

THE FREETHINKER

EDITED *by* CHAPMAN COHEN
— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIX.—No. 41

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1939

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Which Road?</i> —The Editor - - - - -	641
<i>The Bogey Business</i> —Mimnermus - - - - -	643
<i>Some Bible Studies</i> —H. Cutner - - - - -	644
<i>The Pacifist and the "War to End War, No. 2"</i> R. H. S. Standfast - - - - -	645
<i>For the "Freethinker"</i> —Chapman Cohen - - - - -	649
<i>The Juvenile Delinquent</i> —T. F. Palmer - - - - -	651
<i>Spiders and Flies</i> —T. H. Elstob - - - - -	652

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

Views and Opinions

Which Road?

I do not purpose replying to all the issues raised in Mr. Du Cann's rejoinder (*Freethinker*, October 1) to my criticism of his previous article. I wish to concern myself with one or two points raised therein. The first is concerned with the use of the word religion. And I must here insist that the essential quality of a definition is to define. That is, it must mark off the thing defined from other things. Inclusion is a subsidiary factor in "definition," even though it be an important one. The essential quality here is exclusion. A definition must shut out things. If we are to take religion as meaning a "creed" (a rather indefinite word) held with emotion in which one believes, and which is one's ultimate standard of values beyond one's own life, then it may take in every serious belief that a man has. In that case religion equals anything and everything, and in so doing loses any value the term has. If we are all religious, despite our differing opinions on gods and devils and a future life, then we might with equal utility and sense say that no one is religious. Mr. Du Cann admits this in a way by saying that "irreligion can be a man's religion." In that case I would submit that a discussion is impossible, since a word may mean anything we care to make it mean. A proposition may contain its opposite, but not a word. A word can only suggest an opposite, it cannot contain it.

I dislike this way of speaking of the Freethinker as a religious man, because it suggests the impertinence of so many who say that a Freethinker may be as good as a Christian. I think a man is a very poor kind of a Freethinker who is not better than a Christian.

A Christian stands for one who believes in a particular form of religious faith, the cardinal features of which are that Jesus Christ was an incarnation of God, that he was born of a virgin, ceremonially sacrificed for the sins of men, and who after he was killed rose from the dead. One is not a Christian merely because

he believes in a number of moral maxims and holds a belief with intensity.

Also when a man calls himself religious we do not mean that he holds some belief with "emotion." One cannot hold any belief without emotion. The belief of a burglar that he will be caught because he sees the house into which he has broken surrounded by policemen, does not excite a religious belief, but it does excite a belief and an emotion. He expresses both in, "Blimey, I'm copped."

I do not admit that Milton's power as a poet, or some others person's ability as an architect, was due to his religion. Milton did not write poetry because he was religious, neither does an architect build a cathedral, or a musician give us first class music because he is religious. An architect or a musician may be religious or Atheistical, but the quality of his work, whether in music or poetry or sculpture, will be wholly dependent upon his ability as a workman, and the opportunities he has for giving his ideas tangible form. If he is religious in mind he will the more eagerly work through a religious medium. If he is not religious his art will find its greatest expressions in non-religious form. But his skill in either direction will be quite independent of the medium in which he works. Whether a man leaps upward to get over a fence or to escape the prick of a pin on which he has just sat is due to the play of his muscles. The play of his muscles has no necessary connexion with the desire to get over a fence or to avoid sitting on something with a sharp point upward.

* * *

Why Obvious?

But I do feel tempted to deal at some length with Mr. Du Cann's defence of Agnosticism, because it represents a very common state of mind, but which is, in my judgment, a very fallacious one, inasmuch as it does not state the position justly, and assumes a state of mind regarding the belief in a god that is not possible. To put it bluntly, the Agnostic fools himself as a preliminary to confusing others.* Mr. Du Cann says: "Obviously there are three plainly separate intellectual positions":—

1. I know there is a God.
2. I know there is not.
3. I don't know whether there is or not; and I wait for more evidence.

That "obviously," as is so often the case, is not obvious at all; indeed far from being obvious it is not even reasonable. For instance, what has Mr. Du Cann in his mind when he talks about God as something that can be known, or unknown, or be in doubt

* Those who wish to trace the evolution of the Agnostic position from its emergence in a philosophy just recovering from the thralldom of the gods to its blending with the religious idea in modern times, thus making confusion more confounded, will find it dealt with in my *Primitive Survivals in Modern Thought*.

about, his or its, existence? If he is thinking of any of the gods that people have believed in, either in the past or in the present—say, the god of the Bible, or the god of the Central African, the god of the Christian Church, the gods of the ancient Egyptian, or the God of the Presbyterian Church, I do not imagine for a moment but that he will not merely brush these aside as creatures of the imagination, but that he will include in his deicidal conduct any god whom man has ever imagined. And if he so deals, as I think he will, with all these gods, what has he in mind when he talks about God? What is it of which he thinks we may say it does exist, or it does not exist, or I am waiting to see whether it exists or not? If any one of these three propositions is intelligible it is absolutely necessary that the man who is looking for a God must know what it is like—in general terms, of course—before he meets it. Otherwise he may run into it without knowing what it is he has met.

But the only gods that we can look for or think about are those that are generally like the gods that have been believed in, but which, I take it, Mr. Du Cann believes never existed. If I tell Mr. Du Cann that I do not believe in the existence of the only kind of fish, or bird, or tree that man has known—these are all creatures of the imagination—but I will not say that there does not exist somewhere a fish that has not the structure or habits of a fish, and does not live in the water, that I think there may somewhere be a bird that is quite unlike in structure, habits, and habitat, as are the birds we know, or that there may exist a tree without roots, or trunk, or branches, a tree that does not root in the soil and absorb moisture, sunlight, etc., Mr. Du Cann will quite properly reply that, if I run across these things and they satisfy my "yearning" for them, that whatever they are they are "obviously" not what we mean when we talk about fishes, birds or trees.

I do not see that Mr. Du Cann, or anyone can say, I have no knowledge of, or I have a knowledge of, or I am waiting for evidence for, something of which I have not the foggiest conception of what it is like or what it does. I hope Mr. Du Cann will not be offended by my saying of his three propositions, that instead of their being obviously distinct intellectual positions, they strike my poor mind as being obvious nonsense. If I believe in a thing, or believe it possible that a thing exists, I must imagine it as existing. But can anyone think of a thing existing, and at the same time rule out all known facts of existence?

* * *

Gods

Let us see if the dictionaries will help us. I am not a slave to dictionaries because they do not make words, they simply register them. A dictionary is not a lawgiver, it is only a recorder. Still it may always help a little, if it is wisely used, and it is always well to remember that the best of teachers will often succeed only in confirming a fool in his folly.

From a good modern dictionary I take the following:—

God—Origin unknown. Probably an Aryan word meaning that to which sacrifice is made. One of a class of powerful spirits regarded as controlling a department of nature or human activity.

Now I think that really does cover all the gods in whom men have at any time believed. They have been powerful "spirits" that took note of man's behaviour, men have sacrificed to them, they have prayed to them, and so forth. No one yet has ever believed in a god unless he in some way resembled a powerful personality, and that he was in mind or body, or mind and body, generically similar to man. Certainly men

have not thought of a God who was existing, or who might exist, but who had no qualities at all similar to those of man. If a man says he is looking for "god," and means something of the first kind, I can understand his saying that he is not sure that such a being exists, but he thinks he does. In that case he is not an Agnostic, he is what I may call a theist who is not quite sure of his ground. But he has no logical right to say I do not believe in any god that was ever believed to exist, or that any god who does exist is generically unlike any in which men have believed. In that case I simply ask, using another illustration to bring the force of my contention home, "What is a tree like that in nowise resembles the tree we know?"

The idea that there exists a prototype of every thing that exists died out of every scientific philosophy generations since. There is no general fish of which known fishes are samples. There are only individual fishes. The general is merely an incalculable number of particulars summed up in their most general features. There is no such thing as a "God" by himself, of whom the gods that the world has known are unreliable copies. The gods that the world has known, knows, and can think about, are individual gods, and if one does not believe in any of these, and cannot say what kind of a god he is looking for, when found it will in no wise resemble what language implies when "god" is named. Whatever it may be it will not be "god," any more than a fish different in every particular from the creature that is known as a fish will be a fish.

* * *

Summing Up

There does not, then, seem to me very much left of Mr. Du Cann's three obvious positions. The first is not obvious to anyone who is not already a believer in God, because the origin of that belief is known to current science and "obviously" arose out of the misinterpretation of a series of natural facts everyone of which is now susceptible of a different interpretation. And in science when a new interpretation is adopted the old one is discarded.

The Atheist is not saying: I know there is no god; if "god" refers to something distinctly and genetically different from the gods that people have known. He does say these do not exist, and, he adds, nothing like them can exist. In this he is supported by every believer in God who regards every other god but his own as non-existent. He simply cannot use the word "god" meaning nothing in particular, because, lacking a definition, he does not know what on earth the other fellow is talking about—neither does the other fellow.

For much the same reasons as those stated the "Agnostic" cannot be in doubt as to whether "god" exists or not, because in terms of his own case he does not know what a "god" is like (apart from the gods of the different religions which he does not believe exists)—and therefore cannot know when he is discovered. To recur to my previous illustration, the man who is looking for a bird that is altogether different from the bird he knows would not know it to be a bird when he comes across it.

Let me say that I have been interested in the way the *Freethinker* strikes a "contemporary." But I think when the "contemporary" knows us better he will realize that the *Freethinker* is what it is because it occupies a place that is filled by no other paper in this country. It is surely not too much to have one weekly paper in this country that devotes itself to a point of view that is not otherwise represented. The *Freethinker* is not a journal published as a commercial speculation. It is published for the sole purpose of cultivating Free-

thought in its very widest sense, and to destroy superstition in all its forms. No other paper in this country dares to do this in the same uncompromising manner. And the *Freethinker* has only managed to keep to its self-appointed task because of the unswerving loyalty of those who believe in its importance to the mental and moral health of the country.

CHAPMAN COHEN

The Bogey Business

Learning is good, but common sense is better.
G. W. Foote.

Elementary, my dear Watson.—Conan Doyle.

SPIRITISM is a hoary antiquity, but its modern counterpart, Spiritualism, has no background, and commands little respect. The adhesion of Sir Oliver Lodge made an enormous sensation, but it proved little except that a famous man may have his foibles. A similar thing happened in the case of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Here was a world-famous novelist who threw in his lot with the Spiritualists. The two, Doyle and Lodge, almost made the cult reputable. Almost, but not quite, respectable. For critics remarked that the creator of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson, the writer of the *White Company*, possessed a very potent imagination; whilst, in the case of Sir Oliver Lodge, they recalled that the great scientist, Faraday, spent his leisure in attendance at a side-street Bethel.

The mediums and the Spiritualist lecturers cannot be blamed for their enthusiastic acclaim of a famous novelist and a still more famous scientist. Some of the side-street mediums must have raised their prices from eighteen pence to five shillings for a seance sitting. That the austere Principal of Birmingham University should approve their evangel was a bolt from the blue. That they should raise their prices was only business, and very human.

Sir Oliver Lodge's testimony has been so exploited that it is worth some examination. It is contained in his book, *Raymond; or Life and Death* (Methuen, 1916). The title requires explanation. His son, Raymond, was killed at the Front in Flanders in September, 1915, and it is claimed that members of his family had been in communication with the young man since that time. The volume contains a record of these alleged conversations between the living and the dead, and this raises again the ages-old question as to whether human personality persists beyond the grave.

For a scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge gives precious little evidence for so momentous a matter. One point relates to a prophecy of Raymond's death made at a seance in America a month before he was killed. Another refers to a "sitting," shortly after the young man's death, in which an alleged message from Raymond was conveyed to Lady Lodge, containing the words, "Good God! how father will be able to speak out! Much firmer than he has ever done, because it will touch our hearts." Further "conversations" with Raymond give descriptions of life in the next world, such as:—

There are men here, and there are women here. I don't think that they stand to each other quite the same as they did on the earth plane, but they seem to have the same feeling to each other, with a different expression of it. There don't seem to be any children born here. People are sent into the physical body to have children on the earth plane; they don't have them there.

Another precious piece of information follows:—

People here try to provide everything that is wanted. A chap came over the other day, who would have a cigar. "That's finished them," he thought. He means he thought they would never be able to provide that. But there are laboratories over here, and they manufacture all sorts of things in them. Not like you do, out of solid matter, but out of essences, and ethers, and gases. It's not the same as on the earth-plane, but they were able to manufacture what looked like a cigar. He didn't try one himself, because he didn't care to; you know he wouldn't want to. But the other chap jumped at it. But when he began to smoke it, he didn't think so much of it; he had four altogether; and now he doesn't look at one.

There are other matters included, which have no value as evidence, such as exalted visions, and a statement that Raymond had seen "Christ," but withholding details. That is the bald outline of Sir Oliver Lodge's case for human survival after death. It is puerile, and singularly unconvincing, especially the twaddle concerning the cigars and of seeing "Christ." Almost any medium could have made out as good a case for human survival after death.

It all sounds very odd in the face of the too-familiar clerical argument that the surgeon's knife cannot find the human "soul." For, in a special sense, Spiritualism does actually try to find the "soul" with the knife, that is with material means. It wants to get as good evidence for the existence of Mr. John Smith after dissolution, as it had for the existence of John Smith before his death. The supposed "spirit" of Smith is required to prove his existence and presence by making himself audible, by showing that he remembers "Auntie" or "Granny," or by having his photograph taken.

Now, what is there in Sir Oliver's evidence to convince the world, or even to carry conviction to the minds of plain men and women? The prophecy of his son's death was not by any means improbable, for he was a soldier, and sharing a constant risk of death. And what are we to make of the "revelations" of the "hereafter," with its "laboratories," and its "cigars," and its "factories?" Are we to suppose that all life is indestructible? In that case, we have still to ask where life begins, and wherever the line may be drawn, it is manifest that the jellyfish, the oyster, the bug and the louse are on the hither side of it, and have "souls." All these, and a hundred other difficulties, encounter us when we try to consider Sir Oliver's account of the "Beyond."

Whilst "Raymond's" description of an alleged future life seems absurd to us, there is one point well worth noting. The ideas concerning human survival have been secularized. Life after death is not painted as being painful or horrific, but as a continuation of life on earth, such as Shelley's sarcastic description of "hell" as a place "very like London." Apparently, even religious folks now-a-days are getting ashamed of the old Orthodox theory of heaven and hell. Unconsciously, their ideas are becoming more secularized. Their ideas may be childish, but it is gratifying to find that they are more humane than formerly. There is a truly enormous difference between Sir Oliver Lodge's farcical views of a future existence and the tragic and disgusting views of the Orthodox Christians. Recall, for instance, the views of Spurgeon, the most popular preacher of the nineteenth century. He preached and wrote for an entire generation that the majority of the human race were destined to everlasting torture in full view of their deity:—

In fire, exactly like that which we have on earth to-day, will lie, asbestos-like, for ever unconsumed, every nerve a string on which the Devil shall for ever play his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament.

The unfortunate people will :—

look up there on the Throne of God, and it shall be written "For Ever." When the damned jingle the burning irons of their torment they shall say, "For Ever." When they howl, echo cries, For Ever.

That was what the historic Christian Churches believed and taught until recently, and similar uncivilized ideas are still preached by the Roman Catholic Church, the Salvation Army, and itinerant and uneducated evangelists. Yet many centuries ago, Omar Khayyam, that splendid poet whose verses came to birth under the Mohammedan crescent, chanted nobler ideas in sonorous music :—

I sent my soul through the invisible,
Some letter of that after-life to spell,
And by and bye my soul returned to me,
And answered, I myself am heaven and hell.

Lodge's pseudo-scientific jargon may be more humane than the barbarities voiced by Spurgeon and other preachers, but it remains unsatisfactory and unreal. Behind Lodge there is always "Sludge, the Medium," with a tambourine between his toes. The new Spiritualism gives no better answer than the old, and the latter "messages" from the "other side" are as unconvincing as the earlier. It is all guesswork, conditioned by environment. Savages dream of their happy hunting-grounds; Moslems people their Paradise with hours; Christians think of Heaven's Hallelujah Chorus, and Hell's "immortal fry," whilst Sir Oliver Lodge is satisfied with cigar-smoking bogeys. The world is no nearer a solution than in the far-off days of Lucretius, or in the earlier times when primitive man sobbed over his dead. The Secular solution is best expressed by Shakespeare, "The rest is silence." All sprang from Nature, and have their little day, and all return for their last sleep. Fear should have no place.

MIMNERMUS

Some Bible Studies

VI.

IN Robert Taylor's fine lecture on the Virgin Mary in the *Devil's Pulpit* will be found a very acute analysis of the myth of the Heavenly Mother Goddess which, in different forms, pervaded the East in remote times, and the worship of whom is still with us in almost its original fervour. Taylor points out that the word *Blessed* added to the name Virgin has the special significance of *fruitfulness* of all sorts of corn and wheat; and that in the fanciful picture which is drawn of the Zodiacal sign *Virgo*, the extended right arm is holding an ear of corn. It will not occasion any surprise, I hope, that there has actually been unearthed with the Ras Shamra Tablets, about which I have already said something in previous articles, a plaque on which in bas-relief is a typical Mother Goddess holding in her hands ears of corn. The style and skirt worn by the goddess suggests Mycenaean workmanship, and the plaque proves how widespread was the idea of such a female divinity. It is not in the least surprising that such a tablet with such a picture should be found; and it proves how right were Dupuis and Taylor in their very suggestive theories on the origins of gods and worships.

According to Dr. Jack in his *Ras Shamra Tablets*, the name Daniel is found on one of them, and he is commended for his virtue just as in Ezekiel, are Noah, Job, and Daniel. Of course, Dr. Jack tries hard to make out that the Daniel in Ezekiel and of the tablets is not *the* Daniel, but somebody else of the same name.

He has to do this because our Daniel flourished—if he ever did—about the sixth century B.C. And as the tablets are dated about the fourteenth century B.C., the two Daniels must be different. It would indeed be a dreadful admission to make that the Bible Daniel may have been, like so many other Bible heroes, a myth, and that the fiction writer simply appropriated the name of Daniel because he may have heard it mentioned from some writings or tablets. As a matter of fact, many names in the Bible correspond with those found on the tablets, and there can be no doubt whatever now where they came from. Moreover, other familiar names are mentioned like Ashter the goddess, and Dagon the famous fish-god—no doubt the prototype of Jesus when he became a fish-god, or anyway "a fisher of men." Then there is a god called Yah or Yo though the authorities are not agreed as to whether he is our old friend Jehovah or Yahveh. For Freethinkers it does not much matter; one god more or less is a trifle, and anyway none of them ever existed.

In the matter of ritual the analogies between the tablets and Judaism are astounding. Dr. Jack says :—

The tablets afford us an excellent commentary on some of the Jewish Feasts and Sacrifices, showing that these were to a large extent similar to those at Ras Shamra, and enabling us to trace their development, and to discover their original meaning and prototype. The tablets in fact throw the same light on the religious ritual of Palestine about 1400 B.C., that the Amarna Letters do on the politics. In the contest between Mot and Aleyn, for example, we have a remarkable passage which seems to be the prototype of the Jewish Feast of Unleavened Bread. . . . The ritual in this matter thus seems to have been similar in Phœnicia and in Israel, and consequently the tablets afford us evidence of the pre-Mosaic origin of this Jewish agricultural feast, and carry it back in reality to the Tammuz myth of Summer and Winter and its associated ritual.

All this, according to Sir Charles Marston, proves the Bible to be true. For other people, it proves that the writers of the Bible had no hesitation in appropriating any pagan myth or ritual, and ascribing it to their own God, who in any case, had already been appropriated.

Dr. Jack thinks it "probable" that the Jewish Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles were also taken bodily from the native inhabitants—all three feasts being really concerned with the fruits of the earth. As he points out these feasts could not have originated in "the nomadic life of the desert," but "must have sprung up in Canaan itself, where they had their natural origin."

Quite a number of Jewish sacrifices and offerings can be traced to the tablets, such as the offerings of the First Fruits, the Trespass Offering, the Offerings of Birds ("comparable to those which are referred to in Lev. i. 14-17, and which have been hitherto wrongly considered as of late origin,") and many others. Even some correspondence between the temple of Ras Shamra and the Jewish Tabernacle with their sacred enclosures and their "ephods" and "teraphim" is clearly admitted. On the tablets the letters *ens elm* have been translated as "man of God." In Hebrew there is a similar term, similarly translated, which is applied to Moses, Samuel, David, and others, and the term is found, we are told, also "in Phœnician and Elephantine texts." In fact, to put the matter briefly, both Dr. Jack and Mr. Gaster are obliged to admit that many stories, customs and rituals, which were once thought to be purely Biblical, and apart altogether from the "pagan" observances surrounding God's Chosen People, are now known to be of purely pagan origin, deliberately copied and assimilated by the Israelites when they became masters

of Canaan—if that part of the story is not also invented.

In any case there is a great deal of information on the tablets about a race called the Sa-Gaz, who were also called the *Habiru*, and who "belonged mostly to the wide Hebrew race which embraced not only the Israelites, but many clans and bodies between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. Their invasion of Palestine and Syria was widespread, powerful, and permanent, and included Ugarit and other towns on the Syrian coasts which they captured, slaying their rulers and seizing their power." Whether this be the case or not, one fact does stand out, and that is, the Bible account of the invasion of Palestine cannot stand. Either the *Habiru* of the tablets were a strong powerful nation or a number of clans, whose invasion of Palestine was altogether different from that under Joshua; or Palestine was invaded by the descendants of Abraham—in which case they could not have the *Habiru* of the tablets.

All sorts of other questions have been raised by the Ras Shamra Tablets, and most perplexing they must be to the Bible believer. To others, who have long seen in the Bible a collection of pagan myths and symbolism, the information on the tablets has come as no surprise. Exactly what was expected has come about. In fact, in a lecture given by Mr. Theodore Gaster in 1936—published in *Religions* for January, 1937—there will be found the most remarkable admissions I have come across from one who has never, as far as I know, identified himself with Freethought. More of the tablets had by then been translated, and Mr. Gaster has to admit, "that the Israelites confederation was constituted out of the earlier tribes living in the land." He adds:—

The Biblical stories of the patriarchs are all founded upon a common body of floating tradition, which took various forms among the different tribes and clans who went to make that remarkable confederation which we know as "the children of Israel." Before their federation into a single unit each of these tribes preserved its own national or tribal legends woven round its ancestral heroes. These legends, however, were so many variations upon a common theme . . . the various heroes were brought into genealogical relationship with one another, and an attempt was made to redact the large body of material into the semblance of a chronological sequence. It is this story the product of the "collective Israel" which we find in the Old Testament.

Space forbids me to give the details with which Mr. Gaster proves his thesis, but if the reader can get hold of the monographs, the titles of which I have already given, on the Ras Shamra Tablets, he will see the fatal blows which have been given to "Inspiration" and "Revelation" by their wonderful discovery.

It can be taken as a fact that excavation in Palestine and the surrounding countries, far from proving the truth of the Bible, has proved the exact opposite. Nothing whatever has been discovered about any of the principal personages, not a single miracle has been substantiated, and Bible chronology has been blown to the winds. Instead, we know now that many of the beliefs of the original inhabitants of Canaan prior to the invasion by the Israelites were extraordinarily like those in the Bible; and we know that the origin of the great God of Jews and Christians alike was a ridiculous pagan myth called El, who was simply a solar deity. The Ras Shamra Tablets in particular have justified to the utmost the Freethought attack on the Bible; and we should be grateful to the eminent scholars who have deciphered them and who have thus put into our hands such incontrovertible proofs that the Bible is *not* true.

H. CUTNER

The Pacifist and the "War to End War, No. 2"

(2) CONSCIENCE AND THE COMMUNITY

HUMANISM (including Freethought), religion and politics all bring their distinctive contributions to Pacifism, but basis of the varying degrees of Pacifism is an acknowledged or unacknowledged recognition of the claims of humanity, one upon another.

Pacifists, although many draw their inspiration from two or three different schools at the same time, can be divided roughly into two main groups—(1) extreme Pacifists, for whom their non-participation in any war is already decided beyond further argument; and (2) those who are opposed in general to participation except in circumstances most compelling to their conscience, but are prepared to review their standpoint in the light of all the practical and moral considerations of the occasion. The first class are subdivided into (a) religious, (b) humanist; the second class into (a) Socialist Pacifists, who judge each war and its possible consequences at the bar of the Socialist brotherhood and its economic needs, and (b) those we might call "practical Pacifists," who similarly judge each war in relation to the social and moral progress of mankind, but on a wider basis than their Socialist contemporaries.

The Extreme Pacifist—Extreme of the Christian Pacifists is the believer who refuses, or claims the right to refuse, to take human life in any circumstances. He believes that the power of life and death is the moral prerogative solely of his God who created life; he relies on the scriptural injunction, "Thou shalt not kill," as a commandment from that God; and—although Jesus never laid down any ruling on the moral issue of war as a factor in international affairs—he draws inspiration from the Jesus who taught the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of (Christian) men, who commanded Peter to put away his defensive sword, and who preached "Love your enemies," "Turn the other cheek," "Resist not evil."

Other religions or philosophies may lead one to a somewhat similar position. For instance, a young Conscientious Objector was recently placed on the exemption list after quoting to the tribunal a lengthy extract from the teachings of Buddha, which began: "He who wishes to attain the joy of living in harmony with the universe shall deceive no one, entertain no hatred for anybody, and no wish to injure through anger. He shall have measureless love for all creatures . . . up above, below, and all around him he shall extend his love, which is without bounds and obstacles, and which is free from all cruelty and antagonism. . . ." That was before the actual outbreak of war. (Incidentally, the newspaper reports pointed out that these words were uttered 500 years before Christ).

Still other persons—including many Freethinkers—take up the extreme position of refusing to fight in any circumstances not on religious grounds, but purely because of their conviction that modern war in any circumstances is wrong, and because of their abhorrence at killing other human beings.

Now, you may consider all these classes of extreme Pacifists to be wrong in their convictions and conduct, but what are you going to do about it except admit their claims? They, not we, are the keepers of their conscience.

After all, many of us know how strong can be that call to conscience and emotions not to kill a fellow-being in cold blood. Many of us know how imperative can be the call not to drop a fiendish hail of death

and destruction from the skies on misled men and women and their babies. Are we going to treat as a criminal a member of the community whose humane sentiments are so strong (even at the expense of his "practical" side) that he cannot resist such a call? Are we going to decry and abuse a system which gaols a Pastor Niemoeller because he refuses to surrender his conscience (whether right or wrong), and then ourselves gaol a Pacifist because he refuses to surrender his conscience? Are we going to condemn a system which coerces an individual from following the command of his God to "preach the gospel," and then ourselves coerce an individual from following the command of his God or his conscience not to kill? Are we going to recognize the right of the individual to exemption from compulsory vaccination, yet not recognize his right to exemption from killing his fellow-man?

There are limits to "state ownership" of the individual and his conscience. There are limits to the rights of the majority over the minority, even when the majority claims (as it usually does) that its coercive action is justified for the sake of all, even when the majority claims (as it usually does) that its tyranny is necessary for the safety of all.

The Socialist Pacifist.—The extreme Pacifist is usually an individual on his own, or isolated in an extreme minority in his church or society, with few home contacts, fewer world links, and no alternative philosophy except possibly the fallacious religious belief that the will of God must triumph in the end, or its equally fallacious secular form that right must eventually triumph over wrong. More organized and possessing a constructive alternative policy, with wider appeal and world-wide contacts, though still in a small minority even in his own movement, is the Socialist Pacifist.

The Socialist Pacifist considers that the interests of the working-classes of all nations are one and the same, to be served not by conflict among themselves but by co-operation to end the present economic system and its exploitation. He does not see why the members of those working classes—always the heaviest sufferers in war—should be hurled into mass slaughter of each other to serve not their own interests but the diametrically opposed interests of the ruling classes, the capitalists, the financiers, the profiteers, etc. Nor is he willing to fight in a war that does not promise to change fundamentally the economic system which, in his opinion, is the cause of wars as well as of so much exploitation. On the other hand, he may be, and usually is, only too willing to fight in a war which is a direct challenge to that system, or in military action initiated by the working-classes themselves.

The "Practical Pacifist."—Finally there is the "practical pacifist," who does not refuse to fight in any war regardless of circumstances, and does not accept the ideological restrictions of the Socialist, but who bases his decision solely on his view of the part any war will play in permanently substituting the rule of international law and honesty for the rule of force and conquest, and in securing the moral progress of mankind. He does not believe that war will be ended by war, but he may consider that a war is necessary to defend the present stage of social evolution in such a way that the system may be the sooner altered to eradicate the causes of future wars.

There are to-day many "practical pacifists"—as well as Socialist Pacifists—who have actively entered the present conflict because they believe that, however many its wrongs, its rights are paramount and its prosecution necessary in order that the world in general, and Europe in particular, may not be driven further back into the jungle from the precarious posi-

tion already reached. As the war goes on their number will probably increase. But there will remain a not inconsiderable number who must say no even to such persuasive arguments. Even after 1914-1918 they may at first be tempted to give war one more chance to end war, but they look back at the "Versailles period" since 1918, they look back at the high hopes and cynical disillusionments of the Geneva period, and at the causes of Hitlerism and the present conflict, they look back at the records of the British and French Governments, and they have no confidence that under its present leadership the war, with all its cost in human life and suffering, will produce a peace fundamentally any easier or more substantial than the uneasy and perverted peace of 1918-1939.

Even an extreme Pacifist might be willing to kill an individual madman to stop his career of murder and destruction; but the waging of a wholesale modern war and blockade upon a misled people raises physical and moral issues that cannot be solved as simply. Nor is the practical Pacifist to be led unthinkingly into "a war of moral values," as Britain's spokesmen were so suspiciously quick to term it. Even where the moral values of international relations are challenged so blatantly as by Herr Hitler, there are many other considerations to be taken into account before the Pacifist is willing to surrender his conscience into the keeping of such cynical protectors of those "moral values." Power politics is a dirty business at the best of times, and most of all to be suspected when it fills the air with fine phrases.

To each of us, then, his choice; and with that choice, our self-respect and our respect for the decision of others. And when it is all over again, when the guns have ceased their rain of death, and the planes have ceased to blacken the sky and devastate the earth and its peoples, when the victims have been sacrificed, and the men and the women and the children have been killed or maimed or starved, then to all of us the task not of a Greater War, but of a Greater Peace—a peace that shall not mock its name or stultify its ideals, and a peace for which we must work and prepare ourselves and others, even now, while conflict rages.

R. H. S. STANDFAST

HARRIET MARTINEAU

(1802-1876)

Hail to the steadfast soul,
Which unflinching and keen,
Wrought to crase from its depth
Mist, and illusion, and fear!
Hail to the spirit which dar'd
Trust its own thoughts, before yet
Echoed her back by the crowd!
Hail to the courage which gave
Voice to its creed, ere the creed
Won consecration from Time!

Matthew Arnold

Love, friendship, ambition, science, literature, art, politics, commerce, professions, trades, and a thousand other matters will go on equally well, as far as I can see, whether there is or is not a God or a future state; and a man who cannot occupy every working moment of a long life with some or other of these things must be either very unfortunate in regard of his health or circumstances, or else must be a poor creature.

Sir James Fitzjames Stephen.

Acid Drops

We wonder whether it is possible to induce the newspapers to act with honesty towards the public "for the duration." What the public may know concerning the war is strictly determined by the 999 wiseacres who constitute the Ministry of Information. This extends to even the gossipy item that the Queen has returned from Balmoral to London, which was released—barred—released—barred—released, as though it mattered in the slightest whether the Queen was at Balmoral or Billingsgate. Now as everything we can get published about the war must be sanctioned by this 999 group of men and women, why do the newspapers not act honestly, and before each item of news that either touches on the war or has a direct bearing on the war put the notice "We are permitted by the Ministry of Information to publish the following about the war." That would at least let the public know that what we are getting is what it is, official information, not items of news independently gathered.

But as we have announced that the Ministry of Information controls the war news, without asking the permission of the Ministry of Information to say so, we are wondering whether that may not in itself be an offence. The Lord (Macmillan) only knows.

Meanwhile we can assure anyone who wishes to advertise that one's wife has given birth to a baby, that this fact may give information to Goering that the British population has added to its numbers. Another item of dangerous information might be for one person to send to another—on a postcard—that his, or her son, has been called up for the army. That will fall into line with the advice given over the wireless that we should never mention anything about the war to anyone with whom we happen to be talking. If for no other reason, to be careful in these matters will keep the people sufficiently fearful, and when people are fearful much may be done with them.

The *Catholic Herald* in its issue for September 22 throws some light on the question that religious people may well ask "Why does God permit such things as the massacre of the Polish people by the German gangsters?" In a leading article the *Catholic Herald* explains:—

Such happenings, such apparent triumphs of evil, are permitted by Almighty God, not only as a punishment for sin, but also to provide the opportunity for repentance and reform.

That is quite clear. When a Polish mother sees her child bombed or watches another being slaughtered by the Germans, God is permitting it to give those who do the slaughtering an opportunity for repentance and salvation. We hope this will be quite satisfactory to all, we know it will be to Roman Catholics. To others the sheer bestiality of it is almost as bad as the German slaughter.

But it is well to bear in mind that this is actually one of the oldest of Christian teachings. It was common with many of the early Christian sects who held that men had to sin in order to be saved, and that once saved what was sinful in others was holiness with them. And there was the famous statement of Martin Luther, "Sin, and sin mightily, but have all the more faith in Jesus who saveth all sinners." We may add the view of the school represented by the famous Spurgeon that, fifty years of sin could be wiped out by the mere belief in Jesus Christ. The *Catholic Herald* simply puts into plain language a teaching of which to-day many so-called Christians are heartily ashamed.

Another gem in the same issue is from the pen of that muddled individual, Mr. Arnold Lunn. He writes that some people cannot see any difference between Mussolini and Hitler. Mr. Lunn points out the differences between

the two. German Fascism is a revolt against Christian civilization; the founder of Italian Fascism "has a profound respect for the culture of Christian Italy." Mussolini, he goes on to say,

is probably a sceptic, but a Catholic sceptic who believes that the difficulties of Atheism are greater than those of Catholicism. I have heard on good authority that he has been seen at Mass quite frequently during the crisis. He was the architect of the Lateran treaty, and he restored to the schools the crucifix which democratic Italy had removed.

It does not matter, for example, that Mussolini connived at the murder of his opponents, as Hitler did, that Mussolini treated the Abyssinian women and children as Hitler has treated the women and children of Poland, that Mussolini set the example to Hitler of imprisoning wives because their husbands would not return to be tortured and killed. The important difference, according to Mr. Lunn, is that Mussolini goes to Church, made a treaty with the Pope, and placed the crucifix back in the schools. Really, if we were editor of a Roman Catholic paper in a Protestant country, we don't think we should care to have Mr. Lunn as an advocate. Poor, muddled Mr. Lunn!

We think the Bishop of Birmingham has a good appreciation of the equality of the clergy when he advises, as reported in the *Birmingham Post*, "Preach as little as possible, Pray as much as you can." That is certainly the line of safety, but it is very old. The inquisitive reader will find it in one of Lucian's Dialogues, where he makes Zeus say to one of his defenders "Don't reason or you will be as dumb as a fish." Except for the worse the clergy do not alter much from generation to generation.

Dean Matthews cheers himself up, even though it may not be a cause of rejoicing to others, by "England still believes in God." At present he appears to believe much more in a large army, and in an unlimited supply of ammunition. But probably Dean Matthews is looking at the situation from the professional point of view. Business as usual.

The issue of the *Listener* for the Second week of the war is admirably free from Religious Sermons and Talks. Considering the deluge of inane Religious Services every day over the Radio, we must pay the editor due praise for realizing that the public has reached saturation point in swallowing Dope of this sort. A Cambridge Church adds to our gaiety—if any—by announcing that

PRAYERS will be held
FOR PEACE
IN THIS CHURCH
every evening.

This frank admission of inside dissensions gives us hope that the quarrels will be "prayed away."

Mr. H. G. Wells recently expressed surprise that a man of Mr. Hilaire Belloc's intelligence could believe in such a religion as Roman Catholicism. Mr. Belloc replies and says, "I follow the Divine Mysteries. I worship the Real Presence of my Redeemer." The question put by Mr. Wells was at least intelligible. The reply of Mr. Belloc is sheer nonsense. But it throws some light on the situation. Mr. Belloc explains a ridiculous belief with an undisguised absurdity. The circle is complete. He holds a ridiculous belief because it is absurd. Mr. Wells ought to know better than to have expected a reasonable answer. But perhaps he didn't.

The Cistercian monks of Mount St. Bernard's Abbey, have sacrificed their beards in order effectively to wear their gas-masks. Would it not have been effective for them to have covered their faces with an order blessed by the Pope? What opportunities for a miracle the Christians are missing in this war!

The Bishop of Lichfield thinks it is not the business of the clergy to take part in combatant service during the war. He thinks the clergy by training and experience may give a special contribution to the war. Well, we are neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but we know what that special contribution will be. If we are successful we must thank God and praise him for his favours. If or when we are unsuccessful, we must humble ourselves before God, praise him for what favours he may shower on us, and go on praising God—and supporting his ministers. In any case keep on praising God, because that will mean keeping or supporting his ministers. Once more, heads the clergy win, tails the laity lose.

There does not seem much difference in the way the clergy behave in different countries. In England the worshippers go to Church with their gas masks, and many churches are protected just as though they were places in which the "protecting arms of God" was a phrase never heard. In Germany the Bishops tell their subordinates that:—

The Holy Eucharist can only be adequately protected in a wrought steel tabernacle. The sacred Host must be protected by a metal cover or wrapped-up in cellophane; both the Host and the Holy Oil must be similarly protected against poisonous gas.

It appears to our carnal mind that there is not much difference in protecting these "holy" objects and protecting pin or billiard tables. And what has become of "The Lord who guards his Own?"

We are pleased to note that some of the American Radio Stations, not being closely associated with the U. S. Government, are insisting that it is not merely Hitler the world wishes to get rid of but the 'ism behind it. We have already emphasized that fact, and hope it will be borne in mind. When it suits the plans of Goering he will get rid of Hitler—if someone does not get rid of both Hitler and Goering.

Those people in this country who were giving open—and those who were giving concealed—support to Hitlerism, in the hope that he would check the growth of Socialism or Communism nearer home, and who did what they could, with only too great success, to prevent an alliance between this country and Russia, must now be feeling queer on finding their idol joining hands with Stalin. The function of Germany as a buffer State between ourselves and Russia is not quite so attractive a picture as it was.

We have mentioned several times the shameless puffing that goes on in the press regarding certain writers. One writer puffs another, in return for puffs of himself, and the editorial comes in with fulsome praise of this man or that because he has been engaged to write a weekly article. But the most impudent of all is one in the *Sunday Chronicle* for October 1. Mr. Beverley Nichols it announces has written a new book—not exactly a world-surprising affair—at least in present circumstances. The writer—he has at least the grace not to sign his name—asks how Mr. Nichols manages to write a book nearly every year, when "His work in the *Sunday Chronicle* always looks like a good week's work." The mentality of this work is such that it could be written by anyone able to write English good enough to write for any local paper in the kingdom. The length is about that of an ordinary *Freethinker* article. And the man who could not write something of that length, and of that material, any morning before breakfast ought never to lift a pen. "A good week's work." Ye gods!

Of that ridiculously managed "Ministry of Information," the *Observer* says plainly that 999 has been recruited from "the proteges of official persons. Their qualifications may be judged by the sequel." If Parliament—not the Cabinet—cannot remedy this state of things, then it may as well close the House of Commons until the war is over.

Extract from *News Review*, September 21, 1939, P. 35:—

Repudiate the idea that Hitlerism can be conquered by force. Evil political systems can only be destroyed by moral victories. It is not Christian, nor even religious, to say that force must be met with force.—Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham.

The policy proclaimed by the German Fuehrer must be resisted and overcome. It is based on force. It must be met by counter-force.—Archbishop of Canterbury.

Differences of opinion among us poor Freethinkers are inevitable. But both these Bishops were called by God to act as interpreters of his will. God should really be more careful when he is selecting his official representatives on earth. Silly in their utterances his agents may be, but he ought at least to endow them with the same kind of silliness.

In these days of stress when so many people have not learned the lesson that the only successful way to face a serious situation is with a smile, one ought almost to thank the clergy for still being with us. Apart from the spectacle of parsons advising people to go to Church carrying gas-masks, and entering the house of God through a barricade of sand-bags, the individual comments of the parsonry still threaten the supremacy of the Marx brothers. An example of this is the following from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Detroit, U.S.A.:—

We have so completely depended upon women and the home to keep flowing the springs of morality and virtue that we have built up a national system of education which excludes the teaching of religion and kindred subjects.

That perhaps is why the Church taught, and still teaches by implication, if not in set words, the superiority of the celibate life. Of course it may be that the Church would say in defence that the official celibacy of the priesthood did not seriously affect the number of children brought into the world. But in reply to that we may point out that in heaven there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage. Old maids and confirmed bachelors make up the heavenly host.

The Bishop says:—

I put it to you whether you have any right to expect, in any orderly universe, that mankind should be prevented from reaping what mankind has sown; the Gospel has something to say about judgment.

But mankind does not plan a scheme which will punish so many innocent men, women and children, and permit so many of those responsible to escape unhurt. Were all the women and children who were machine-gunned by order of Goering and Co. really responsible for what had occurred? It is *men*—individual men—who commit the wrong, and it is the poor semi-dumb portion of *mankind* that largely reaps the consequences. The indictment of the Christian God by common sense and humanity is that he is too damned promiscuous. If some people displease him he at once runs amuck and lets go at everyone he can reach. That is if the Christian God exists. So let's hope he doesn't. *Mankind* has enough troubles without having anything like the Christian deity to put up with in addition.

Fifty Years Ago

THAT Christianity "overspread the mightiest empire in the world" is undoubtedly true. It had converts in all parts of the Roman empire. But they scarcely numbered a twentieth of the population when it was made the State religion by Constantine. From that moment, it was not persuasion that made converts, but wholesale bribery and persecution. Proscription, fine, imprisonment, and murder, were the agencies by which the triumph of Christianity was completely secured.

You assert that Christianity is "now spreading to the ends of the earth." I deny it. The Christian populations outside Europe are descended from European emigrants. The extension is merely physical. What impression have you made on the heathen populations of Asia and Africa? Is not the failure of your missions a byword?

The Freethinker, October 6, 1889

To get a New Subscriber is to make a New Friend

FOR THE "FREETHINKER"

It is nearly twelve years since I last asked the friends of the *Freethinker* for financial support. The response was prompt and generous—more generous than any similar appeal had ever been in the history of the Freethought movement. I had hoped that this would have been the last of such appeals. The sum raised for the *Freethinker* Endowment Trust was by investment enough to meet the annual loss within about sixty pounds, but I hoped to meet this deficit by other methods. I was never quite successful, and there has been created a cumulative deficit. After some years other difficulties manifested themselves. Nearly half the investments which up to then had been yielding five and five and a half per cent were repaid, and re-investment at that rate could not be found. Then came a slow but steady rise in prices all round. The price of paper increased gradually, before the new war began it was just over a third dearer. A renewal of the lease of the *Freethinker* offices involved a further expenditure in rent. Then came a rise in wages in the shape of a decrease in the hours of labour, and that meant an all-round increase in the cost of printing. One way and another, in spite of all that could be done the total deficit now amounts to about £250 per year. And now we have a war with us, the result of which it is not easy to forecast. Paper may rise to famine price—in the last war it rose to six times the pre-war price.

In these circumstances I am obliged to ask the help of our friends, and I make this appeal with all confidence as to the result.

A few weeks ago I achieved my Jubilee on the Freethought platform. The last Annual Conference of the National Secular Society, in view of that approaching fact, passed a resolution congratulating me on my record, and instructed the Executive to give that vote practical shape. I told the Conference that I should decline the presentation indicated, although I would value some slight souvenir of a record that I had never before been registered in the history of Freethought. A sub-committee of the Executive submitted a plan which again suggested a presentation, but again I declined, with the qualification I have already stated.

Now I withdraw that refusal. But I wish the presentation to take the form I desire. I am asking all my friends to do what they can to meet the situation I have outlined, and to do so in a way that will make any further appeal unnecessary for at least some years. My first concern is the *Freethinker*, and I shall take a generous response to this appeal as a testimonial to what I have been able to do for our great cause. It is the only one I desire, and whatever results I shall count it as, at least partly, a presentation to myself. But remember there are arrears to be cleared, and a security to be achieved.

But I do not wish anyone to subscribe in a panic. The *Freethinker* will continue. I am asking only that the burden of maintenance shall be spread over as wide an area as possible, and when so distributed the load will be oppressive to none.

Some two years ago Mr. Hilaire Belloc, in his *The Crisis of Our Civilization*, drew up a plan for a new Roman Catholic weekly. He calculated it would

need an annual subsidy of £3,000. I wonder what he would have wanted to run the *Freethinker*, without an advertising income, with a persistent boycott and against a campaign of misrepresentation!

I think, I ought to say, to avoid all misunderstanding, that the increased expense of production is not due to any extra claims I have made on the paper. My salary for managing, writing, and editing is as it began—three guineas weekly—when it is there. When it is not I am the only one who must go without. The wages of a compositor is five guineas weekly.

With regard to war-troubles that have arisen, and may come from the war, including a paper shortage and a rise in price, I have made plans to meet these, and I hope to overcome them as I overcame them in the last war. During that period the *Freethinker* was one of the very few papers in this country that neither increased its price nor decreased its size, and it came out of the war stronger than it went into it. When peace comes this time I hope to find the *Freethinker* stronger, not weaker. If it is stronger, in its humble way, it will be a good sign for the future of all.

I know this is a very bad time to appeal for financial help, but I am also certain that this is not the least worthy cause for which help is asked.

One final word. I have never encouraged long-standing appeals, and I hope this will be as short as others have been. All subscriptions will be acknowledged in the *Freethinker*, and the accounts of that paper are, as they have always been, in the hands of a chartered accountant. The first list of subscriptions will appear in our issue for October 15.

CHAPMAN COHEN

Twenty Five Years Ago

Less than five years ago the Clericals in Spain murdered Ferrer, the Rationalist founder of the *Escuela Moderna*, in the sombre trenches of Montjuich, but they have not yet succeeded in burying him. The blood of Ferrer chokes the gloomy and morose Maura, and his name, with that of the odious la Cierva, his accomplice in the crime, is to-day, and has been ever since the fateful October 18, 1909, pursued with infamy not only in Spain but throughout the civilized world.

The monument in Brussels, erected to the memory of Ferrer, is more than a tribute in stone and bronze to a brave man; it is also reminiscent of the martyrdom which Freethought and its heroes, teachers, and apostles have had to suffer throughout the ages at the hands of bigots, and a reminder of the martyrdom which may in future be inflicted upon Freethinkers if and whenever reaction raises its head as of yore. To the bigots this memorial is an eyesore; and standing as it does in face of the church of St. Catherine, it is a perpetual reminder to the world of the natural ferocity of religion in any country and under any regime in which, as in Spain during the Clericalist reign of terror in 1909, it may have the power to act with impunity in repression of Freethought. It is because Ferrer symbolized in his death not only the meanness and cruelty of Christianity, but the dignity and fortitude of the Rationalist ideal, that he so powerfully gripped the imagination and sympathy of the whole civilized world; and thus his name became the more hated by the obscurantists of all creeds precisely because the world-wide manifestations of sympathy which his assassination evoked revealed to the astonished soul of the priests and the priestly-minded the depth and unanimity of the world's repugnance for their chosen methods of brutal repression.

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We regret to have to correct an error in the letter by Lady Maud Simon in last week's issue. "To defend Leonidas" should read "defend with Leonidas," and "for at the pass," read "the pass."

S. WINKWORTH.—Many thanks for addresses; papers have been sent.

S. JONES.—Sir Richard Burton was an Atheist and called himself such. There is no truth in his dying a Christian. His wife was a Roman Catholic, very superstitious and comparatively ignorant. We may tell the story of his death when we have half an hour to spare, but at present we are terribly busy. We have a score of things that demand attention, and new questions are constantly rising.

L. CHEETHAM.—Much obliged for your thoughtfulness and good wishes.

R.L.—The answer to your question will be found in the special article in this issue. It will be a hard struggle, but we have every confidence in the loyalty of our readers.

J. S. HAXELTINE AND W. J. NEILD.—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.

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

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

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

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

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.

Sugar Plums

Pressure on time and space prevented our noting the loss to the scientific world by the death of Dr. Sigmund Freud, and now we can afford just a note, mainly to say that if nothing intervenes, an article on Freud will appear next week. For the moment we wish to pay our mite of tribute to the work of a man who deserves to stand side by side with Darwin. He has become at least a lawgiver in psychology, and the first man to unflinchingly apply the principle of Determinism to the whole field of mental phenomena. The questions that have been raised concerning the validity of his speculations, and to some of his interpretations do nothing to weaken in the slightest degree what has been said. Only the incompetent could, after studying Freud's work, decide otherwise. The death of Freud, while an exile in England, is indicative of the decay of that veneration for learning that Germany once manifested, and which it may again show when the present criminal gang meets with the fate from which even their British supporters will not be able to save them.

On the evening of October 2 we listened to one of the best broadcasts given since the war opened. And it was

by the Archbishop of York. It stood out well against the smug speeches of his brother Archbishop of Canterbury, and with the exception of the dash of "Christian" fatuities towards the end, was admirable in substance and delivery. Several weeks ago we said that the one thing the Allies should make quite plain is that the gangsters—Hitler and his criminal companions, should be plainly and deliberately outlawed. This was endorsed by Dr. Temple. We can win, he said, but only if two conditions are made quite clear:—

No terms with Herr Hitler or his Government. . . .
When the fighting stops the terms of peace shall be drawn by a true congress of nations in which Germany, freed from the Nazi tyrants shall take her place among the rest, but in which Czechs and Poles shall have a first claim to consideration.

We are pleased to see our suggestions endorsed by the Archbishop of York.

We must beware of other things. There is a peace plan in the air—we are writing on October 3—and even if that is rejected the "readiness of Hitler to make peace" will be with us. And when the war is almost over those friends of Fascism in this country will resume their underground and overground activities. We must be on our guard as much against sabotaging the peace as we are firm in carrying on the war. The last, and fatal, move for us would be to leave Fascism in power.

We know we shall have the peace at any price soon at work so soon as it promises to be at all effective. We shall also hear of it in the disguised form of saving the lives of so many young men, etc. But the issue, as in the "peace or war" slogan used just before Munich and onward, is almost criminally misleading. No one but a Fascist would hesitate a moment if the issue was to lose or save the lives of the young men upon whom will fall the actual fighting. The actual issue, the moral issue, the social issue, would be in the situation named, that of risking the lives of our young people now, or preserving them at the cost of living under conditions that would make life intolerable to all courageous and decent-minded men and women. We think the Archbishop's speech should be reprinted and circulated as a leaflet. We could all forget the Christian verbiage in reading the rest.

In his weekly article in *Reynolds* of a recent date, Mr. Hamilton Fyfe wrote:—

There is not so much claptrap about Providence this time as there was 21 years ago. Then the Kaiser was invoking the aid of "our old German god," and we were assuming blandly that our Almighty approved of us. It reminded me of the Israelites and the tribes they warred against in the Old Testament, each calling on the local deity for assistance. As Sir John Squire put it in deathless doggerel,

God heard the embattled nations shout,
"God strafe England" and "God Save the King."
God this, God that, and God the other thing,
"Good God!" said God, "I've got my work cut out."

A happy reminder, Mr. Fyfe; but why, oh why, could you not also have used the right word *God* instead of that "claptrap" "*Providence*?"

Clapham Guide, Edited by J. R. Battley, L.C.C., F.R.S.A., and published by The Westminster City Publishing Co., Ltd., 94 Clapham Park Road, contains over 350 pages of useful and interesting local information, including illustrations, maps and a street guide. There is a full-page notice of the National Secular Society on page 254. Published at sixpence, *Clapham Guide* should be in every local household.

The North London Branch N.S.S. had to endure a disappointment last Sunday evening when a lecture was substituted for a debate. Mr. T. H. Ilstob is the speaker this evening (October 8), and his subject, "Man's War—against God's Insects," promises to be very interesting. The speaker's name is a guarantee of his ap-

pearance, and the hall, Cricketers Arms, Inverness Street, Camden Town, N.W.1, should be well filled. The lecture begins at 7.30 p.m.

We can't have war without paying for it—that much is certain. And so far we have to submit with as good grace as possible to the heavy demands made upon us all. But we note that the Government has left one class of people alone. We refer to the ducal and other tax-dodgers who by turning themselves into limited companies deprive the exchequer of many millions. Some time back, when pressed, Sir John Simon said he would bear these in mind. That is as far as he has got. If an Act cannot make its application retrospective, and there are objections to retrospective legislation, I think an Act should be passed making every estate that has been turned into a limited company liable to Death and other Duties on the value of the estate at the date of the formation of the company.

We have to remember that these companies have no other object save that of dodging payments which small estates cannot avoid. The owner of the estate appoints his heirs as directors, and keeps a hold on them while he is alive, and so still enjoys the income of his possessions. It is the clearest case of tax-dodging in existence. And to-day it is a crying scandal that these Dukes serve as a shield to protect many others. If Sir John Simon has the courage to swoop down on the poor person's pound of sugar, is it not time we had a Chancellor who would dare the anger of some of our aristocracy?

The West London Branch asks us to announce that owing to circumstances arising out of the present conditions of war the meetings which were to have been held at the Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, are cancelled. Outdoor meetings continue in Hyde Park every Sunday, commencing at 12 until 6 o'clock. Weekday meetings have been discontinued.

The Juvenile Delinquent

THE causation and cure of juvenile transgression have long exercised the minds of psychologists and penal reformers. That criminal tendencies are inborn is a doctrine that has been earnestly advocated by Lombroso and other criminologists, while later investigators tend to trace youthful delinquencies almost exclusively to environmental agencies. But, presumably both evil heredity and unfavourable surroundings frequently conspire to engender the juvenile misdemeanant. As a result of painstaking researches among youthful offenders, Dr. Cyril Burt concludes that it is imperative to ascertain, so far as is possible, the influences in operation prior to the child's birth. Not only is the child's parentage to be determined, but that of earlier ancestors as well. In this way, the hereditary tendencies transmitted by pathological parents to their offspring may be in some measure gauged.

Those who are convinced that unsocial citizens are the product purely of unsavoury surroundings aspire to eliminate the wrong-doer by paying higher wages, supplying improved habitations, sweeping the slums away and closing the poor man's refuge—the public house. If it were possible to eliminate misconduct in this facile manner the problem might soon cease to exist. But, as Dr. Burt states in his invaluable monograph: *The Young Delinquent* (University of London Press): "To the biologist, on the other hand, heredity is no mere hypothesis but a scientific fact—a verified phenomenon with which he is far better acquainted than he is with the alleys of Euston or the dens by Limehouse Docks. . . . Yet the two views are not incompatible; they are complementary.

Heredity and environment may each do their sinister share. And an equal attention to either aspect, with an impartial balancing of the respective points in evidence becomes the first essential to a scientific survey."

Diverse are the definitions of drunkenness, but in cases of chronic intemperance the judicial inquirer may count on not more than 8 per cent among the delinquent group, while 3 per cent of inebriate families in the same poor economic circumstances are law-abiding. The perplexities encountered by the investigators are legion. But perhaps it is safest to proceed on the plan adopted by Burt, in which domestic conditions were first studied, and then the temptations of the street, school, and later occupational surroundings.

Poverty is certainly an incentive to crime, yet the truth remains that many families living in the most overcrowded and insanitary conditions, in the presence of abject privation, still remain honest in the eyes of the law. Yet, taking as his standard the poverty-line as defined by Charles Booth in his monumental study, *Life and Labour in London*, Burt estimated that in cases where full particulars were available 16 per cent of his delinquent instances concerned children denied the barest necessities of subsistence. Of these he reports that a large majority were accused of theft. "In households below the poverty-line as many as 81 per cent of these offences belonged to this category; in households above the poverty-line only 63 per cent." In fine, more than half the delinquencies occur in families that are indigent or completely poverty-stricken, which plainly suggests that abject penury is a constant stimulus to wrong-doing.

Yet, even if delinquency appears disproportionate in extent among the more impoverished section of the community, nearly half the juvenile misdemeanants are members of families well above poverty-line destitution. Therefore poverty cannot be the sole cause of offences. Despite the evil reputation of Hoxton as a criminal centre, Finsbury's record in 1922 was even blacker. Of the numerous Shoreditch cases studied: "A large proportion, larger than anywhere else in the county of London, belong to families whose only trade is crime—coiners, burglars, housebreakers and pickpockets. It is a region made familiar in *Oliver Twist*, and the first impression the visitor receives is still very much the same as Oliver's."

Despite recent improvements Clerkenwell and St. Luke's remain the haunts of the professional malefactor and another black patch defaces the slums of Marylebone and St. Pancras, while areas in Haggerston and Islington are not spotless. The East End has many squalid regions and south of the river chronic poverty and youthful depravity are constant companions. Still, save in Southwark and its environs, the sum of delinquency seldom or never approaches that found north of the Thames.

As their superior standing suggests, the residential districts such as Hampstead, Stoke Newington, Lewisham and Wandsworth are practically free from juvenile delinquency. But while the poverty-ridden areas of London furnish a high proportion of offenders there are noteworthy exceptions. Still, it is indisputable that "it is in the poor, overcrowded, insanitary households, where families are huge, where the children are dependent wholly on the State for their education, and where the parents are largely dependent on charity and relief for their own maintenance, that juvenile delinquency is most rife."

Not only in poverty-haunted and ill-disciplined households is delinquency fostered, but it is encouraged outside by that evil acquaintanceship which corrupts good manners. Such malign influences may be exerted in the school or street, while the boys who as-

sociate in transgression seem more numerous than girls. In some cases the pernicious counsel of adults will lead to youthful malpractices of many descriptions. Receivers of stolen property and Fagins are now said to be comparatively rare, but other evils persist. As Burt points out: "A presentable maid from the provinces, tired of domestic service, can find all too easily an older woman who will initiate her into various malpractices, who will point out West-End streets and Soho restaurants safe for such uses, who will tell her (with much inexactitude) how to avoid the three great plagues of an irregular life, and from what shops and markets she can most safely pilfer when 'business is bad'; and such a woman after a little initial liberality—the loan of a fur or the offer of smart shoes—will look more or less openly for some material return."

Often it appears the pilfering habit is initiated by the thoughtless prodigality of friends and relatives who provide the young with pleasures unobtainable in normal circumstances. When the innocently indulgent companion departs, the juveniles' cravings for excitement and amusement can only be gratified by petty theft. The pretty child's silent appeal may secure a visit to the cinema, a small coin, or a gift of sweets. As she progresses similar arts may win presents from youths with a little money and careful inquiries show that this may readily lead "to soliciting with dumb demureness the passing stranger in the street."

Incorrigible as certain children may appear, many are open to amendment. One striking instance may be cited. A diminutive boy of seven was so attractive in appearance that people exclaimed: "What an angel!" At one time he was the spoilt darling of his family, but he soon grew so exasperating in his requirements that all who knew him lost patience. In the infant's school he was at first the pet of the class, but after a day or two everyone's chief aversion. So the boy soon tried his wiles on strangers, and as he resided near a well-to-do district, he was able to exploit the sentiments of sympathetic ladies, who gave him money. When he had lost his way he constantly contrived on some artful pretext or other to give his kindly guide the slip and quickly vanish from sight in some alley or other. He learnt to relate heartrending stories of cruel or penniless parents, or of his sad orphan state. His apparent artlessness secured the acceptance of his most romantic tales. His good looks and seeming innocence made his impositions so successful that the little rascal was even entertained for a day or two in a sympathiser's home, and at the very least he was almost certain to obtain gifts of sweets and coins to spend.

At the age of eight "Johnny" had developed into a proficient professional beggar. But, notes his biographer, "His tale of the derelict orphan was related once too often. It brought him at last to the place to which lost boys are usually conducted—the police station. Here he was tipped and regaled by the good natured police officers, who gave him a kitten to play with (a tribute to his successful imposture, which he afterwards related with much gusto); and was retained until telephone inquiries from another station revealed that his true character and his real home circumstances were quite other than had been assumed." Johnny was then sent to a strict but humanely conducted country institution, where the inmates were made fully aware of the knave's real character. In contact with normal children of his own age he soon attained the average stature of his years, lost his seraphic appearance, and acquired an abiding interest in natural history and athletics. These improvements continued when he returned home, let us trust, a repentant sinner.

The cinema's evil influences seem overrated, but betting and gambling apparently lead to more serious results, whose extent is difficult to assess. In one London school, however, in a class of boys under eleven, 19 backed horses for the Derby and other races: some making bets several times each week. These venturers are rare among girls, although comparatively common among female adolescents. The statistics are precarious, but Burt's studies indicated that with boys above school age of delinquent character, "43 per cent were habitually engaged in gambling or betting; among those still at school only 8 per cent."

These diversions, which pervade the entire community from dukes to dustmen, seem more rife than ever. But possibly their more pernicious forms are most prevalent in slum areas. In districts where cul-de-sac and other retreats abound every advantage is taken of the facilities afforded for practising these arts. Certain densely populated working-class districts "seem infested by street book-makers, whose methods are amazingly well organized. In some parts many small shopkeepers . . . are known to their customers as book-makers' agents; and their ostensible business is little more than a cloak for a betting office. The influence of such facilities to the youths who live near by is always harmful."

Truancy, unemployment, uncongenial occupations are among the factors that conduce to misconduct. But the theory of congenital criminality, and that criminals constitute an easily recognizable type has, in Burt's opinion, received its death-blow. Possibly, degenerate types may be more common on the Continent, but it is urged that Dr. Goring's prolonged researches embracing 3,000 adult convicts in British prisons compelled him to conclude that "there is no such thing as a criminal class differentiated by abnormal physique." Still, "English criminals are markedly differentiated from the general population in stature and body weight." This, he asserts, is the only anomaly in the prison population, while youthful delinquents are frequently below the average in height, weight and bodily development. Yet some juvenile offenders are robust enough, and their violence is facilitated by this fact, while the weakly child is sadly handicapped in the struggle for existence when it is compelled to compete in the workaday world with stronger children. A problem so complex is soluble by science alone, if solution be possible.

T. F. PALMER

Spiders and Flies

DURING part of the war (1914-1918) I was engaged by the War Office on a Military Camp in North Wales. My office was in a wooden cabin with one window in front of my desk. In the left-hand corner (low) of this was a spider's web. The cabin was cleaned each morning, but I had given instruction for this web to remain unmolested. There was excuse I argued, in spite of or because of war exigencies, for a little personal relaxation in the way of nature study. The attendant whose duty it was to keep the place spick and span no doubt regarded the order as a proof of feeble-mindedness. Henri Fabre gave many such proofs, if proofs they be. With this protective thought I faced the pitying smile (which Huxley once admitted it was difficult even for a philosopher altogether to disdain) and determined to regard my web as a war-time luxury which I had deserved by hard work in some other respects.

One day I witnessed what I had long wished to observe: a declaration of war between a predatory spider

and the rightful occupant of the web. The latter had left his nest a few inches only, and in front of him (about three quarters of an inch away) was the invader. They stood motionless face to face, each evidently afraid to take up any other posture. Nothing happened for about a couple of hours when I had, most reluctantly, to leave the office for a mid-day meal. When I returned the postures had not altered, though I noticed there had exuded from the body of the owner of the web (spider Number One) a tiny globule of liquid matter, the significance of which I did not and do not know.

It struck me that I might learn something by creating a diversion. I caught a fly and threw it gently into a well-woven part of the web about four inches from the combatants. The legs of each spider quivered registering their awareness of the fact, but never for a moment did they relax their face to face posture. The fly struggled to free itself, but without the slightest effect. I was writing intermittently during these observations, but happening to glance up at the window-pane I became aware of another happening. I saw a third spider (similar to the predator type then engaged in combat) come from the Right Hand corner (high) of the window and move speedily and in practically a straight diagonal line to the scene of conflict, *some 4 or 5 feet away*. It was apparent that it knew what was going on in that battlefield even at that distance apart. How much it knew one cannot tell. One will never be able to enter into the subjective life of another living object, but circumstances seemed plainly to point to the fact that it knew not only of the existence of a free meal, but also the fact of a mortal combat being waged.

Its first action on reaching the web was to go near, but not too near, the fly. One can imagine that it noticed it would make a good meal and was also sufficiently entangled. Its next movement was surprising. It advanced to the scene of battle to a point which (taking the other two spiders as the base) would have formed the apex of an isosceles triangle of sides about two inches long, and then ostentatiously made its presence felt to the other two spiders by oscillating some of the threads of the web. Neither of these spiders could afford to relax their position; they certainly did not do so. I speak with due scientific reserve, but it certainly looked as if Spider Number Three had (speaking now with non-scientific freedom) got the combatants taped. After making its gesture of contempt (or sardonic humour) it then approached the fly, despatched it, wrapped it up and carried it immediately off to a spot underneath the window-ledge, well-clear of the web, and commenced its meal. Spider Number Three disappears now from this narrative; whether his methods of warfare paid him *in the long run*, one shall never know.

The war of patience between the original combatants still continued. Immobility was the only tactic, and one assumed that it would only be a question of stamina that would decide the battle. Weakness was likely to show itself sooner or later in one or the other. In the interests of science (so I persuaded myself—I hope rightly—) I inserted another fly in a part of the web near to where the first fly had been placed. There was no visible effect made on the spiders, although the buzzing of the fly was dislocating the web to some extent. But the fly remained a prisoner.

It was now time to leave for the day, but I had made up my mind to stay an hour or two extra for purposes of observation. The only change noticeable from the position first taken up by the fighters was that the small globule on the body of the owner of the web, Spider Number One, was by now increased in size. When I noticed the slightest of movements in this spider. It was the beginning of a series of tiny back-

ward steps towards its nest, its eyes still rigidly fixed upon its opponent's. The predator never moved. Moving a little more freely as the distance increased, the owner of the web reached its nest, although its head and fore-legs still were plainly visible outside. Some minutes elapsed. Then Spider Number Two (the predator) cautiously moved backwards also, and (in his case) nearer the fly. He then approached the fly, and, very cautiously, and so far as possible with its eyes towards the nest, poisoned the fly, dislodged it from its threads and wrapped it up. Spider Number One all this time laid low and did nuffin. Then Spider Number Two took the fly in its mandibles and prepared to leave the web. It was at this point that there was a *lightning* dash from Spider Number One. Spider Number Two, it is particularly interesting to note, did *not* drop the fly. Spider Number One made some quick gyrations around Spider Number Two, Spider Number Two trying but clumsily, owing to its being hampered by the fly, to protect its rear. In a very few seconds (and again to my surprise, for I had seen no blow struck), Spider Number One retired to its den. It looked as if the operation had been concluded to its satisfaction. It was right, for in less than half-a-minute Spider Number Two began to quiver and then violently shake, and in a very short space of time, it was hanging, apparently lifeless, to a thread. I remembered then that I had seen many spiders hanging thus from spider's webs, and now realized that I knew the meaning of this phenomenon.

I am not much of a naturalist, and I was less than twenty-five years ago. But the vividness of those observations made in very unscientific surroundings has never left me. Many times have I longed to meet the entomologists who could tell me of the types of spiders I then observed, and to hear their comments upon my observations. It is possible that what I say is but a common-place to scientific observers. But I have not met with any similar account in volumes from men like Fabre, Dallinger and others, and I have read many. It is indeed possible that there may be something of value in the observations here recorded. I can only regret that I was an untrained observer, and that what I have *omitted* to record may negative or lessen any value these notes possess.

O yes, I am painfully conscious that ingenious parallels can be drawn from what I have written, and applications can be made to human life here and now. As an essay I feel I could have made rather a good thing of it by pressing these parallels into my service. The reason I do not do so is that by so doing I would prejudice the value of these notes as a simple factual relation.

T. H. ELSTON

Correspondence

CURRENCY AND WHEAT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—A printer's error has unfortunately resulted in making nonsense of the first sentence in my letter on this subject in your issue for October 1. This sentence should have read as follows: "Mr. Kensett still labours under the confusion between currency (intrinsically valueless symbols of wealth) and currency backing (intrinsically valuable commodities which constitute wealth)."

I might add that Mr. Kensett is not the only one who labours under this confusion—a confusion due to careless thinking, in some cases, and to careless terminology in others. I have heard people, who should know better, refer to gold as "currency backing." If gold is withdrawn from use, amongst the public, it may perhaps be regarded as "backing" for the currency in use, but it still remains a form of *currency* for use between nations who agree to regard it as such. It can never, by any stretch of the imagination, nor by any legal enactment,

be turned into what must forever remain *true currency backing*, namely, wealth in the form of intrinsically valuable commodities which humanity demands for its existence.

C. S. FRASER

THE IDLE HOUR

SIR,—During the last few tragic weeks we have had through the Press and the B.B.C. recommendations concerning suitable reading for the long dark nights of those troublous times which are indeed, or will be, "the times that try mens' souls" to quote Paine's expressive phrase. Shakespeare, Tolstoy, Romance, and Fairy Tales and many others have been suggested. Very good, of course, and every man to his taste. Also, of course, carefully selected passages from the Christian Bible. "Careful selection" is I should say very advisable! I have not, however, noticed any recommendation of philosophical works which seems to me very strange. We shall, I venture to believe, need all the philosophy we can call up in the times to come. In war time there is inevitably a considerable amount of what I would call organized inactivity. Watching and waiting without the opportunity of physical activity. Hence the advisability of a suitable diversion and what better than reading? Well, yes, perhaps chess, but this needs an accomplice! Literature is the never-failing resort. I venture therefore to give this my best "tip" to all the members of the N.S.S., and to others too of course.

Last week-end I found myself without a new book. On my shelves there is Shaw, Wells, Hardy and quite a few others, but I know them so well that they did not appeal, then suddenly I espied some volumes of *Essays in Freethinking*, by Chapman Cohen. But these too I had already read and digested. At least I thought I had. Nevertheless, I took up the Fourth Series and found them as fresh and freshening as ever. And hence this my very earnest recommendation to my fellow members of the N.S.S. and to all and sundry. Never mind about having read them before. They will astonish and delight. What they did to me they will do to you—tickle, touch and teach!

And let me furthermore make this confession: I was disconcerted at the amount of good things that I had forgotten in them! You will be the same! Finally, whilst on A.R.P. duty, and waiting for the call that has not as yet come, I found Bertrand Russell's *Sceptical Essays*, *The Scientific Method*, and *In Praise of Idleness* effective antidotes to the idle hour!

A. HANSON

Cathedral

AND why this ornate pile? These laboured chisellings?
The windows stained and fretted as if fearful
To admit the meagre light that falls within
On aisles sepulchral, cold, where priests
Ridiculously sad, with child-like chant and ritual absurd,

Invoke a mystic deity—

Some figment from the infancy of Thought—
Whose house this is.

Within these walls, behold creation's lord a crawling
sycophant!

Praying the mercy of a phantom god;
Without, a vicious mite preying upon its fellow;
Clinging, precarious, to the fragile shell of Earth—
Another mite—that from the everlasting flame
Breathes but an instant and is cold,
Adrift in icy voids, destined for what?

To wait the impact of another long-dead world?
To breathe the flame again?

To leave the steaming husk a stage for more experiments?
Cathedral! For all the truths thou hast revealed,
For all thy guidance through the night of Mind,
We rank thee;

Mightiest descendant of the totem-pole.
With all thy mummery and holy nooks,
Thy golden thingummies and sacred bric-a-brac.
We shamefully bequeath thee to posterity
A legacy of stone from out the pagan past.

WILLIAM MORGAN

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) : 6.0, A Lecture.
NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. White Stone Pond, Hampstead) : 11.30. Parliament Hill Fields, 3.30, Mr. L. Ebury.
WEST LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (Hyde Park) : 12 a.m. until 6 p.m. Various Speakers.

INDOOR

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N.S.S. (The Cricketers Arms, near Camden Town Tube Station) : 7.30, Mr. T. H. Elstob—"Man's War—Against God's Insects."

COUNTRY

INDOOR

BIRKENHEAD BRANCH N.S.S. (Beechcroft Settlement) : 7.0. A meeting will be held.

OUTDOOR

BIRKENHEAD BRANCH N.S.S. (Haymarket) : 7.0, Saturday, G. Thompson—A Lecture.

BLYTH (The Fountain) : 6.0, Monday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.
CHESTER-LE-STREET (The Bridge) : 11.0, Sunday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

NORTH SHIELDS (Harbour View) : 6.0, Tuesday, Mr. J. T. Brighton.

THOMAS PAINE

JOHN M. ROBERTSON

An Investigation of Sir Leslie Stephen's criticism of Paine's influence on religious and political reform. An indispensable work for all who are interested in Paine and his influence

SIXPENCE

Postage 1d

THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH

CHAPMAN COHEN

A critical examination of the belief in a future life, with a study of spiritualism

CLOTH 2s. 6d., postage 2½d.; PAPER 1s. 6d., postage 2d.

RELIGION AND SEX

CHAPMAN COHEN

Studies in the Pathology of religious development

Price 6s.

Postage 6d.

Realistic Aphorisms and Purple Patches

By ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.

320 pages.

Paper Covers 3/6.

Postage 4d.

(All Cloth copies sold).

HUMANITY AND WAR

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Forty pages, with cover. **THREEPENCE**, postage 1d. extra. This is a Freethinker's view of the whole subject of war, fearlessly and simply expressed. In order to assist in its circulation eight copies will be sent for Two Shillings postage paid. Terms for larger quantities on application.

Send at once for a Supply

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

PAGAN ELEMENTS IN CHRISTIANITY

H. CUTNER

A concise and scathing account of the debt
Christianity owes to Paganism, with a chapter
on Relics

Price Sixpence

Postage 1d.

MOTHER OF GOD

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Post Free

2½d.

THE MIRACLES OF ST. MARTIN

BY

C. CLAYTON DOYE

Price post free

7d.

Shakespeare & other Literary Essays

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Price 3s. 6d.

Postage 3d

TWO GREAT PIONEER FREETHINKERS

HENRY HETHERINGTON

(1792-1849)

Ambrose G. Barker

Price 6d.

By post 7d.

PETER ANNET—1693-1769

Ella Twynam

Price post free 2½d.

It may safely be said that only a small minority of present-day Freethinkers are acquainted with the lives of those men and women, to whom they, and the English speaking peoples owe so much. Annet and Hetherington bore aloft the flag of Freethought at a time when men had to face imprisonment for daring to question the claims of the Church. But these two men did more than that. They were among the founders of modern democracy in this country, and it is one of the disgraces of our history that their work has been so generally slurred over, when it is not completely ignored. These two pamphlets will introduce, to those who need the introduction, two doughty fighters in the best of all causes.

Infidel Death-Beds

BY

G. W. Foote and A. D. McLaren

Price 2s.

Postage 3d.

Historical Jesus and the Mythical Christ

BY

GERALD MASSEY

Price 6d.

Postage 1d.

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

By

G. W. FOOTE

Before LORD COLERIDGE in the
Court of Queen's Bench

Price 6d.

Postage 1d.

MATERIALISM RE-STATED

CHAPMAN COHEN

No other subject has been misunderstood and mis-stated 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.

ESSAYS IN FREETHINKING

FIFTH SERIES

CHAPMAN COHEN

About Books. The Damned Truth. Maeterlinck on Immortality. On Snobs and Snobbery. Jesus and the B.B.C. Man's Greatest Enemy. Dean Inge Among the Atheists. Politics and Religion. Christianity on Trial. Woman and Christianity. Why? Man and His Environment. The Nemesis of Christianity. Good God! God and the Weather. Women in the Pulpit. All Sorts of Ideas. According to Plan. A Question of Honour. Are We Christian? A Study in Fallacy. Medical Science and the Church.

1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Series 2s. 6d. each.

Price 2s. 6d. Postage 3d.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

i BIBLE CONTRADICTIONS. ii BIBLE ABSURDITIES. iii. BIBLE ATROCITIES iv. UNFULFILLED PROMISES AND BROKEN PROMISES. v BIBLE IMMORALITIES, INDECENCIES AND OBSCENITIES

By G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball

Millions of people have read "The Bible" but only a few read it with an unprejudiced mind. Believers read it in the light of inculcated obsessions and with their minds closed to a real understanding. "The Handbook" sets forth the Bible message as it really is, it is made to tell its own story. Every text is cited accurately and exact reference is given. It is a book that is useful, even indispensable to Freethinkers and it is educational to Christians.

Cloth 2s. 6d. Postage 3d.

FASCISM & CHRISTIANITY

Chapman Cohen

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

This is a timely and appropriate propagandist pamphlet, and should be circulated as widely and as wisely as possible. Packets of Fifty copies will be sent post free for 4s. 6d.

ONE PENNY. By post Threehalfpence

FANFARE FOR FREETHOUGHT

By

BAYARD SIMMONS

A collection of verse wise and witty, filling a gap in Freethought propagandist literature. Specially and tastefully printed and bound.

Price One Shilling.

Postage Twopence.