't want it back again.

MIMNERMUS

Anti-Semitism in Medieval Times

THE various Crusades were signalized by popular frenzy and fanaticism, which was largely directed against the Jewish communities in European lands. But the opening Crusade of 1096 witnessed the most pitiless persecution and widespread massacre of the chosen people.

Dr. James Parkes has enriched the libraries with two discriminating and scholarly volumes of his *History of Anti-Semitism: The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, and *The Jew in the Medieval Community* (Soncino Press, 1938). Three Volumes are to follow, and the concluding work will deal with *The Return of Anti-Semitism*.

In his published volumes Dr. Parkes has laid all the surviving documents under contribution and dispassionate as his survey is, his study of the Middle Ages constitutes a damning indictment of the avarice, rancour and prejudice which disgraced the Christian world. Then as now, political, economic and theological interests were involved. Popular emotion was stimulated by the desire to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the desecrating clutches of the infidel Moslems who had taken possession of Palestine. Yet, as Dr. Parkes declares, "the conflict with Islam was not merely a competition for the religious dominion of the various peoples, but even more a struggle for the political domination of the countries around the Mediterranean."

Not only had the Moslems conquered the major part of the Asiatic possessions of the fallen Roman Empire, but they had annexed Sicily, were supreme in Spain and Northern Africa, while their shipping dominated every Mediterranean port. And in addition to the fears aroused by the Saracen invasions, there was felt great indignation concerning the harsh treatment accorded Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land by some zealous Moslem Caliphs. Usually, visitors were welcomed to the supposed scene of their Redeemer's

ministry and martyrdom, when the Caliph Hakim, in the tenth century, subjected the pilgrims to a severe persecution. This did not deter them, although they now armed themselves against molestation. But worse was in store, and in 1071 the Seljuks intensified Hakim's intolerance. These events precipitated the opening Crusade, which coincided with the massacre of the Jews.

In 1095 Pope Urban advised the contending and competing princes of Christendom to compose their quarrels and combine in a common attack on the perfidious Eastern Moslem. The Holy Father personally conducted services in favour of a Crusade which met with pronounced success. Popular preachers aroused the passions of the populace, and among these was the notorious adventurer, Peter the Hermit.

In consequence of these exhortations a pious and superstitious rabble, encouraged by a parochial clergy almost as illiterate as themselves, was collected to march from Northern Europe to Constantinople. This multitude was largely inspired by religious enthusiasm, but the leaders of the movement presumably cherished a desire to obtain temporal advantages from the expedition. In any case, the countries through which they proceeded were ravaged, but the Hungarians and Bulgarians who had been plundered retaliated by slaughtering the intruders and the ragged remnant that eventually reached Constantinople perished in an encounter with the Saracens in Asia Minor.

Probably the excesses of the Crusaders were in some measure due to their trusting to Providence to supply sustenance on the line of march. Also, before their march began the detestation of the insolent Moslem aroused by the clergy was coupled with a deadly hatred of the Jews, whose ancestors had been guilty of deicide. For had not the Jews executed God?

A ghastly massacre of the Jews was perpetrated in Spain in 1063, and the more humane and enlightened Church dignitaries were appalled by this atrocity, while in 1093 the monks and minor clergy were chiefly responsible for the holocausts that then occurred. Peter the Hermit, Volkmar and Gottschalk seem to have initiated these revolting crimes. The saying ran: "We have set out to march on a long road against the enemies of God in the East, and behold, before our eyes are his worst foes—the Jews. To ignore them is preposterous."

Christian and Hebrew chroniclers alike relate the same story. It was declared that Christ's disciples must avenge the injury inflicted by the Jews and an alleged proclamation intimated that "whoever killed a Jew had all his sins forgiven him." Even the vaunted Godfrey of Bouillon is said to have solemnly sworn that no Jew on his march should be spared. But when he was cautioned by the Emperor, and perhaps accepted a substantial bribe from the Jews of Cologne, he promised to protect them.

That the atrocities committed were inspired by greed as well as religious rancour is clearly evident. Gifts and other concessions saved many Jews from destruction. When the Archbishop of Trier realized that the Crusaders premeditated wholesale butchery, he advised the city's Jewish colony to receive baptism into the Christian fold. This suggestion they adopted, but unfortunately: "While the Crusaders in many cases forcibly baptized large numbers of Jews, these baptisms either followed the sack of the Jewish quarter, or the acceptance of large Jewish bribes. In such circumstances it must be assumed that a desire for plunder and a religious blood-lust were the real sources of their actions, and not a desire for the conversion of the Jews."

History has recently repeated its crimes with a vengeance. But the outrages of the First Crusade were initiated in Rouen, where the dregs of the populace

drove the Jews into a church and there offered them the alternative of baptism or death. All that refused to submit were immediately murdered. From Normandy the contagion spread to Lorraine and a terrible massacre took place in Metz.

The Rhineland settlement at Speyer was considered the property of the bishop of the diocese, and thus escaped destruction. In Worms, however, where the Jews were accused of the murder and subsequent desecration of the corpse of a Christian, the rabble defied the authorities, sacked the synagogue and defiled and destroyed the Scrolls of the Law, while the Jews sheltered in their dwellings were hunted out and murdered, and their property plundered. Even the children who escaped the holocaust were taken into Christian custody and control. Those of the persecuted people who had taken refuge in the castle were given the choice of conversion or death. They requested a short delay to consider, but when the impatient mob broke into the castle they discovered that their intended prey had preferred death to disgrace. It is recorded that on two days alone, eight hundred perished "at the hands of their fellows or of the mob."

The massacre of the colony at Mainz succeeded that at Worms. The Archbishop's authority was contemptuously disregarded by the Crusading rabble, who paid no attention to the value set on the Jewish community by the burghers and prelate. Costly offerings were made by the menaced people to the authorities, who endeavoured to bar the entrance of the invaders to the city. But they broke in after the Jews had sought shelter in the Count's residence, the cathedral, and the episcopal palace. There they proved powerless to resist their persecutors, and an appalling massacre followed. Even those that fled were reduced to beggary. Their houses and synagogues were set on fire, and the flames "spread until a considerable quarter of the city was destroyed. Women who had been taken alive were dragged to a church and, on refusing baptism, murdered. The city presented the appearance of a shambles." More than a thousand Jews seem to have been done to death.

Cologne then witnessed the spectacle of arson, pillage and murder, and what a Jewish historian has termed "the bloody hand in Germany" was malevolently active. But in Trier more mercy was displayed. Yet, when the fanatical Crusaders neared the city some of the terrified Jews committed suicide, after slaying their children in fear of a more agonizing fate, while some of the women weighted their clothing with stones and flung themselves into the river. While the greater number of the menaced Jews were given sanctuary in the Archbishop's castle, which was deemed impregnable, the mob hesitated to attack until market-day thronged Trier with buyers and sellers from adjacent villages. This gathering seemed to favour the violence of the mob, and appearances became so ominous that the Archbishop seized the occasion to deliver a sermon in the Cathedral condemning the projected pogrom. But this address so infuriated the pious canaille that the prelate was compelled to conceal himself in an adjoining building, where he was imprisoned for a week. Ultimately, after the afflicted people had accepted a nominal conversion, order was restored, and with the return of the Emperor, all of the baptized Jews, save one, reverted to the faith of their fathers in the following year. This was made possible by the circumstance that the German Emperor, Henry IV., permitted them to resume their religious rites despite the angry indignation of the Pope, with whom the Emperor Henry was at daggers drawn.

In Bohemia and along the Danube the dark drama was re-enacted, but many of the threatened race managed to escape to Hungary and Poland. The Crusade soon came to an ignominious conclusion, but the mer-

cilessly fanatical outbreak furnished a precedent for the bitter and blood-stained persecutions which have left an indelible disgrace on succeeding centuries.

Indeed, Dr. Parkes concludes that apart from the recognition of this earlier persecution, "it is not possible to understand the subsequent history of the Middle Ages, or the bitterness of the hatred of the Jews for Christianity, and for those Jews who accepted conversion to it. For, whether there was or was not some economic motive in their actions, the Crusaders murdered in the name of Christ, killing 'His enemies,' mercilessly and with torture, as a deed well pleasing in his sight."

T. F. PALMER

Flashbacks on Tyneside

(Continued from page 70)

THE *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* of those days exercised much more than a local influence, and had qualities worthy of remark. One of its features was OPEN COUNSEL. Under that heading there appeared a figure of the Winged Lion of St. Mark, followed by the familiar challenge from Arcopagitica: Who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? To many, the correspondence in these columns represented the leading feature of the paper. Subjects were discussed with the utmost freedom, and it happened, at times, that *pages*, not columns, of the paper were occupied by controversy. I well remember Bartram (in 1900) initiating a discussion on "Why Won't Parsons Debate?"; not as a private individual, but as "Secretary of the Newcastle Branch of the National Secular Society." The discussion went on for months, participants coming from all parts of the country. I recollect seeing a Contents Bill of the *Chronicle* with the four words: WHY WON'T PARSONS DEBATE? Branch members were particularly active. My share in the polemic was under the *nom de guerre* of "Microbe," but this was by no means my baptism in these discussions. I had used that name some years previously when writing from the place of my birth, Houghton-le-Spring. Altogether I must have had scores of letters printed in the *Weekly Chronicle*. I have no recollection of any letter sent by me that was not printed, and printed in its entirety. "Cockiness" was perhaps a quality appropriate to my time of life (I had just become "of age") but when I look back upon some of the joyous impertinences that escaped the blue pencil, I am bound to confess that the exercise of a little editorial authority might have proved salutary. I hope that I did a little good for the best of causes all the same—certainly that was my intention. What I can vouch for is the good it did me. Newspaper correspondence teaches one to be concise—if it were good when t'is said, then t'were well it were said quickly. It also—in the likelihood of correctives—teaches one a wholesome restraint. ("Cut out your *very's*" I remember being advised at a quite early date). Many people I have already mentioned figured in that discussion. One other very useful contributor whose name occurs to me was "Damodar K." This was Jimmie Tullin, who was well-known to Bartram and was living then, I think, somewhere in the Cleveland district. I had the fortune only two or three years ago to meet him at a Freethought lecture in Manchester in which town I believe he now lives.

The *Weekly Chronicle* did magnificent work in those days, and for this there was a simple explanation. Its editor was W. E. Adams, who at one time had written regularly in the *National Reformer* over the name "Caractacus." His articles dealt with eur-

rent political events, more especially Foreign Affairs. These had evidently met with the approval of Joseph Cowen, the radical proprietor of the *Chronicle*, who himself specialized in International Relationships at Westminster. He was, indeed, in well-informed quarters, expected to become Foreign Secretary in some future Gladstonian Government.* Cowen wrote to Bradlaugh asking if his contributor would be allowed to write similar articles for the *Chronicle*. Bradlaugh acceded to this and so Adams became in time the Editor of the *Weekly*, when he was obviously allowed a free hand. Not only did his paper stand for free discussion, but I remember weekly articles appearing by George Julian Harney. Harney was notorious for his Chartist activities; he had edited *The Red Republican*, had been thrown into prison more than once for selling the *Poor Man's Guardian* (published by Henry Hetherington), and had been sub-editor and editor of O'Connor's *Northern Star*. This was a pretty batch of recommendations—well calculated to induce apoplexy in any modern editor or proprietor. Harney had also stood for Parliament on one occasion (Tiverton), and the result of the election is amusing enough to chronicle:—

John Heathcote (Liberal) ...	148
Viscount Palmerston (Liberal) ...	127
George Julian Harney ...	0

The figure of Adams in the editor's chair of the *Weekly Chronicle* is also plainly discernible by the printing of Holyoake's *Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life* and, if I recollect aright, a biography of W. J. Linton, engraver, Republican and Freethinker; also a novel by Elijah Copland. As a young man he had almost got into the select circle of martyrs by being the writer of a pamphlet on *Tyrannicide*. It was Edward Truelove, the publisher, that splendid old man, whom the arm of the law pounced upon.

There was "a certain liveliness" in the North of England occasioned by the *Weekly Chronicle* all the time I lived there. The time came, unfortunately, when "commercial exigencies" brought the features we so much admired to an abrupt close. This was the official explanation given, and there was no reason to doubt it. A man named Alfred Harmsworth had, by then, been making discoveries. He had brought out a paper named *Answers*, and discovered that offering something for nothing was one way to the hearts and pennies of the great public. He gave a Pound a Week for Life to the person who could guess the amount of bullion in the Bank of England at a definite date. It was an illegal lottery but *Answers* boomed all the same, and our magnate moved upwards and onwards towards the Higher Journalism in the shape of the *Daily Mail*, and when there he won the war. His principle at first was simply to find out how the cat was jumping, and to frame his policy accordingly. But another lesson was borne in upon him later. He made the discovery that the cat could generally be made to jump in the required direction. The discovery of the Slogan met with its due reward, and he became Lord Northcliffe, and a thoroughly dependable man to "those who matter."

Joseph Cowen lost all his prestige amongst northern radicals before his death. He had done, all the same, good work in his time. One of his accomplishments deserves mention. One Sunday near the beginning of the nineties he had placed (without notice) an observer with notebook at every entrance to every place of worship in Newcastle. The following Monday he published the result of his census in his paper. The figures were startling in their smallness and produced a sensation all over the country. To Joseph Cowen

before any other man must go the credit of definitely pricking the preposterous bubble of a "Christian England." His exploit is little known now, and I derive pleasure in bringing the fact to light. It was considered in the "right" quarters that Cowen had done something not quite "the thing"—he had been found guilty in fact of hitting below the belt. I know of few such parallels in journalistic audacity.

Nowadays the memory of the *Daily Chronicle* in Newcastle is still kept alive in the title *North Mail and Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, whilst the name of the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* is still retained. The *North Mail* knows not Joseph, and probably doesn't want to be reminded of him. "Joe," W. E. Adams and their radical staffs, belong to the contemptible Victorian era when men stirred uncomfortably at the thought of injustice to others. It was the era when England gave the right of asylum to political refugees and was proud of it. Whatever unhealthy features in the manners and habits of the England of that day—and I would be the last to deny their existence—it cannot be said of the old *Newcastle Chronicle* that it didn't do its utmost to confound and eliminate them. The wagon of the old *Chronicle* was hitched to a star. The pursuit of the penny has changed all that. Our Modern Press is no wagon; it is a chariot, bedaubed with the primary colours. It is hitched to no star; whatever it may be hitched to is obscured—something that the honest eye cannot readily discern. One can only surmise.

T. H. ELSTON

(To be continued)

The Reason Why

With apologies to the Author of "Shall Trelawny die"

AND shall God be defamed—
Freethinkers Him deny?
Then fifty thousand Catholics
Shall know the reason why!

They walk and walk around
And dumbly pray and sigh
And humbly do what they are told
Though not quite clear just why.

The order goes abroad
That Catholics shall walk
Though public praying He abhorred
To pray without the talk.

Religious freedom once
They struggled hard to get,
But having got it now they want
To all free thought forget.

For God is so thin-skinned
(As only R.C.'s know)
That all have very deeply sinned.
Who seek in thought to grow.

At least that's what they're told
By Cardinal and Priest
And none within that sacred fold
Dare contradict a Priest.

They would not stop to think
As Sons of God they claim
That fifty thousand brainless ones
Must rate Him much the same.

"TAPPUC."

*It was the common belief that it was because this plan failed to materialize that Cowen became "sour."

Acid Drops

For the future, wit, which is not too prominent in Germany, is to be officially banished. Goebbels has explained that while *humour* may be allowed, in other words clowning, wit, which he describes as "coldly intellectual," is *verboten*. We are not surprised. The systematic, and worse than animal, brutality, which is the favourite amusement of the Nazi leaders and their most ardent followers, is incompatible with intellectuality. So much credit we must give Goebbels, Goering & Co. If the slave state is to be maintained, intellectuality must be kept at its lowest level. Germany has created another record. It is the only country in the world that has ever officially banished intellectuality.

Mr. Chamberlain must have had his child-like faith in the sincerity in Mussolini shaken by recent events. After he returned from Rome he was quite convinced, from the spontaneous manifestation of welcome by the Italian people, carefully ordered and arranged, that Mussolini had no desire to rule Spain. Now that Germany and Spain appear to be likely to conquer, Italy has officially stated that there will be no withdrawal of German and Italian forces from Spain until Spain has a political policy agreeable to Rome and Berlin. We wonder when Mr. Chamberlain will have the courage to admit that he has been led up the garden by Hitler and Mussolini.

Only one good thing emerges from the present situation. Over 200,000 Spanish Government troops are in France. That may serve as a little check to Mussolini in attacking France. These 200,000 soldiers, represent a potential fighting force that must give Mussolini pause in his piratical intended enterprises against France, and after this Chamberlain's declaration in the House of Commons, means against Britain. There is some hope for civilization yet, now that circumstances have compelled the Government to drop its too-successful propaganda of panic.

When the founder of the Salvation Army, General Booth, issued his *Darkest London*, on which was raised a huge sum of money, avowedly for a scheme of social reform but which did little except subsidize the religious part of the Salvation Army, one of the most reasonable, and the most humane of the suggestions made was that prisons should be converted into something of the nature of hospitals, and should aim at converting prisons into places in which the object was to make men socially healthy instead of places in which it was shown that society could, collectively, be just as brutal as criminals could be individually. So far as the "Army" was concerned this was mainly window-dressing. It should be added that the movement for a scientific treatment of the criminal, which dates from the impetus given by the Atheist, Beccaria, has in the main derived from Freethinking influences. The Christian influence has been largely cast on the side of "an eye for an eye," and the gratification of an essentially brutal impulse has been disguised by a frothy and intemperate expression of indignation at the brutality manifested by degenerate characters.

Now that a movement is well on its way to abolish flogging as something that is demoralizing to both "he who gives and he who receives," it is to be noted that the main opposition is again from religious quarters, and the Salvation Army, in the person of Commissioner Lamb, appears to have quite rejected even a pretence of dealing with crime on a reasonably scientific basis. He not only wishes a continuance of the "cat," he strongly demands its extension. He denies that flogging is an inhuman form of punishment, and would like hard-labour "stiffened up." He says, "a man does not get flogged unless he has done something to deserve it." That is a kind of

argument one would expect from the mentality of a Salvation Army leader. It is the argument of the bully, and the narrow-minded moralist who favour any and every official brutality. It is the argument in favour of the obscene brutality of Germany to-day. That the aim of criminology should be to remove conditions that incite to "crime," and to train the criminal so that he may become a decent member of society, does not dawn upon the type of mind that flies to the "cat," or solitary confinement. There is nothing worse than the sight of a man, or woman, expressing their detestation of brutality by showing that he or she can be as brutal as the greatest of criminals where occasion offers. There would be more sense and more humanity if death were made the punishment for every offence committed. A sane view of "crime" with an equally sane view of "criminality" would rapidly decrease the number of offenders and alter the quality of the offence.

The Church Council of Holy Trinity, Hounslow, Middlesex, have found it financially necessary to cut the vicar's wage down by £100 a year. Vicar Rev. C. M. E. Hicks retorted that "faced with the prospect of so serious a decrease in my income, it will be impossible for me to remain as vicar." The "living" is worth £630 a year, but Mr. Hicks laments that from it must be deducted income-tax, and the expense of bringing up and educating his children. (Just as other people have to do!) Therefore he "cannot pay his bills." (Not as other people have to do!) "Crockford" adds a house to the vicar's wages—one of the biggest items in *other people's* out-goings—but not a word of that comes from the vicar. However, "the Bishop of London is looking out" for another "living" for this "poor parson."

The bus at Waterloo was filling up rapidly, and the conductor on the top deck looked down the stairs and called out, "Pull up here, mate!" A man was heard in sepulchral, basso profundo terms to exclaim, "Holy Jesus!" This may be one of the signs of a revival in religion, or, on strictly scientific grounds, it may be the victim's frustration being released on the bus at having to get off.

Up the Strand there was one of the usual blockages in the traffic, and a taxi-man behind a bus began to hoot with his horn. "You'll wear that out mate," said the conductor—"and I'll buy you a baby's rattle." This was the soft answer that turneth away wrath; the dreary world might be much better, if we could have more soft answers of that kind.

Mr. Noyes—the Roman Catholic Poet whose last work was condemned by the Papal Censorship—assures the world that he himself is only too anxious to serve his church. His condemned book—a Biography of Voltaire—appears to have offended the authorities solely because it told too large a percentage of truth. A not unfriendly critic calls the poet "A Confused Noise Without." Lord Charnwood, in a letter to the *Times*, says that Mr. Noyes "takes no interest in himself as a victim of persecution"—he has, in fact, bought back from his Catholic publisher the rights of publication of his book, and has proceeded to re-publish it through a publisher independent of Catholic patronage. Lord Charnwood's letter suggests that the result of such Papal interference with an author's liberty of expression will be that "henceforth, wherever the Roman Church may be subjected to harsh measures of repression, the Protestant, the Agnostic, the Atheist can still protest in the name of freedom, of justice, and of common humanity, but the mouth of the Roman Catholic will by authority have been stopped."

The coming year is likely to show us some further examples of German interference with religious liberty. The *British Weekly* correspondent is usually well-informed about the German Protestant bodies. He says:—

I have it on excellent authority that already the Government has insisted that the Methodists and the Salvation Army dismiss all their members of Jewish or partly Jewish blood, and that these bodies have accepted the ruling.

I hear, further, that Bishop Marahrens has refused ordination to a candidate on no other ground than that he is not a full-blooded Aryan. Before Christmas the Vatican was anticipating a decree forbidding the Church to baptize Jews or to allow any non-Aryan in the priesthood.

As to the future the same correspondent is most pessimistic. Judging the churches he knows best by their own past submissions, he cannot hope for any great stand to be made:—

Will our brethren—Roman Catholic and Protestant—stand firm upon this issue? There is depressing evidence that many of the Protestants will not.

By interning in Concentration Camps all the Freethinkers—with no protest from any Church—in Germany, the Churches are likely to make a poor show in defence of their own freedom.

Our recent exposure of the falsity of the statement by the *Universe*, that the Roman Church has never put anyone to death for the "crime" of heresy, has brought the following from the journal named:—

Our statement that there never was any law of the Church that heretics should be put to death is perfectly correct. The Church has never claimed any such power, and has never exercised it. The Church did, however, in the Middle Ages approve the State inflicting such punishment. After condemnation in the ecclesiastical courts, heretics were "handed over to the secular arm" for punishment according to the civil law. The Church today claims the right to punish her guilty members with "temporal" as well as with spiritual punishments. But, as we say, she has never claimed the right to inflict the death penalty. So much for the facts.

As we said when dealing with this matter, there are many ways of telling a downright lie, and this is one of them. We said that the Church did not condemn the heretic to death, what it did was to find the man or woman guilty, and then hand him over to be dealt with by the civil law. So far we agree with the *Universe*. But this journal omits to say that it was the Church which created the civil law, and also forced the civil authorities to put it into operation. There are other aspects of the subject, still more damning to the Church, but we have not time to deal with them now. All we wish to do now is emphasize the fact that the *Universe* having told one lie, tries to hide the fact by telling another. This is not an uncommon Roman Catholic, even Christian, practice, so we note it in passing, and let the matter rest there.

The French Catholic paper *La Croix*, has had to toe the line with regard to the war in Spain. It appears that it did its best to give the news from both sides as impartially as possible, and for this attitude it was taken severely to task by the Vatican journal *Osservatore Romano*. The editor of *La Croix* has had humbly to apologize as follows:—

La Croix has only one rule of conduct: submission to the Church and devotion to the Pope. Our only desire is to reprove what the Church condemns. We adhere with heart and soul to all advice and guidance coming from Rome.

This submission to the Church is, of course, exactly like the submission of lay editors in Totalitarian States, and proves that in the matter of dictatorship there is little to choose between the Roman Catholic Church and the Dictator countries.

With satire as delicate as the tread of an elephant dancing among chickens, a writer, Bernhard Varlett, in the *Weekly Review*, discourses on "Franco's Incompe-

tence." The satire may be a veil for rejoicing over victories, and, we will not be niggardly towards this writer, for we have a present to make to him. On January 28 the *Evening News* placard read, "New Franco rain of death on Refugees." Assuming that the *Evening News* is not a liar, the placard then is one of the highest tributes to what an English M.P. has described as a gallant Christian Gentleman.

A religious weekly raises a strong protest against what it calls the "idolatry of mascots." How fastidious some Christians are! What after all is the essential difference between the mascots sold publicly by the Roman Catholic Church, such as candles and crosses and so forth, the belief in "sacred" books, and "sacred" buildings, and the like, and the selling of a Swastika or the use of rabbit's foot? We rather fancy that the root objection is to the sale of unauthorized mascots. When a Church issue them they are treated with respect.

Six thousand people were canvassed as to their interest in religion by the Rev. C. L. Graham, vicar of St. Michael-at-Bowes, Bowes Park, North London. Five thousand did not reply in any way; 450 answered that they attended other places of worship, and a similar number replied that they were "not interested." But there were 50 who said they were interested. Well: these 50 might all be Atheists; for who so "interested" in religion as the Atheist? How that "recall to religion" seems to be ignored! It is plainly as audible as the Scotchman's tap on the window. (For those who don't see the allusion, it may be told that a customer made a trifling purchase from a Scotch chemist, for which he tendered payment with a treasury note. Absent-mindedly he left the shop forgetting to pick up his change, whereat the chemist, concerned about his reputation for honesty, rushed to the window and tapped on it—with a sponge.)

For the past two years the Tibetan Lamas have been hunting to spoor a reincarnated chief. They have now reduced the possibles to two "bright-looking boys," telegraphs Reuter. Doubt remains as to which of these is the real "Simon Pure," and if the monks and soothsayers can't decide soon into which of the lads the spirit of the dead Dalai Lama entered, lots will be drawn to determine the issue. So the "Glendowers" of East (and West) continue to "call spirits from the vasty deep," undisturbed by the "Hotspurs" questioning: "But will they come, when you do call them?"

At a "Conference of Sunday School Teachers," at Peckham, the Rev. Wilfred Dodge preached on "Seeking," and the Rev. W. Milton preached on "Serving." After which the congregation sat down to a hearty meal, and—according to the report—"enjoyed the generous provisions." The congregation sought, it was served, it was filled and went away content—except those who suffered from indigestion.

Fifty Years Ago

MAX O'REILLY ON INGERSOLL

I ONE day asked one of the cleverest ladies of New York whether she had met Col. Ingersoll.

"No," she answered, "I never met him, and do not wish to make his acquaintance."

"May I ask why?" I said.

She replied: "Simply because I am told that it is impossible to know him without admiring and loving him."

"Well?"

"Well, I don't want to admire or love him." . . .

The Freethinker, February 10, 1889

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No. : CENTRAL 2412.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

FOR Advertising and Distributing the *Freethinker*.—E. M. Sandys, 218.

A. C. SPARKES.—Thanks for suggested word. It would go part of the way, but is not quite wide enough to cover the field.

J. BROLES.—Sorry we did not reply to your previous letter, but our correspondence grows in bulk, and other things crop up, with the result that some things are delayed or overlooked. We have no doubt whatever that the *Freethinker* might be made to pay—if it ceased to be the *Freethinker*. But the paper exists for a specific purpose, and unless that specific purpose is served we have no interest in it.

E. W. FLINT (Auckland, N.Z.).—Letter of January 15 to hand, but the "clipping" was not in envelope. We do not care to intervene in internal disputes unless the matter is of general importance.

J. DELL.—Was crowded out of last issue. See page 108.

L.T.—We expect the true explanation is that a rejection of formal religion does not of necessity indicate a mind that is open to new ideas in all directions. As we have often said there is an orthodoxy of heresy that is as impervious to new conceptions as a hard-shell Presbyterian is to a new view of Christian doctrines.

R. B. KERR.—As we have no desire to make ourselves appear stupid by asking a scientific man whether he would be able to foretell, prior to experience, the qualities manifested by a combination of chemical substances from a complete knowledge of the mathematical structure of an atom, we must decline your suggestion. It is a question of fact, not of opinion, and in any case has nothing whatever to do with the point at issue. One might as reasonably ask whether we shall ever be able to deduce the architecturally artistic beauties of a cathedral from a complete knowledge of the atomic structure of marble, stone, glass, etc. We think the question had better be dropped.

J. W. PICKARD, A. CROSS, H. BROWN AND J. SHARPLES.—Thanks for addresses of likely new readers; paper being sent for four weeks.

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

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

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.

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.

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

Even gods must yield—religions take their turn :
'Twas Jove's—'tis Mahomet's—and other creeds
Will rise with other years, till man shall learn
Vainly his incense soars, his victim bleeds;
Poor child of Doubt and Death, whose hope is built on
reeds.

Byron.

Sugar Plums

To-day (February 12) Mr. Cohen will speak in the Town Hall, Stratford, E. His subject will be "The New Science and the New God." This is a title he has used before, but he seldom gives the same lecture twice, and the title is wide enough to admit of great variations. Mr. Cohen will not be lecturing again in London this season. Stratford Town Hall may be reached from any part of London by bus, tram, or train. The chair will be taken at 7 o'clock. Doors open at 6.30.

There was a mix-up over Mr. Cohen's visit to Nottingham, which was announced for Sunday last. Mr. Cohen had booked the date for February 5, and only after the issue of the *Freethinker* was it discovered that the date had been booked by the Secretary of the Society for March 5. We offer our apologies to those visitors from a distance, and it is useless now discussing as to where the fault lay. Mr. Cohen has arranged to be at Nottingham on March 12, and this time there will be no mistake.

We have received a number of letters congratulating us upon the great success of the Society's Annual Dinner on January 28, and in our judgment the satisfaction expressed was deserved. Everything went well from start to finish. But in our report last week one item was omitted. This took the form of the presentation of a very handsome bouquet of flowers to Mrs. Cohen. Nothing could have gratified her—or the President—more. The bouquet was a pretty thought handsomely expressed.

The *Freethinker* for 1938, strongly bound in cloth, gilt-lettered and with title-page, will be ready in a few days. As for some years now the available copies have been rapidly exhausted, those who require the volume should send their order without delay, particularly as we anticipate a greater demand than usual, owing to the Congress of the World Union of Freethinkers and other matters of unusual interest occurring in the past year. Orders will be executed in rotation. The price is 17s. 6d., plus 1s. postage.

The Vatican has appointed an "Apostolic Delegate" to this country, who will take up his position here at once. On the face of it there is no more in this than there is in the appointment of a representative of the English Church to a Continental country. The professed object in both cases is concern with the "rights" of members of a religious body, and to see that they are placed under no civil or religious disability on account of their religious beliefs. So far we can see no objection to any form of religious belief having its headquarters elsewhere, doing what is legal and proper to see that its followers have "a square deal." If the British Government formally received the Apostolic Delegate as a political representative of the Vatican, whether as an Ambassador or as a Consul, the position would be different, for it would be ridiculous to accept such with reference to the Vatican, with which the relations could only be of a religious character. A protest is being made against the appointment of this Apostolic Delegate, and we have been asked to sign it. We would cheerfully do so, provided the protest touched the real evil of the situation, but that is not the case, and we have therefore declined the invitation, while agreeing with all that is said concerning the evil of Roman Catholic operations.

We are solidly with any protest against the interference of religion and religious organizations in secular affairs, whether it be in the region of the higher diplomacy or in that of the smallest parish council, and whatever be the colour or quality of the religion concerned. But even if the Apostolic Delegate were invited to take part in the political life of this country, we could see nothing intrinsically more objectionable than the presence of a Bench of Bishops in the House of Lords, the

maintenance, in the sole interests of Christian Churches, of Sunday laws, blasphemy laws, sectarian teaching in the schools, the non-payment of rates and taxes, the intriguing that goes on to secure religious representatives on local governing bodies, the payment of tithes for the upkeep of the Established Church, and other forms of religious control, both avowed and surreptitious. We are prepared to join in any protest against the recognition by the Government of any religious organization, save as organizations that are working within the recognized limits of such associations. And then the State is recognizing them as mere associations, and has no concern whatever with their particular opinions, and will grant no special privileges on that account. But to pick out one Church among many, and to protest against that Church, while remaining silent against other Churches, strikes one as too much of a modified Kensitite programme. It is a complete separation of the State from all forms of religion that is required. The evils of a particular Church, even the greater evil of a particular Church, should be used only so far as it supports the general movement for the complete secularization of the State. But we have no desire to see the interests of the Freethought movement diverted into the channels of either a particular political campaign, or into a modified anti-Roman Catholic agitation. We are not merely anti-Roman Catholic, we are anti-religious; we are not opposed to one Church, but to all. Once in the history of Europe the development of Freethought and all that it implies was arrested first by the "Reformation," and next by the reform of the Roman Church, and we are not inclined to lend a hand in a repetition of that manœuvre. We do not wish it to be inferred that we believe all those who protest against the appointment of an Apostolic Delegate to this country, are manœuvring for the protection of Protestantism against Roman Catholics, only that the form of their protest is too narrow, and lacks foresight.

The B.B.C. recently arranged for a discussion at Edinburgh, on the subject of "Religion in Relation to Broadcasting." The invitations were sent out by the Scottish Regional Director. The value of religious broadcasting "as a whole" was to be discussed, and acting on this statement the Secretary of the Glasgow Branch of the N.S.S. wrote asking for a ticket for the meeting, so that the views of Freethinkers might be heard. The reply to this was that "the broadcast announcement did not extend the invitation to Atheists," but as Atheists have to pay precisely as much as Christians pay, there does not seem any real ground for refusing to hear their opinion of the religious broadcasting—particularly as the B.B.C. makes the public (but obviously false) claim that it puts over both sides of a case. There is some truth in the statement where other subjects are concerned, but none at all where religion is in question. There it is sheer unadulterated "dope," and all the B.B.C. had in view, apparently, was to see how far the dope administered could be made agreeable to all the Christian bodies.

But an offer was made to send a ticket for one member of the Society, who would be there as an onlooker. Mrs. Whitefield, as Secretary of the Glasgow Branch, accepted the invitation, and, from the newspaper jottings about the meeting, did more than look on. She spoke, and although her speaking is not likely to lead to any immediate decrease in the quantity of the religious broadcasting (it can hardly show any decrease in quality) it may do good in creating a *tendency* in the minds of some Christians in the direction of fair-play. Better still, what Mrs. Whitefield had to say would probably affect others who were present, and that is far better than an appeal to the B.B.C. Governors for justice where religion is concerned.

Bradford Branch N.S.S. will have a London speaker to-day (February 12). Mr. R. H. Rosetti will speak in the Mechanics' Institute, Town Hall Square, at 7 o'clock, on "The Church and the Threat to Civilization." Admission is free, but there will also be some reserved seats. Personal attendance accompanied by orthodox friends is the best way in which local Freethinkers can help.

Mr. G. Whitehead will be the speaker for the Birmingham Branch N.S.S., in the Bristol Street Schools, this evening (February 12), at 7 o'clock. The local Secretary, Mr. C. H. Smith, is untiring in his efforts to place Birmingham prominently on the Freethought map, and he deserves all the support that can be given.

Mr. Pearsall Smith's latest book: *The Unforgotten Years*, shows very clearly the attitude of the wise man on the subject of Death. The following may well accompany the phrases we recently quoted from Maeterlinck on the same topic and similarly non-theistic:—

We are leaves that perish, as Homer told us long ago. I do not find that a fate to be regretted: for any other form of being I feel no longing. All that I have read about what happens in a future existence makes the life beyond the grave seem an uncomfortable adventure. I have no desire for eternal bliss.

Astrology

THE *Daily Mail Year Book* for 1939 informs us that a review of the latest statistics reveals that the Churches have lost over 20,000 members, and the Sunday Schools over 94,000, and that this decrease, following as it does a succession of losses over the past twenty-one years, is a cause for much concern. To Freethinkers this may appear to be gratifying news and a sign that superstition in this country is on the wane. But though there has been a decrease in actual church attendance, one must be blind to imagine for a moment that this country as a whole has a more rationalistic outlook than it had at the end of the much-maligned nineteenth century.

The decline in public worship is due more to apathy than to a positive scepticism, and it is evident on all hands that superstition generally is still very much alive. Even the average non-church goer will call himself a Christian, and is prepared to defend his religion with a zeal worthy of a better cause. The editors of popular newspapers and periodicals realize that if their circulations are to be maintained, the superstitious convictions of their readers must be carefully considered and, with this end in view, even the correspondence columns are carefully controlled. A correspondent with a religious bias is encouraged to write nonsense to his heart's content: any criticism of such being invariably ignored.

On every hand, superstition appears to be sacrosanct and most carefully protected from the winds that blow. A similar attitude is adopted by the B.B.C., whose programmes embrace a surfeit of sermons, religious services and talks, the effects of which are not suffered to be vitiated by anything of an antagonistic character. The B.C.C., newspapers, periodicals, public and private societies and institutions, all combine to keep superstition alive and to resist any attempts at its destruction.

Nor is the superstition thus encouraged necessarily of the orthodox brand. There appears to be a tacit understanding that any kind of superstition is better than none at all, and as a result there has arisen a system of beliefs and practices reminiscent of the Middle Ages. Lucky charms and mascots have their adherents by the thousands. Not long ago the cinema was showing the picture of the captain of a large ocean liner displaying his lucky charm—a small image of St. Christopher—to which he attributed his successes by sea and land. But the most conspicuous evidence of the unreasoning credulity of the present-day is provided by the recrudescence of the belief in Astrology. Newspapers and periodicals by the score have their own astrologers to cater for the present craze, and, to ensure that there shall be no fall in the harvest,

their horoscopes and predictions are being introduced into the journals published for the delectation of the rising generation. Newsagents and stores are doing a roaring trade in the sale of horoscopes, and there is at least one journal devoted exclusively to the ancient superstition. The predictions are accepted without scruple by the credulous people for whom they are provided, who usually have not the slightest idea as to how the predictions, etc., are arrived at, except by a vague reference to the stars.

Astrology is the pseudo-science which pretends to enable men to judge of the effects and influences of the heavenly bodies on human affairs, and to foretell future events by their situations and conjunctions. As formerly practised, the whole heavens, visible and invisible, were divided by great circles into twelve equal parts, called *houses*. As the circles were supposed to remain immovable, every heavenly body passed through each of the twelve houses every twenty-four hours. The portion of the zodiac contained in each house was the part to which chief attention was paid, and the position of any planet was settled by its distance from the boundary circle of the house, measured on the ecliptic.

The houses had different names and powers, the first being called the house of life, the second the house of riches, the third of brethren, the seventh of marriage, the eighth of death, and so on. The part of the heavens about to rise was called the *ascendant*, the planet within the house of the ascendant being *lord of the ascendant*. The different *aspects* of the planets were of great importance. To cast a person's nativity (or draw his horoscope) was to find the position of the heavens at the instant of his birth, which enable the astrologer, with his special knowledge, to predict what the course and termination of that person's life would be.

The temperament of the individual was ascribed to the planet under which he was born, as *saturnine* from *Saturn*, *jovial* from *Jupiter*, *mercurial* from *Mercury*, etc.

Prior to the revival of learning there did not appear to be any incongruity in such beliefs.

To an uncivilized man, no proposition appears more self-evident than that our world is the great central object of the universe. Around it the sun and moon appear alike to revolve, and the stars seem but inconsiderable lights destined to garnish its firmament. From this conception there naturally followed a crowd of superstitions which occupy a conspicuous place in the belief of every early civilization. Man being the centre of all things, every startling phenomenon has some bearing upon his acts. The eclipse, the comet, the meteor, and the tempest, are all intended for him. The whole history of the universe centres upon him, and all the dislocations and perturbations it exhibits are connected with his history. (W. E. H. Lecky *The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*.)

As Lecky points out, however, when the revival of learning came, and the regeneration of physical science which speedily followed, there was effected a series of most important revolutions in our conceptions, the first of which was to shake the old view of the position of man in the universe. Our earth, from being the centre of the universe, dwindled to an infinitesimal fraction, as undistinguished by its position as by its magnitude.

During the sixteenth century the cultivation of Astrology gradually declined and, since the time of Newton has passed into the hands of quacks and pseudo-scientists, where it still remains.

Such is the ancient superstition which, after languishing in practical oblivion for over two hundred years has, thanks to the spread of human credulity,

and its encouragement by the sensational press, once more resumed its influence in human affairs.

The B.B.C., ever ready to countenance a prevailing folly, has the following announcement in the issue of the *Radio Times* dated January 20, 1939:—

MONDAY NATIONAL

8.20. BIRTHDAY PARTY

at which the guests will be..... and Ann Maritza, the famous astrologer..... Ann Maritza, who is staff astrologer to a well-known London newspaper, will be there to cast the horoscopes of the guests, and give her general forecast for the month.

The original proposal to broadcast the above item elicited a protest from the Astronomer Royal (Dr. H. Spencer Jones). The B.B.C., however, decided to go ahead with the scheme and, in a reply to the Astronomer Royal, pointed out that the broadcast was not really to be taken seriously, and that while astrology would not be "guyed" in the broadcast, it would be treated in a suitably light-hearted fashion. The subsequent announcement quoted above is a confirmation that it would certainly not be "guyed," but there is definitely nothing in it to indicate that it would be treated "in a suitably light-hearted fashion," and the fact remains, as pointed out by the *News-Chronicle*, that there are thousands of superstitious people who take the claims of the astrologers seriously, and that it is no part of the B.B.C.'s task to encourage the credulity of foolish folk. The *News-Chronicle* deserves credit for its attitude in this matter.

The increasing popularity of this medieval superstition, and the consequent deterioration in national character which it portends, cannot be viewed without grave misgivings. The lives of thousands of people in this country are governed or influenced to some extent by their daily horoscopes, and reliance on individual thought and effort in the affairs of life is being replaced by an abject dependence on "what the stars foretell."

F. KENYON.

Nature Notes of a Freethinker

A FRIEND has given me a copy of *The Charm of Birds*, by Viscount Grey of Fallodon (Hodder and Stoughton). There was special pleasure in noting that the gift was a tenth edition; birds are not every person's interest, but who has ever heard of ten editions of a celebrated statesman's *War Memories*, or whatever title was put on a record of humanity's slip from sanity—probably ordered by big financial interests, having, ironically, the world as their country—and no country? I trust *The Charm of Birds* will go on making records in new editions—in some subtle way, a study of birds substantiates the phrase of "live and let live." In another way, bird study keeps one in touch with the fundamentals of liberty. The author during his years of retirement devoted a lot of his time to efforts in taming birds—and succeeded. There is our tame thrush, whom you ought to know by now, up in the poplar tree singing. Or he may be winging his flight in the air from the silver birch trees to the vegetable patch; that same bird of his freewill takes food from the hand—he comes near enough for you to see his almost transparent pink legs—the tiny claws at the end of each toe, and both his big round eyes, containing reproach in neither, at a world he did not make, but rather something wistful, harmless, and trusting. I find the author records this very real pleasure about different birds as follows: "To see a pair of Chioe wigeon on the wing high in the air, conversing audibly as they fly,

and to know that when they alight they will take food from the hand—all is a satisfaction that no pinioned birds can give." Elizabeth, a pintail, to take another case, was a favourite that took food from the hand. Grey writes of her:—

"The unexpected return of her after months of absence, during which it must have led a perfectly wild life, and perhaps visited the Arctic zone, uplifts one with satisfaction." I wonder if this satisfaction of the bird-lover can be traced to the fact of having broken the antagonism and fear between bird and biped? It was gratifying to find my own experience confirmed by another writer on the subject; put in another way: I prefer certain birds to fly to me rather than from me. *The Charm of Birds*—I find myself unconsciously recommending it—will make good reading to those whose small demand on life would startle a navy. To be precise, I mean those who do not confuse progress with din and rattle, and who await the time when we might, with confidence, take the first step into a genuine civilization.

NICHOLAS MERE

No Pasaran!

[The following article was written before the fall of Barcelona, but much of it is still pertinent to the situation.]

It is not so very long ago since, the September sun, in a final burst of brilliance, heralded the opening of our International Congress in London. It is not so very long ago, but memories—for the most part—are short, and the anxieties of everyday life sometimes crowd out remembrances of things we would wish to keep with us. Perhaps the memories have not altogether disappeared; maybe they are still there, tucked snugly away in the unconscious, and it may need only a brief pause in the hurried rush of things to evoke them from their resting place. Will you pause with me awhile?

It would be foolish to imagine that we still recall the personalities of all our Continental delegates. Two of them, however, must remain, for they represented tortured, suffering countries struggling to preserve their freedom. I refer to Spain and Czechoslovakia. If the applause for the latter exceeded that of the former by an infinitesimal degree, it was because at that time, Czechoslovakia was being prepared for the rack, and those of us with enough imagination glimpsed the agony yet to be endured by that brave little country. So, Munich came and went, and the fate of Czechoslovakia was sure, but comparatively swift. Events moved rapidly, and we watched with shame her annexation by Germany. Her suffering is not yet over, but her fate was decisive.

And what of Spain? So long has that tragedy been drawn out, that we had almost grown callously accustomed to it, and with the one might almost say—contempt, bred from familiarity, it seemed that we had come to regard the Spanish struggle with the same detachment as we applied to that sorrowful Chaco war of recent date. It needed a messenger from Spain—a personification of all that tortured land is suffering to rouse the sympathy of the audience and cause them to break forth into prolonged applause. Do you remember him? Sr. F. Diego Abad? With what visible emotion he waited for the applause to cease, before he uttered his message—in rapid Spanish. He knew no English; most of his listeners could not understand Spanish; yet the brilliancy of his pleading reached the hearts of all, and made us feel that his cause was *our* cause. But is it? What of

Spain to-day? The struggle becomes desperate—the need is terribly urgent—food is hopelessly short—there is no light—no heat. Sr. Diego Abad is only one of many thousands who are starving, but he is one of us, a fighter for Freethought. I doubt if now his physical strength would allow him to plead his cause so passionately. The body is a tyrant, and needs satisfying. So we should not wonder if sometimes that magnificent courage of these people weakens a little. Yet it is not the lack of material needs which tends to bow their proud spirit, for in a letter received this week, he says: "It is not the feeling of physical cold—nor all the privations and sorrows we endure which cause us pain. It is the feeling of abandonment—of being deserted by the democracies which grieves us most, and which proves only too well the retrogression of civilization."

Is then, the cause of Spain *our* cause? Or are we in the grip of that apathy which is slowly, but very surely, strangling us? At least, if we have not the moral courage to support the cause of freedom, let us at least, do our share in helping to keep alive the bodies of those who are fighting the battle for us.

So many calls are made upon our charity to-day, that one more makes no difference. Those of you who would like to help in an "easy" way can send a Postal Order for 6s., 12s., and upwards to the National Aid for Spain Committee, 21 Cavendish Square, London, W.1., who will undertake to send a parcel of food to any person you name. This saves the trouble of buying the goods, packing them, filling in various forms, and posting. Here is the address of our delegate: Sr. F. Diego Abad, Av. de la Republica Argentina 5, Barcelona, Spain.

For those who perhaps cannot spare more than 6d. I should be glad if they would forward any contribution, however small, to me, and I will undertake to buy the goods and despatch them. Remittances will be acknowledge, and a receipt for the purchase and postage of goods available for inspection. In this way, if we could manage to send just one parcel a week during Barcelona's darkest hours, we should be helping to keep alive, morally and physically, the cause of Freethought. Is it not worth doing—*now*—if only for the selfish pleasure resulting therefrom? What will to-morrow bring? We do not know. This alone we know:—

When the lamp is shattered
The light in the dust lies dead—
When the cloud is scattered
The rainbow's glory is shed.
When the lute is broken,
Sweet tones are remembered not;
When the lips have spoken,
Their accents are soon forgot.

As music and splendour
Survive not the lamp and the lute,
The heart's echoes render
No song when the spirit is mute:—
No song but sad dirges,
Like the wind through a ruined cell
Or the mournful surges
That ring the dead seaman's knell."

"PENSADORA."

The world is not mad, only in ignorance—an interested ignorance, kept up by strenuous exertions, from which infernal darkness it will, in course of time, emerge, marvelling at the past as a man who has escaped from darkness wonders at and glories in the light.—*Chatham*.

False education is a delightful thing, and warms you, and makes you every day think more of yourself. And true education is a deathly cold thing, with a Gorgon's shield on her head, and makes you every day think worse of yourself.—*Ruskin*.

What is Christianity?

[We publish the following from a New York clergyman, not because it offers anything that is new to our readers, but rather as an indication of the uneasiness felt by many of the better type of clergymen, over the purely religious aspect of the New Testament. Of course, the truth is that no religion could be established on a purely ethical basis. In all religions the foundation is supernaturalism. The emphasis on the ethical teachings associated with them is an indication of the impact of secular forces on religious beliefs.]

In the *Freethinker* for December 25, under the heading "Views and Opinions," the following statement appears: "Once give up the supernaturally sired, miracle-working, resurrected Jesus, what is there left on which to base the Christian theology?"

Christianity is neither a supernatural religion nor a theology. Nor is it a scheme of salvation; even from the ethical point of view it is open to criticism.

A Toronto clergyman recently said that the religion of Jesus, as Wesley, Moody and Billy Sunday preached it, has lost out among thinking, well educated Christians, and he says that the traditional belief in an infallible Bible was responsible for Negro slavery in the United States, and he concludes an article critical of orthodoxy in these words: "When Abraham Lincoln's proclamation abolished slavery in the United States there was not an evangelical preacher in the South who was not upholding slavery as a divine institution." But while much can be said both for and against the ethical teachings of the Bible, I desire, in this article, merely to direct attention to what all enlightened persons know; that we can find our way in the moral realm whether we are religious or not; this means that as an ethical guide religion is not necessary even though its codes were vastly better than most of them have been at any time.

What then is Christianity?

There are scholars who tell us that we do not know much about Jesus, the gospels as we have them having been written from much earlier documents, when legend and myth had grown up around His real life. But there is one fact we have reason to believe about Him, and that is that He "called His disciples that they might be with Him," and to whom He seemed so divine when they knew Him intimately, that the feeling was begotten that He was exactly like God; this is to say, Jesus is the world's supreme religious genius.

I say that we have reason to believe that the religion of Jesus originated and became a great power because of the uniqueness of His personality, for to-day there are men and women who because of His portrayal in the gospels have come under His spell and dwell in serenity at all times.

All this is to say that religion seems to express an eternal fact. S. Parkes Cadman well said that we are "religious animals" whether we know it or not. Sooner or later we all realize that we cannot live by bread alone. Jung, the psychiatrist, says he finds multitudes of persons who come to him complaining of the emptiness of life, and in every case he finds the trouble to be in their lack of a religious outlook.

Whatever the readers of the *Freethinker* may think of this explanation of Jesus, I feel sure that it has more appeal than the view of the traditionalists. To make such an interpretation of Christianity intelligible we must think of it as the way of God to reveal Himself to us, a disclosure of Himself that is to be fully effective only in the hereafter, if indeed we are His children in the making as our make-up seemingly indicates. Nor is the religion of Jesus invalidated though there have been divine revelations in other lands; that is to say, that in Hindu religions lesser and "broken lights" of

Him may have appeared at various times. "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs."

T. DARLEY ALLAN, D.D.

Putrescent Print

THE weaker the cause, the more illogical and virulent are its protagonists against its antagonists and critics. Freethinkers know this all too well in the matter of religion, but the failings are common in many other spheres. A recent instance arises from correspondence following the condemnation of current detective fiction by Howard Spring, the *Evening Standard's* reviewer (E.S. 4th ult.) In the course of a well-reasoned argument, he writes:—

My thesis is that the mountains of detective novels and of "thrillers" that industrious and uninspired moles of writers push up year by year are injurious and mentally devitalizing. . . .

It infuriates me when some placid Simon Pure denounces an "immoral" novel, while no voice is raised against the day-by-day doping of the people with stuff which is beneath the contempt of a C₃ intelligence.

That the British public is increasingly illiterate is a matter of common observation.

This is quite in line with opinions we have often expressed, but we can accord a hearty welcome to one who has wit and courage to express them in the time-serving press. We can also congratulate the paper which publishes such honest and healthy opinion. Mr. Spring says that he

heard a writer of the Wallace school defend his craft on the ground that the public wanted entertainment, not "high-brow" stuff.

"The impertinence of these people," he comments: and cites Dickens, Thackeray, Flaubert and Somerset Maugham as writers who knew the art of entertainment. Do the modern readers suppose, he asks, that

"Entertainment value" is some new discovery, conditioned exclusively by the absence of intelligence?

Mr. Spring sees two dangerous tendencies in reading to-day. . . . On the one hand that preoccupation with modern problems should make us neglect first principles, all the wide and illuminating sweep of philosophy and history and humane letters in general; on the other hand, that the cheap titillating tale of mystery of detection should take the time that a wise man devotes to the lovely regions of true imagination where the great novelists and the great poets dwell.

One has only to look at the rubbish filling the windows and shelves of the "Twopenny" libraries, the muddy pile of picture-papers having no other than a pornographic appeal, and the almost-equally vile trash of "sensational" and illiterate periodicals and magazines, to be convinced of the danger Mr. Spring sees.

Certain statesmen (save the mark!) and other public characters have occasionally expressed pleasure in turning to detective, wild-west and similar stories for relaxation. There is nothing objectionable in this, so long as these people recognize the taste as exactly linked with a recourse to other forms of narcotics, drinks and drugs, which are used to counter weariness, overstrain, boredom, and the *weakness of infirm minds*. D.

A better distribution and a moralization of wealth are approaching with a rapidity which is not exaggerated by the panic fears of the amazed Few, who hear with astonishment and horror that the world is no longer made for idlers only. The period of social revolution into which we are about to enter, will probably be marked by many mistakes and not a few crimes. Man's capacity for blunder is very great. He smarts for his blunders and in time corrects them. But the point to be noted is, that the social revolution will be accomplished on secular principles; that this province of practical life is once for all severed from any theological interference. The proletariat of Europe is resolved to have its fair share of the banquet of life, quite regardless of the good or bad things in store for it in the next world.

Cotter Morrison (1887).

Correspondence

THE LOURDES MIRACLES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—Somebody has sent me a "cutting" from your last issue, Mr. G. H. Taylor's article on "Faith Healing." In it my pamphlet on *Lourdes Miracles* (C.T.S., Ashley Place, S.W., 2d.) is dealt with. I shall not attempt to reply fully to the article. I am a "Rationalist" and "Freethinker" in regard to Lourdes miracles, as I am not obliged by my Catholic Faith to accept their genuineness, but use my reason to test them, and am free to accept what my reason concludes. A Materialist and Atheist is not free to accept them! With regard to at least most of the cases dealt with in my pamphlet, one may deny the evidence for the facts, but science cannot accept the facts and give them a scientific, naturalistic explanation. We do know that certain, sudden cures are beyond the powers of Nature and psychotherapy. We do know that a "process" essentially takes time, and that grave organic lesions are healed by a cell-building process. This is the "well established law of growth and healing" I alluded to. The illustration drawn from experiments on rats have no bearing whatever on the cases quoted. Professor Haldane's instance of cell-division in the embryo before the heart has even developed is so patently without a parallel to the case of the sudden reuniting of the broken leg bones, necrosed, bathed in pus, yet rejoined without shortening or "crookedness" and covered with a substantial callus that I strongly suspect that Professor Haldane never read the account of the cure in my pamphlet. It is the only charitable explanation I can give for his amazing use of the embryo illustration.

"Heart-beats" came into the problem because the blood-stream depends on them, and the blood-stream only contains very minute qualities of the constituents necessary to build up the callus.

But I don't intend any complete reply to the article. I challenge your readers to buy the 2d. pamphlet for themselves, and then judge whether, if the facts as certified are true, the suggested explanation of them by Professor Haldane is scientific.

They are either miracles or have not happened as the witnesses attest.

FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.

[We have no desire to follow Father Woodlock's letter, but we cannot resist exposing a conception of Freethought as a state of mind that can be put on and put off as a woman may put on another dress or change the fashion of her hair. Father Woodlock's conception of Freethought as something to be applied exclusively to a subject on which he is to give his judgment free play, but in which it is to have no play at all when he is ordered to believe something really ridiculous, is the most extraordinary conception of Freethought we have ever encountered. We do not know any one man or woman who is so organically stupid as to believe everything he is told. But we have never heard the fact that one believes everything he is ordered to believe but may question some of the things he is told he may disbelieve cited as proof that he is a Freethinker. Father Woodlock is the preacher in charge of one of London's most fashionable Roman Catholic Churches. We do not wonder at these men steering clear of discussion with real Freethinkers.—Ed.]

MRS. EDDY

SIR,—A note at the foot of G. H. Taylor's article on "Faith Healing," which appeared in your issue of January 29, states that "Mrs. Eddy was cured by Dr. Quimby, who himself learned hypnotic suggestion from Charcot." Such is not the case. Mrs. Eddy went to Quimby and received temporary help from his treatment, but later suffered a relapse. Mrs. Eddy was cured through spiritual means, and by the understanding which came to her from the Bible. This healing was permanent, and one which she has described as "the falling apple that led me to the discovery how to be well myself, and how to make others so." (*Retrospection and Introspection*, p. 24).

Quimby's teaching had nothing to do with Christian Science. The basis of his teaching was hypnotic, whereas

the basis of Christian Science teaching is Scriptural. I hope you will find space for this brief correction.

ROBERT E. KEY

[We print the above, although we are quite familiar with the apologies put forward by the defenders of that mixture of folly and fraud, Christian Science. There is no question of Mrs. Eddy having taken her book from the Quimby manuscripts. This is patent in the first edition of the book, although with succeeding editions—in the hands of more competent writers—the modifications made the likeness less noticeable. The anxiety of the Christian Science Organization to collect (and destroy?) all copies of the first edition makes the origin of that work less obvious.—Ed.]

Obituary

JAMES RAMSDEN

ON Friday, February 3, the remains of James Ramsden, of Totnes, were cremated in the peace and beauty of Efford Crematorium, Plymouth. In his 68th year, when death took place, he was a convinced Freethinker and never hid his opinions. He experienced the usual treatment from a certain class of Christians, and although his business suffered in consequence they never broke his spirit. At the Crematorium a Secular Service was conducted before assembled relatives, and the ashes were afterwards scattered. To his wife and all members of the family we offer sincere condolence.—R.H.R.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON

OUTDOOR

KINGSTON BRANCH N.S.S. (Market Place) : 7.30, A Lecture. Weather permitting.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (White Stone Pond) : 11.30, Sunday, Mr. L. Ebury. Parliament Hill Fields, 3.30, Mr. L. Ebury.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park) : 3.30, Sunday, Messrs. Bryant, Barnes, Collins, Tuson and Mrs. N. Buxton.

INDOOR

NORTH LONDON BRANCH (The Cricketers' Arms, Inverness Street, Camden Town, N.W.1) : 7.30, Allan Flanders (Militant Socialist International)—"Freethought and Socialism."

SOUTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Alexandra Hotel, South Side, Clapham Common, S.W.4) : 7.30, Mr. C. B. Greenwood (British Union of Fascists)—"Fascism."

SOUTH PLACE ETHICAL SOCIETY (Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1) : 11.0, Professor G. W. Keeton, L.D.—"The Refugee Problem."

WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Town Hall, Stratford, London, E.) : 7.0, Chapman Cohen—"The New Science and the New God."

WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.) : 7.30, Miss E. Millard, M.A.—"Political Ramblings, by a Political Ignoramus."

COUNTRY

INDOOR

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N.S.S. (Bristol Street Council Schools, Birmingham) : 7.0, Mr. George Whitehead (London)—"Science the Saviour."

BIKENHEAD (Wirral) BRANCH N.S.S. (Beechcroft Settlement, Whetstone Lane) : 7.0, W. L. Owen (Liverpool)—"Secular Sanity."

BLACKBURN BRANCH N.S.S. (Jubilee Assembly Hall, Market Hall, Blackburn) : 7.30, Monday, February 13, Mr. Ronald Standfast (Birkenhead)—"Freethought and the Free Man." Literature for sale.

BRADFORD BRANCH N.S.S. (Mechanics' Institute, Town Hall, Bradford) : 7.0, Mr. R. H. Rosetti—"The Churches and the Threat to Civilization."

BLYTH : 7.0, Monday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

EAST LANCASHIRE RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION (28 Bridge Street, Burnley) : 2.30, Mr. C. Oakes—"Problems of Bird Life."

[Continued on page 111]

**IN AID OF THE FUNDS OF THE LEAGUE FOR
THE BOYCOTT OF AGGRESSOR NATIONS**

**SUFFOLK GALLERIES,
Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, S.W. 1**

On Wednesday, 15th February, 1939, at 8 30 p.m

Personal appearance of
PAUL ROBESON
in specially selected items from his repertoire

also
Miss IRENE SCHARRER
The Distinguished Pianiste

and
HARRY BLECH
The well known Violinist

Tickets £1 1s. 0d., 10s. 6d. and 5s. 0d

May be obtained from the Suffolk Galleries, from
Members of the Committee: The Hon. Mrs. Ewen Mon-
tagu, Mrs. Philip Guedalla, Mrs. Rachel Lewis,
Mr. Peter Northcote, and the Secretary of the League
for the Boycott of Aggressor Nations, 40a Paulton's
Square, S.W.3. Phone: Flaxman 6496.

Twelve Religions and Modern Life

By **HAR DAYAL, M A., Ph.D.**

H. G. WELLS: "I find it a useful summary."
Public Opinion: "Humanism and its ideals form
the keynote of Dr. Dayal's unusual work."

Price 2s. 6d. Post Free

MODERN CULTURE INSTITUTE, EDGWARE, MIDDX.

(Continued from page 110)

EDINBURGH BRANCH N.S.S. (Free Gardeners' Hall, Picardy
Edinburgh): 7.0, Mrs. Whitefield (Glasgow)—"The Patho-
logy of Religious Leaders."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (East Hall, McLellan Galleries,
Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow): 7.0, Dr. James Dunlop—"A
Map of Scotland."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone
Gate): 6.30, Prof. Robert Peers, M.A.—"German National
Socialism, its Theory and Practice."

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N.S.S. (Transport Hall, Islington,
entrance in Christian Street): 7.0, R. H. S. Standfast (Bir-
kenhead)—"What is this Freedom?"

MANCHESTER BRANCH N.S.S. (King's Café, 64-66 Oxford
Road, Manchester, near All Saints Church): 7.0, Mr. G. M.
Henderson (Anti-Vivisection Society)—"The Case Against
Vivisection."

STOCKTON (Jubilee Hall): 7.30, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

WINGATE (Co-operative Hall): 7.0, Wednesday. A Debate
—"The Word of God: Fact or Fiction?" *Fact*: Rev. W.
Grieves. *Fiction*: Mr. J. T. Brighton.

The Secular Society Ltd.,

CHAIRMAN: CHAPMAN COHEN

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

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

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the
Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human
conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not
upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this
world is the proper end of all thought and action. To 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 Society
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.

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

MEAT EATING INVOLVES CRUELTY!

Why not try the Vegetarian Way?

Free Literature, including Recipes,
from The Vegetarian Society, 57 Princess Street,
Manchester, 2

MATERIALISM RESTATED

NEW EDITION. GREATLY ENLARGED

CHAPMAN COHEN

CONTENTS

A Question of Prejudice	The March of Materialism
Materialism in History	On Cause and Effect
What is Materialism?	Reply to a Critic
Science and Pseudo-Science	Emergence
	The Problem of Personality

No other subject has been misunderstood and misstated so frequently as Materialism. Its reception has marked the development of science, and it has been the age-long foe of superstition in all its forms. Hence the necessity for a restatement of Materialism in the light of modern science and philosophy.

Strongly bound in Cloth.

3s. 6d. Postage 4d.

STRATFORD TOWN HALL, E.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1939

CHAPMAN COHEN

ON

“The New Science and the New God”

Questions and Discussion cordially invited

Admission Free

Doors open 6.30 p.m.

Commence 7.0 p.m.

220 pages of Wit and Wisdom

BIBLE ROMANCES

By G. W. Foote

The *Bible Romances* is an illustration of G. W. Foote at his best. It is profound without being dull, witty without being shallow, and is as indispensable to the Freethinker as is the *Bible Handbook*.

Price 2/6 Postage 3d.

Well printed and well bound.

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

BRAIN and MIND

— BY —

Dr. ARTHUR LYNCH.

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

Price - 6d. By post - 7d.