

THE FREETHINKER

EDITED by CHAPMAN COHEN

— Founded 1881 —

VOL. LIX.—No. 44

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1939

PRICE THREEPENCE

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

	Page
That German Race—The Editor	689
Continental Christianity—Mimmermus	691
Pulling our Weight—T. H. Elstob	692
"The Best is always the Enemy of the Good"— George Redborough	693
The Mind of Christ—Alan Tyndal	694
Symbolism in the Bible—Ishmaelite	694
"Jubilee Freethinker Fund"	697
The Inheritance of Defects—G. H. Taylor	699
Acid Drops, To Correspondents, Sugar Plums, Letters to the Editor, etc.	

Views and Opinions

That German Race

I INTEND devoting this week's notes and, unless something important intervenes, next week's notes, to two topics which while connected with the war are not peculiar to it. They are not even necessarily connected with any war; strictly they are sociological questions that have been brought out distinctly by the war. Unfortunately this greater prominence has led to increased confusion with many, and given greater opportunities for misleading to others. From the first class I shall probably get the reminder that the present is not the time to bother people with abstract questions; and that, I challenge at the outset. When we find ourselves faced with such a disaster as the present war it is the time to probe its nature and decide as to its causation. If civilization is on the brink of destruction then the sooner we enquire into the cause of such a situation the better. It is no real relief from war-strain to thrust serious thinking into the background and to think we are consoling ourselves with the inane Church services supplied by the B.B.C. or wearisome weak jokes of alleged humorists, or to heed the advice of B.B.C. propagandists that we should not talk to our neighbours about the war or criticize our rulers. This emphatically is a time when we should keep a watchful eye on our many battalions of rulers, and have in mind, not merely the task of winning the war, but also our duty to consider the problem of why so much of our energy and our resources are being expended either fighting wars or getting ready for them. It is quite misleading to call the periods between set wars "peace." These are not periods of peace, they are merely longer or shorter armistices. Our cardinal fault is that we will simply not think out problems both actual and probable. Too many of us live in the present and think in terms of the past.

* * *

Fallacy and Confusions

One of these questions I wish to discuss was put by Mr. Duff Cooper, M.P., in a recent issue of the *Even-*

ing Standard. Mr. Duff Cooper is an ex-Cabinet Minister, who one day may be again in the Cabinet, and will then be covered by that mantle of wisdom which is supposed to cover every Cabinet Minister. I select Mr. Duff Cooper for another reason. While others might have given us the absurd thesis Mr. Duff Cooper does, not many would have made its absurdity so patent. He says "there is some profound quality that differentiates the Germans from other people." That it must be noted is the thesis of Hitler—with different implications. Hitler's implication is that the Germans are the fathers of world culture, and the predestined rulers of the earth; Mr. Duff Cooper's thesis is that Germans have in them certain "profound qualities" which make them submissive to their rulers and so stir up war. He says this does not mean that Germans are "in all respects worse than others," he merely defines their "particular failing," just as certain individuals are subject to rheumatism or asthma. He says that Prussia has let loose since 1864 five wars on Europe. To Mr. Duff Cooper, Russia, Afghanistan, the Soudan, South Africa, Abyssinia, Ashantee, Burmah, etc., during about the same period, have no significance. But perhaps wars outside Europe do not count, although Germany might plead that it had no chance of making war except in Europe. She did her best to reach the level of other peoples.

Finally Mr. Duff Cooper hopes that when the statesmen of Europe are gathered round the table of peace they will bear in mind what he has said about Germans. I hope they will. In fact I should like to see Mr. Duff Cooper there, seated in a high chair, for the rest of the members to have before them a visible emblem of "How not to do it."

* * *

What is Innate Character?

What does Mr. Duff Cooper mean by saying that there

is something innate in the German character which makes them accept a particular form of bad government?

He surely cannot mean that all Germans are specially inclined to a bad form of Government. He must know that after the war, one of the complaints brought against the Germans was that they were going "red," and so might form a dangerous bloc in the centre of Europe. He might also bear in mind that, before Hitler, Germany had about thirteen million Socialists who were working to get a new form of Government established, that during this war our Government—with Mr. Duff Cooper's approval—has scattered millions of leaflets over Germany in the confident expectation that by placing certain ideas before the German people, a considerable number of them may realize they have been misled and deceived, and so may overthrow their war-like Government; also

that Hitler and his gang have to feed the Germans on lies in order to induce them to obey orders. Finally—not that the list is exhausted—very many thousands of talented German refugees are working vigorously in every part of the world to create an altogether different form of Government to the present one.

So all that emerges from a study of the subject is that *some* German individuals, a much larger number than could be found in this country, and a very much larger number than could be found in France, are inclined to do as they are told. But the quality of obedience is one of the qualities of mankind—more or less developed according to circumstance. On that I will say a word later. A very common thing to hear lately from the man in the street is, "Well, the Government has the job in hand, and our business is to do as we are told. We must obey orders." But I think Mr. Duff Cooper would strongly protest if he was told that this habit of obeying orders is peculiar to the British people. Colonel Blimp is a personage that can be met by the score in the middle and upper classes in this country. One wonders what would be said if some German or French writer was to say that Blimpism was due to "something innate" in the British character. Heine said: "Talk to an Englishman on politics and he will say something sensible; talk to him on religion and he will say something silly." But we know as a matter of fact that while it is true of a great many Englishmen it is not true to say that it is due to some "innate" (an admirable cover for ignorance!) quality of the English people.

Mr. Duff Cooper and his kind might also remember that our Royal Family is German in origin, and that only yesterday did German influence disappear from the family circle of the reigning house. Does he mean that the Royal Family has shed its "innate" quality? If so why may not the ordinary Hans and Gretel shed theirs? Also, when we look back on our own history we find the original inhabitants of this country overrun by swarms of Normans (Northmen originally, not French) and Danes, with copious mixtures of Dutch, Flemish, and other peoples. What has become of their innate characters? America has received millions of Danes, Finns, Germans, with large quantities of Dutch and others. What have they done with their innate qualities? In Ireland we have the case of large numbers of Englishmen and women settling in Ireland, whose descendants have become the most Irish of the Irish, and have produced the greatest opponents to British rule. What became of their innate qualities?

* * *

The Fallacy of "Race"

I am asking this question because it would be too bad to think that Mr. Duff Cooper is so foolish, so unacquainted with either logic or science as to hold that it is Germans only who have innate qualities that are indestructible. But if we are not to say this, what are we to say? Mind I do not say that Germans have not characteristics that are different from those of other peoples. They *are* different from others, but they are not more different from others than others are different from them. Each of these peoples will have a more or less distinctive dress, social habits, marriage and family customs, kinds of food, cooking, housing, and so forth. These differences are so distinct that one may say, with regard to habits, food, clothing, etc., this is French, or German, English or Scottish. They are as patent as is the language each one uses. These habits and customs may be better or worse than ours, that is another question altogether. A people may have customs and institutions that we may judge to be better or worse than ours. Mr. Duff Cooper notes the differences between the mass of the German people and the mass of the British people, and he is

not content to begin with the statement that they are different, he says they are worse, and being worse they must have their origin in something innate in the people as a people. He does not even say that the differences in particular persons may be due to some innate quality of their constitution. That would be at least a debatable proposition. He says it is an innate quality of the *people*—the whole of the people. Please meet Colonel Blimp, with M.P. at the end of his name. That creation of Low's deserves to have an illuminated statue in Trafalgar Square with a suitable inscription in gold on it. I would suggest that such an inscription should be in the words of John Stuart Mill:—

Of all the vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences.

Or this might be inscribed from Dr. Hertz's *Race and Civilisation*:—

Race theories represent a strange mixture, made up of evolutionary thought on the one hand, and on the other, the assumption of rigid race types and of absolute differences between man and man. They are made up further of determinism and a moralizing view of history, of mysticism and most blatant egotism. . . . This idea of race, mostly ignored or even confuted by competent science, has, all the same, an enormous influence on the credulous mass of half-educated peoples, to whom it is cleverly presented as the latest revelation by uncritical dilettanti, by snobbish superficial writers, and by politicians who preach it with simplicity, vulgar demagogy and insistence.

If I were to write or think on the level of Mr. Duff Cooper, I should either feel inclined to support Hitlerism, or regard the future of the race very pessimistically. But I never did think on those lines. From my youth upward it has been plain to me that while there may be different endowments with individuals, so that some Germans may be as independent in their outlook as some Englishmen, and some Englishmen as sheep-like in their mentality as some Germans, it is the social and cultural environment in which we find ourselves that is responsible for the form of expression of those qualities that are common to all. These differences are consequent on fundamental similarities. I lack the space at present to argue this out, so I end with a quotation from Julian Huxley's *We Europeans*:—

There will be in every social class or ethnic group a great quantitative range and a great qualitative diversity of mental characters. . . . All the evidence we possess goes to show that the expression of such mental characters is dependent on the social environment to a very high degree. Let us take the so-called "national character." There was a time when England was called "merry": during the nineteenth century that epithet was not applicable. In Elizabeth's time, the English were among the most musical of the European nations; the reverse is generally held to have been true in Victorian times. . . . In Carlyle's time, the German "national character" was supposed to be peaceable, philosophic, musical and individualist. After the Franco-Prussian War it became arrogant and militaristic. Now we are witnessing the blossoming of tendencies to State-worship, mass enthusiasm and the like, which we are once more assured are inherent in it.

But it would be inconceivable on any biblical theory whatever to believe that the inherent constitution of the German people could change so rapidly. We are therefore driven to believe that the change, where it has not been merely an apparent one, due to the bias of the recorder, has been brought about by changes in social atmosphere and institutions.

But if, when the war is over, the peace-makers are influenced by the Blimpian philosophy of Mr. Duff Cooper, then the outlook is black indeed, and we shall again lose the war in the peace.

CHAPMAN COHEN

Continental Christianity

Christians themselves are all infidels in the sight of some other Christians.—*Landor*

God will knit and break religions.—*Shakespeare*.

VERY little is known of Continental Christianity in this country. The average English Christian may be pious, but he is certain to be provincial. And this provincialism is fostered by his spiritual pastors and masters. Recall, for a moment, the perfectly ridiculous claims to spiritual authority abroad made by the Anglican Church, which maps out the world with the ease of a Dictator. One may smile at the bishopric of Gibraltar, with its patronizing piety and its enforced naval and military church-parades; but what is one to say of the bishopric of North and Central Europe? This latter area includes Germany, and it is quite safe to say that the Germans themselves are entirely unaware of the proximity of the great spiritual force of Anglican Orthodoxy. For the Church of England in this part of the world is engaged in ministering to the pious needs of English people abroad, and a mere handful of tourists. That the Anglican Church in Naziland has escaped persecution in Germany may be due to the fact that it is so insignificant as to have altogether evaded the attention of the Nazi Government.

The Christian religion is chiefly represented on the Continent of Europe by the Greek and the Romish Hierarchies, and by the Protestant Churches of Germany and other countries. All have been through very troublous times recently, and have suffered enormous setbacks. The Roman Catholic Church has had the worst time of all Christian bodies. Just at the period when the Roman Pontiff has reassumed secular sovereignty, and played the sedulous ape to Monarchy, so the authority of this historic church has waned correspondingly. In Germany, she has lost all semblance of authority and power. Austria dubbed "the eldest daughter of the Church," and Poland, a most Catholic country, have been snatched from her, by both the Soviet and the Nazis, and she is left a Rachel mourning for her children.

Here's a pretty kettle of fish. Ever since the Pope in 1870 made a claim to infallibility, things have been going from bad to worse in all matters concerning Papal affairs. So far as Germany is concerned, the Roman Catholics claim forty per cent of the population as belonging to the Church. Allowing for exaggeration, it remains true that a large proportion of religious people in that part of the world are Catholics. Yet these have been treated almost as badly as the unfortunate Jews, who were outnumbered by 200 to 1. Priests in concentration camps, Catholic leaders shot, Church funds seized, Catholic Youth Movement liquidated, colleges refused recognition, all these things show some of the processes of extirpation. Persecution began almost as soon as the Nazis got power, to which they had been helped, ironically, by the Catholics themselves who were fooled by the Nazis' deceptive Anti-Socialist policy. The Vatican itself was enlisted in a crusade against Communism, and hoped to use the Nazis against the Bolsheviks. As late as 1933, the Romish Church signed a Concordat with the Nazis, which solemnly guaranteed the Catholics their privileges. Within eight months this document was

a mere "scrap of paper" in Hitler's waste-paper basket. Six years of Nazi oppression had reduced enormously the number of Catholics in Germany. In 1936 priests in the Rhineland districts reported to their superiors that nearly half of their flocks were scattered. The percentage is higher to-day. If the Nazis should remain in power for another decade, the Roman Catholic Church will be nearly obliterated in Central Europe. The Protestant Churches, by virtue of their different organization, may survive in places. The younger generation in Germany is largely being educated in Nazi Paganism, a novel and hybrid form of religion. All this spells the death-sentence of the historic Romish Church in Central Europe, which a belated and forced victory in Spain will by no means counterbalance. Only a change in the Germanic regime, or its defeat in war, can save the once-powerful Catholic Church in Austria, Germany, Poland, and Czecho-Slovakia from almost total destruction. "What a fall is here, my countrymen!" The Great Spiritual Power, which launched the Crusades, and dethroned kings, is now reduced to the impotence of a corporal's guard, despite her boast of millions of adherents and mountains of money.

The Greek Church is in a scarcely more enviable position. Under the Czarist regime in Russia she enjoyed State protection, and amassed wealth "beyond the dreams of avarice." To-day, shorn of her once boundless power, she is but one of many competing sects. Indeed, throughout the Near East and the Balkan States her power is becoming a thing of small account. It is an amazing transformation scene. The Greek and Roman Hierarchies, once the two most powerful churches of all Christendom, reduced to impotence in the course of a few years!

The Roman Catholic, the oldest and most powerful of all the Christian Churches, is succumbing to the reign of brute force, after tyrannizing over the Old World for sixteen centuries. So secure did her dominion once seem that Macaulay declared that the Romish Church

may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

What is the secret of this astonishing decline and fall? It is not the action of the German people themselves, for they have only lost the fetters of Priestcraft in order to find that Nazi fetters have been rivetted in their place on their arms. It is due to the action of a half-demented religious Dictator, who objects to the Church Catholic because it is rooted in Judaism, and classes it as Communistic, because it is international in its appeal. There is method, too, in his madness. Instead of bothering about this Church's doctrines, he seizes her property and reduces her to impotence at a single stroke. Loot from the Jews helped to keep the Nazi regime going. More loot from the Catholics will achieve the same object. That this loot will be worth while may be seen by the bare facts that there are over 10,000 convents and monasteries in Germany alone, and the Church's wealth in Germany and Austria amounted to £4,000,000,000. This may help to explain the sources of her ages-old influence, which her apologists always explain is due to spiritual rather than material things.

But there are other important factors at work in the decline and fall of historic Christianity in North and Central Europe and Russia. The decline of faith itself is very apparent, and explains the inertia of Catholics. Epochs come to an end, and even churches have to endure the vicissitudes of fortune. No amount of indignant protest will avail to conceal the fact that we stand to-day at the porch of an entirely new age. It is too early to conjecture what its char-

acter will be. Meanwhile the old order recedes, and the two greatest of the Christian Churches are crumbling to their ruin. "Nothing is here for tears." They have both outlived whatever usefulness they possessed and, latterly, their priests and ecclesiastics lagged superfluous upon the stage of life. "You cannot turn the mill with the water that is past," says the old proverb. The great river of life rolls on, further and ever further from the shadow of Medieval Ecclesiasticism. That a frenzied religious nationalism should administer the death-blow is the unkindest cut of all.

MIMNERMUS

Pulling our Weight

NONE knew better than Robert Ingersoll the position of the Earth in astronomical space. None knew better than he how egotistical Man, whose frame was the playground of the hookworm, the tape-worm, and countless other parasites, had puffed himself up with vain conceit, and had even come to the preposterous conclusion that he deserved the gift of eternal life. Whether this gift was pleasant or unpleasant depended upon his having lacked the winning formula, as presented by the Orthodox Greek, the Holy Roman, the Presbyterian, or Particular Baptist. But all the same these conceptions of smallness did not prevent Ingersoll from using the "dignity of the unit," and like phrases, and bringing thereby a loftiness into the business of living which the purely self-centred (and in this class go the majority of theologians and theologically-minded people) will always miss. There is nothing good or bad, but thinking makes it so; and if there is a dignity of the unit that can be upheld by an appeal to the facts and sound deductions from them, these are the only data necessary to place the *dignity of the unit* on a firm basis.

Clifford's sentence that "every rustic who delivers in the village alehouse his slow, infrequent sentences, may help to kill or keep alive the fatal superstitions which clog his race" is an example of a truth, the appreciation of which adds to our dignity and tends to bring a quiet joy to our "allotted span." Of course it does not follow that the appreciation of its truth will automatically result in the pursuit of its plain corollary, the duty of questioning all we believe, so that our slow, infrequent sentences (?) may have as a result the circulation of good coinage in the mental world instead of spurious stuff. There are other conclusions that are come to, and many come to them. Among them are the diametrically opposed teachings that "phoney notes" are the things that should be circulated in order that false beliefs may continue and certain personal advantages that accrue to certain sections of society from such errors may also continue. The practical application of Clifford's aphorism may not then be the same one; it may be one opposed to it.

It is up to the unit to consider the situation and make his choice. Is he going to see "dignity" in accepting the tendentious matter served up to him in the daily press? Is he going to be proud because of his loyalty to convictions that he has never examined, that he has had since childhood? He has had them hammered into him by an interested type of schooling and generally supported and reinforced by parental duress. For papa and mamma too often consider it their prescriptive right to make their children faint copies of themselves. This parental attitude they consider "dignified." Papa and Mamma not only believe in God, and in the system by which they run their shop on the village green, but they believe that they themselves are Gods and are fitted to pass on to

the fruit of their loins what it pleased God to pass on to them through their parents. Not only do they pass these things on, but they add defence mechanisms to see that they get passed on effectively—by repetition, by choosing for their circle of friends those who repeat the same slogans and thus ensuring, as far as it can be managed, that their children hear the same tune interminably. And, subtler than other methods, they erect a code of loyalty by which the child is told to honour his father and mother not by just listening to them and giving them respectful attention, but by listening and swallowing, and by listening to no one else. They give them an air on their penny whistle and ask them to repeat it faithfully (at the most they will countenance a fugue) and by the skill by which they repeat it so will they be blessed of God and the other powers that be. The Church will tell them that their days will be long in the land that their Lord God has allotted to them—an allotment of both life and land they might otherwise be inclined to believe had been carried out with some partiality.

If the Schools, and the Churches, and Papa and Mamma, have done their work well then the offspring when they arrive at maturity will join the kindly chorus rehearsed by the Dead Hand (The Hallelujah Chorus). They will be loyal in all the agreeable and disagreeable senses of the word. They will have a strong disinclination to change of any kind. They will feel the pain of a new idea and will have also accepted the lesson drummed into them that this pain is one of God's Notice Boards warning them off the grass. They will not only have become mentally lazy, but have found out that this laziness is condoned and complimented by the "best people." They will have found that being a "gentleman" or "lady" is bound up with these loyalties and that the breaking away from them is likely to get you classed amongst the "riff-raff." When they have got this far it will not be difficult to equate this attitude with one of personal dignity. It will almost always be so equated, and Dignity itself will be thus ineradicably wrapped up with acceptance of the *status quo*, as laid down by God and his hangers-on who know all about him. What matter then that these hangers-on only cease from fighting each other when the loaves and fishes are in danger. That it is then only that we have occasional exhibitions of Christian charity and forbearance in the Household of Faith.

Then little William and Mary will, in turn, enter into the rite of Holy Matrimony and prove how far-seeing their parents were, by bringing up their children in the same way. Dignified children deserved dignified children. And so the process goes merrily on. The adaptation of society to new knowledge, a task in which they are, whatever their station, able to share, has not dawned upon them because of the criminal operation performed upon them in their helplessness years. Only in very exceptional cases do persons break free from the bonds placed upon them by such dignified parents and, even when they have done so, bits of old superstitions—that is beliefs true or false held without evidence—remain in them. This makes much of their work less valuable, inasmuch as it is to that extent undermined.

Wherein dignity has its true home is a matter for each unit to decide. It is to the glory of Freethinkers that the business of bringing a child into the world merely to be a Little Me is being considered to-day as not only undignified but contemptible. None can logically attempt it unless with the belief that one is indeed a God, omnipotent and omniscient. This does not signify that a parent should be an intellectual miser hoarding his garnering as something so precious as to be for himself alone. The attitude to be adopted is that of Huxley: "This much have I learned; this

is how I learned it. Go thou and do better. But do not thrust upon my shoulders the responsibility for opinions the truth of which you ought to have tested for yourself." That is the attitude of the Freethinker. That is the attitude of a dignified parent: it is the attitude that will tend to increase dignity in the child. It may be that the idea contains too much dynamite for it to be to-day proclaimed with general rapture. It is the root idea of Freethought and the practical propagation of it is a cleanly thing, leaving one one's self-respect, as it is devoid of subterfuge, cabals, plots, and any kind of underhandedness. Its main proposition can be put to the honest mind of an adolescent unaffected by parental tyranny, with the certainty that it will not be resented, and that it will not rob him of what should be his most precious possession, a sense of personal dignity. This is not only good for him, but good for the rest of the human race.

T. H. ELSTON

"The Best is always the Enemy of the Good"

It would be a grave mistake to reckon the present Archbishop of York amongst the foes of Peace and Good-will amongst nations. His Radio Talk praised in this journal, must be counted as one of the few speeches by eminent persons which really gave a genuine lead to what should be our aims and desires in the crisis facing civilization.

The Archbishop spoke recently in Cambridge at a Service, in a Cinema, arranged by the Student Christian Movement, at which the Master of Christ's College presided. Apparently the audience was mainly Christian Students. It may therefore be that Freethinkers ought to abstain from comment. We at least recognize the right of Christian leaders to make efforts to place before their followers a saner and more humanitarian gospel than is generally taught by Christian pastors and masters.

As however few Christians will be influenced by any comments of ours, we feel no hesitation in passing over the points wherein we agree with the Archbishop, after acknowledging our appreciation, and just deal with the less rational and more questionable views which evidently His Grace thought likely to be acceptable to his Christian audience. One of these views was the very common uncharitableness of most Christians:—

Only by the belief in the goodness of God's love could they find the way, the truth and the life.

The only meaning of these words is that only Christians can possibly be right about anything. History and experience afford little support to the idea that Christians monopolize Truth, Life or Love. If every Christian dogma were accepted, we should still be in the same position as we are in respect to most of the natural evils of life—the only exception being that probably—if mankind had believed these dogmas we should ages ago have ceased to exist.

As we have often pointed out, Christianity—either alone or even in conjunction with every existing aid which experience and good-will can provide—cannot easily see any solution to international difficulties. As the Archbishop says:—

The most important decisions in this world were brought about by large groups of people dealing with other large groups of people. It was difficult for Christian statesmen and for Christian citizens to see their duty in this matter.

"Problems would still exist," he went on. Yes, but the important fact to notice is that Christians are quite as much divided as other sections of society, in respect of existing problems even of the greatest possible importance. Shall we never get a prominent Christian to admit that Christianity is no solution at all, although we see no objection to Christians—like the Archbishop and the millions of rank-and-file Christians—behaving as citizens and seeking, in conjunction with their fellow-citizens to find "the way, the truth and the life" we all need to find.

The Archbishop reassured a number of his Christian Students:—

"The present state does not mean that God has suddenly been seized with a fit of petulant irritation," he continued. "Some people seem to think this is so. God creates His world and man brings catastrophe upon himself. That is the working of his judgment. If you make the selfish choice, you will come to disaster because God is Love, and the root principle of life is love."

Only a Theist like himself could believe that God has been seized with fits, although we do not see how a Theist could regard the present horrors of slaughter and torture as wholly ruling out the theory that the Divine Ruler of All Things was far from exhibiting signs of normal sanity and health.

When people begin to talk about LOVE, we must despair of their understanding what are the actual problems involved in our present situation. Nobody in their senses underestimates the world's indebtedness to the principle of love. Nobody can dispute that if Hitler loved Niemöller and Mr. Winston Churchill, his behaviour towards them would be improved. If all Germans loved all Jews even Goebbels and Streicher might look for other victims than Jews for the display of their strange blood-lusts. But we never dream of pretending that we ought to LOVE mosquitoes and sharks or other creatures inimical to our life and health. Only a moron could delight in inflicting needless pain on any sensitive organism. We go farther. Not only must we seek to be merciful, we must try to be just, we must be tolerant, to myriads with whom we never can have that personal relation which alone can produce love.

We note that Hitler is proposing to draw all Germans from several countries where they have lived a long time without any interference from their neighbours. It may be that Hitler loves them, and will not persecute or destroy them when they land in the so-called "Fatherland." If this were approximately true, it would be no proof of Hitler's moral superiority. The real test of civilization is Toleration of all—not Love on one side and hate on the other. Unless we are willing to tolerate people whose race, or creed or colour, or political attitude is opposed to our own, we are not yet liberated from the taint of barbaric savagery. To await men's loving each other is to substitute sentimentality for wisdom, and to place the obstacle of Ideality between mankind and all progress.

To quote a favourite phrase of Mr. W. T. Stead's: "The Best is always the enemy of the Good." Toleration is practical. Love may be better, but it isn't likely to be universal in our lifetime.

GEORGE BEDBOROUGH

Poor splendid wings so frayed and soiled and torn!
 Poor kind wild eyes so dashed with light-quick tears!
 Poor perfect voice, most blithe when most forlorn,
 That rings athwart the sea whence no man steers,
 Like joy-bells crossed with death-bells in our ears.

James Thomson

The Mind of Christ

WHEN we were very, very young we used to think the mind of Christ was as an open book. "Feed my Lambs," and "Suffer little children," etc., were supposed to be two of his chief concerns. We hardly ever thought of him as a satirist or a scorner of "whited sepulchres," a wielder of the whip, or lacking in chivalry towards his relations. In short we thought of Christ as the embodiment of everything good and gentle, quite certain he had no redeeming vices.

The curious thing is that everyone imagines they know the mind of Christ. Perhaps I should qualify that by saying, nearly everyone who believes him to be God Incarnate. Authors and preachers all down the ages, if they have been sure of anything, were certain they knew the mind of Christ. One of our northern judges has just said that he is quite certain Christ would approve of this war. He knows! He knows!

St. Paul was very sure on this point. He says in one of his letters, "For who hath known the mind of the Lord that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." Paul seems to contradict himself here somewhat. First he assumes that the mind of the Lord is unknowable, and then he suggests that he knows all about it. But then Paul could swallow any paradox, and besides, he might argue that the Lord he meant was the chief partner in the wonderful Trinity.

Paul entertained some queer notions about resurrection, the implications of sex, the distinction between the carnal and the spiritual, so he can hardly be accepted as a safe guide regarding the mind of Christ. I expect he would allege that the mind of Christ bore a close resemblance to the mind of Paul!

Mr. John Cowper Powys, in his weighty volume, *The Pleasures of Literature*, has a chapter on St. Paul. He praises his literary acumen and compares him favourably with Rabelais, Shakespeare, Goethe and Homer. He thinks that Paul appealed to something different in human nature. Not to our intellect, or reason, or æsthetic sense, or our blood, or race, but to what we share with every child of man, "this melting mood," "this mysterious something, coming—for where else can it come? from behind the whole system of Things. That finds in forgiveness and mercy, and pity, and magnanimity, an exultation larger than space, older than Time—able to melt our very bones in a feeling for which there is no name."

Mr. Powys has made a wonderful discovery in regard to this simple matter. He should have it patented. This is an universal cure-all that would settle the machinations of Hitler, Stalin, and all would-be aggressors. It would stop the war! It is all so simple that one wonders why it has never been tried. Emily Bronte, it seems, referred to it as "The God within my breast." Just that! "A something more of the same kind." Exactly! And Wm. James says it is a "supernatural presence existing in every human soul. A something behind the electrons and the void," and its greatest implication is, "the equality of all souls."

So now we know exactly where we stand, and we must stir ourselves to accomplish the redemption of mankind. We are not sure whence this mysterious something comes—sorry I forgot the capitals!—but we know it's behind the electrons and the void. Therefore let us get on with it!

A person who can write long and interesting chapters on such subjects as 'The Bible, Dostoevsky, Rabelais, Montaigne, Cervantes, Goethe, Homer and such is a critic not to be sneezed at. He seems to find

his way very readily through the mazes of different styles and differing temperaments. I would say he is not enamoured of science which he thinks has "not merely failed the human race at the turning-point of its history, but has given it the power to rush effectively down the road to ruin," and it is here where St. Paul's mind of Christ comes to our rescue, and it is the only thing that does come to our rescue." So, now you know! Plain as the nose upon your face!

I fancy Mr. Powys would give short shrift to the Materialist, the Atheist, or the Freethinker. I expect he thinks they are a class of deluded mortals who have failed to hitch-on to that mysterious something behind the electrons. Or if science is unable to connect us with this "good thing" how is communication to be effected? Reason, intellect, æsthetic sense we can comprehend. Even intuition may be partly explored. But this melting mood which is equivalent to pity, mercy, etc., including the equality of all souls is a big chunk to chew. Our digestive powers are hardly "ekal" to it. Of course it is just possible that Mr. Powys belongs to the same category as our judges, authors, and preachers, and that the mind of Christ, in his case, bears a striking resemblance to the mind of John Cowper Powys.

ALAN TYNDAL

Symbolism in the Bible

SOME time ago an article appeared on the above subject, and the hypothesis was advanced that this view would probably provide a logical solution to what might otherwise appear as illogical happenings.

To me, Freethought—as Freethought—is comparatively new. It is therefore with a great deal of trepidation that the subject, which bristles with so many difficulties, is approached. Fools are reputed to rush in where angels fear to tread. Naturally—one doesn't wish to rush. So—as a feeler, pushed out from the darkness of inexperience, it is suggested that the parable of the blasting of the fig tree was symbolical, and not material. The mythology of the Bible teaches, in the first instance, that "man" was dispossessed of the garden of Eden for eating of the tree of knowledge, which has been identified with "original sin," now called sexual intercourse. We are informed that—after eating this fruit—Eve covered her nakedness with a fig leaf. Her nakedness, from early illustrations, consisted of her generative organ. Symbolically she therefore covered the naked truth—of creation. Right down the corridors of time, the common peoples have been governed by means of their own credulity. The naked truth has been hid from them. They have been encouraged to react to any eventuality by blind impulse or passion. They have not been taught to apply REASON. Consequently, when the cult of Christianity first made its appearance, it became necessary to correct first impressions. An unnatural education was to give way to a natural education. So—the inhibitions due to the covering of nakedness had to be removed. The tree, whose leaves had allegorically been used in the first instance—to cover the natural truth—was blasted. The truth was to be revealed, not by any lengthy process of teaching, but—immediately, and anything or anybody tending to obscure the truth in any way, was to be ruthlessly dealt with and destroyed.

The parable of the turning of water into wine—in this manner—can be construed to mean that man's enjoyment of the fruits of the earth are not to be curtailed, until reasonable satiety has been reached.

The cult of Christianity is thus but a continuation of the mythologies of earlier Greek, Egyptian and Hindoo thinkers, and the forerunner of what Paine, Comte, Ruskin and others have endeavoured to put into words. The idea of an ideological state of Socialism, where all are equal, is inconsistent with the tenets of Christianity, which more nearly approaches that ideal of philosophical anarchists, of a disciplined "indiscipline."

ISHMAELITE

Acid Drops

If we are not wishful to make our profession of being a democracy appear to the world as a specimen of British humbug, it is about time that our papers stopped giving special articles such headlines as one that appeared in the *Evening News* for October 17, with reference to the Kings of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark meeting the President of Finland, "Three Kings will meet a Peasant President." Why not? On whom, if on any, is the honour conferred. In what respect, if in any, is it to be expected that a President will be less, or more, worthy than a King, or *visa versa*? We are not implying that a peasant is likely to be a less intelligent, or a more intelligent man than a King, or the other way about. But we are dead certain that, other things equal, a collection of the Kings of the world will not show to a greater advantage than an equal number of elected "common" people. Such headlines as that of the *Evening News*, and it was echoed in other papers, is an insult to the intelligence of to-day, and an evidence that we are still a very long way off being a genuine democracy.

There is not so much wonder, after all, that when the office of a King is abolished the people so often submit to a dictator. The servile habit, the tendency to snobbery, the superstition upon which kingcraft ultimately rests is not abolished by a decree. It persists until a better and higher form of social life has had time and opportunity to make a better influence tell and manhood ranks higher than a title. But we need not at this juncture advertise to the world the hold that snobbery and superstition have upon the British public.

The B.B.C. must really exercise greater care if it is not to excite suspicion as to its religious belief. For what is the good of dosing the public with religious services morning and evening, with an extra quantity on Sunday, if it announced that the American Government has prohibited the entrance of submarines into territorial waters unless forced to do so by "acts of God, such as accidents or storms." God should remain neutral. And this statement added to the plain provision of all insurance companies that regular policies will not cover acts of God, and the teaching of the Church of England prayer book that all diseases come from God, and Coroner's verdicts that many people are killed by Act of God, makes it look as though some kind of collective action ought to be taken about it. Surely some of the parsons who are allowed to put their inanities on the air will protest against this implied attack on the character of God. Miss Ellen Wilkinson was recently pulled up by the Speaker when she described one of Mr. Chamberlain's latest appointments as "an amiable old gentleman." What would the Speaker have said had some member got up and asked what can be done to protect people from certain acts of the Christian deity?

Lady Eden, the wife of Sir Anthony Eden, has let loose what may be an official secret. Addressing a meeting of the Byker (Newcastle-on-Tyne) Brotherhood on October 15, she said ("Revealed" is the proper newspaper word, it sounds more important and gives the reader the impression that he has been taken behind the scenes) that this was "no ordinary war." "Britain has been chosen once again to carry out God's work." In common politeness something might have been said of France, but Lady Eden is perhaps careful to restrict her statements to facts known to her. But she says, "it is not we who are carrying out the war, a course has been set for us to follow," it may be that in agreeing to a French commander of the Allied troops in France, God has agreed to pay the French this compliment without disturbing British complacency. We may follow Lady Eden's example and say that God sees after everything, and is using the French as a kind of reserve. But what will Hore Pelisha say of the claim that God is running the war?

Our own crimes are duly set forth by Lady Eden:—

We are ceasing to believe and ceasing to worry about God. The children are not taught to read their Bible, although thousands of pounds every year are spent on secular education; family prayers are almost extinct; the Lord's Day is being filched from us . . . But God has pulled us up sharply. God is using us now to work out his purpose in the world.

That, one may say, is almost official information as to what lies behind the war. The German atrocities, the threat to British financial interests, the desire to prevent the growth of a system which cannot be kept within stated limits, but must threaten other peoples, all these things are just so much window-dressing. The real thing is that we spend money on secular education that should be spent on religious instruction, we do not teach our children to read the Bible (the Bible Society must be fearful liars when they publish the alleged huge distribution of Bibles), prayers are almost extinct, in spite of the daily prayers from the B.B.C. and the constant prayers in the Churches, and we are losing the "Lord's Day." We think this last statement needs qualifying, because, as God is using us, we may note he has said and done nothing to prevent fighting on Sunday. Anyway here is information from a prominent member of the "upper circles." This is "God's war," transmitted to us by one who has evidently received a sound religious education.

The papers are now proclaiming that Turkey will keep its promises to Great Britain, and that the Turks always were an honourable people. We beg to note that they are the one people in this war who have not a very old Christian tradition behind them. We wonder of what other country in the war it could be said that they always stand by their treaty undertaking in both the letter and the spirit.

On very high authority there are many varieties of lies. Among these is the lie by suggestion. One example of this kind is found in the *Church Times*. Its parent is the regular paragraphist *Laicus Ignotus*. He remarks, not for the first time, that the author of the German "Hymn of Hate" was a Jew. That, we believe, is quite true, although he might have taken it straight from the Bible so far as its essence is concerned. But what *Laicus Ignotus* does not tell his readers is that Lissauer—the author of the hymn—was converted to Christianity before he wrote that hymn. It is a case where a lie is suggested by suppressing the truth. We did not have any deliberately written hymn of hate in this country. That would have been too open. But when one remembers that a Roman Catholic Archbishop declared it to be our duty to go on killing Germans, that there was a continuous stream of lies in circulation, from the numerous babies' hands that were cut off, and Belgian women raped in public with the soldiers standing in circles watching, to the boiling down of German dead to get the fat, we can claim that even at that game the Germans in the last war "had nothing on us."

There is no questioning the firmness, now, of Sir Neville Henderson, our late Ambassador to Berlin, as to his conviction of the utter unreliability of Hitler's word, his capacity as a liar, and his susceptibility to attacks of delusion amounting almost to insanity. But we share the curiosity of many others as to when Sir Neville arrived at these conclusions. So far as is known, the change dates from only just previous to the war. But to anyone with judgment Hitler has never altered since he gained power. He is the same Hitler that existed in 1933, with clearer manifestations of his character at every stage of his progress. If Sir Neville only recently made the discovery of Hitler's character and aims—the latter stated them as clearly as could be, then he was unfitted for the post he held, since to a considerable extent the home Government depended upon his judgments and reports. Sir Neville owes it to the public—if he will condescend to admit the obligation—some explanation. There are others who might be included in the same questionnaire.

As the general policy of the Government appears to be to send everyone from where he is to somewhere else, it might be enlarged to transporting all who are where the transported ones are sent, to where the evacuees were. This would balance the distribution of the population, and at the same time provide occupation for many of those who have been deprived of their occupation by their dismissal from public positions.

A reviewer of a book on *God in Education*, says that the author, Mr. M. L. Jacks, "sounds a loud note of warning about the danger to the world by leaving God out of education as has been done in the past." The worst of these ultra-religious people is that they say so much and prove so little. More than that, what they say is so obviously false to informed readers that it looks as though, provided they can satisfy that type of mind which lives on the repetition of familiar phrases, nothing else matters. We do not claim for a moment that Mr. Jacks, and the reviewer does not know his public better than we do. But we still think that they ought to be able so to write that the fact of their playing to the unthinking should not be so obvious to outsiders.

For example. When was God left out of education in the educational system in this country? Until about seventy years ago—setting on one side a few individual enterprises—there was no education in this country in which God did not find a very prominent place, and in the national system of education God can only be left out of education at the express desire of individual parents. So it cannot be in Britain that God is left out, and thanks to the underground methods of the Church, and the craze for popularity of novelists and others God never occupied so prominent a place in the press as he does at present. Evidently we have not sinned by leaving God out. It is still "Gott mit Uns."

Well, if we are not sinners, who is? In the whole of Europe there is only one country in which God has been deliberately left out of education. That is Russia—which is only partly in Europe. There God is left out of the national education. But this system in Russia is about twenty years old. And without expressing any great fondness for the Russian system, and disliking altogether the restrictions on freedom of speech and thought that exists, would Mr. Jacks or his reviewer say clearly and deliberately that the Russian people, as a whole, are not better fed, better educated, and with a better feeling of manliness about them than they possessed before the Russian "godless" education came into force? It is no use comparing Russia with this country or with France. One must compare Russia under the Czar and under the Church with the Russia of to-day. We do not think that many English people would care to exchange life in Russia for life in this country. But we are certain they would, unless they belonged to a specially privileged set, like life in the old Russia still less.

Now will Mr. Jacks tell us plainly and precisely exactly what danger to the world results, necessarily results, from leaving God out of education? We ought to say that we are taking the passage cited by the reviewer of his book. But it is quite an ordinary kind of religious statement. We should be delighted to get the information for which we ask—after seeking it for a full half-century.

The *Catholic Times*, for October 20, has, quite naturally, a profound trust in its armour of magic workers in the shape of relics, rosaries, "Hail Mary's," holy candles and so forth, to say nothing of the help of the Saints, the intervention of the Mother of God, the love of Jesus, and the power of God to protect his church. But there are some things that make us doubt whether all is quite as well as might be. A special article in that paper by Mgr. Canon Jackson warns Catholics that the Church is faced with the greatest danger it has yet met—the impact of atheistic ideas, and "we cannot reach those minds" that are threatening the Church. The Canon

gets more alarmed as he proceeds with his thesis. He says:—

We have no protection against millions of individual minds. . . . Minds are free, we cannot coerce them; we can kill bodies but thought is not killed, and when thought is as destructive as Atheism there rises a force that is absolutely beyond us. . . . And as this enemy is surely mental it is not confined to any particular place. It may and does harbour in the head of a professor, a teacher, a civil servant, a health visitor, anybody and that within our very gates, in our very midst.

After the repeated assurance that there are no such beings as Atheists, and that Atheism is powerless to injure the Church, it is rather a change of tone to be told that the Church is "on the eve of a cataclysm."

What is to be done about it? The resource is not prayer. That method the Canon evidently believes is too slow and too uncertain. The situation is so serious that the Canon says deliberately: "I do not say have recourse to prayer." He probably thinks that trying to kill Atheism with prayer is like fighting bombing-planes with pop-guns. What he advises is "speak to God about it." The only alternative left is to speak to God about it and induce him to do the "needful." I rather like this Canon Jackson, there seems more of man about him than one usually finds in such circumstances. He says to his people, in effect, don't waste time in whining prayers, don't beg, just tell God about it. Tell him that looking after the Church is his job, and if he doesn't do something, and do it damned quick, he will soon have no Church to bother about. The Protestant preachers are whining to God about their sinfulness, their weakness, and their unworthiness. The Canon says, "let's have done with this. Let us speak to God about it, and let him realize that the day has gone by when one can shoot ideas out of men's heads. The forces opposed to God are absolutely beyond us, if God wants to have worshippers at all he must wake up and do something to protect his own existence." Bravo, Canon Jackson! But we are a little surprised at the *Catholic Times* publishing his article.

WHITMAN AND INGERSOLL

WHITMAN said: "I had a visitor one day last week, a preacher fellow: he wore black clothes, clerical: was quite courteous, almost gracious. . . . Just before he left he said (here Whitman paused and chuckled): 'I hope it is not true, Mr. Whitman, that you are a great admirer of Bob Ingersoll.' It was lugged in in such a way that I felt as if that was really the purpose of his visit—to satisfy himself on that point. I blurted out at once, so that he should remain in no uncertainty: 'I'm afraid, my friend, that I hope it is true and always may be true.' You should have seen his crestfallen face. He said at once: 'I confess I am disappointed.' I only smiled. He seemed to take it to heart. I asked him: 'I suppose your religion has a place for Ingersoll?' He answered evasively: 'That opens up a large field,' which meant that he had his doubts. So I hurried to add: 'Well, I am afraid mine does, anyhow. *Leaves of Grass* would be a poor sort of pretender if it flourished a whip over people.' He bowed as if to say, 'Have it as you will.' The fellow riled me a bit, too; it was all so unnecessary. I did not wish him to go on supposing my love for the Colonel was only a half-hearted sort of thing—an apology: so I said quite vehemently: 'You must make no mistake about it: I am Bob's friend: I admire him: I stand by him in his war on the Church.' He was as solemn as a judge by this time. 'And in his war against religion, Mr. Whitman—do you stand by him in that?' I answered: 'He makes no war on religion.'"

Whitman laughed. "It's astonishing to me how these preacher people thin themselves down—lose their blood: they have no more guts than a dead weasel: they nose about with their little hells and heavens, like a corner grocer with something toothsome to sell."—From *Horace Traubel*, "With Walt Whitman in Camden."

To get a New Subscriber is to make a New Friend

"Jubilee Freethinker Fund"

We don't like this job of asking for financial help for the *Freethinker*, but it is made less unpleasant than it might be by the many letters from old friends and new readers—even from new friends and old readers—even from those who feel impelled to say why they cannot contribute. We regret that, more for their sake than our own. One old age pensioner, and a fifty-one years' reader, bears testimony to his appreciation of the paper. Another Old Age Pensioner sends along a second subscription, but obstinately refuses either name or address. We wish we had it. We should like to write him.

Old memories are awakened by Mr. J. Bryan who writes, "I have enjoyed your articles since hearing you when you gave a week's mission in the Co-op building in Downing Street, Manchester." That must be over forty years ago. Mr. G. R. Baulks says that while he is looking forward to his own retirement "I am selfish enough to hope you are able to carry on for many years." I think the Bible says there is no rest for the wicked, so we must keep on. Mr. Owen says that whatever happens in this war the *Freethinker* must not be allowed to go down. It won't. A reminder comes from an old friend whom we have neglected—in the direction of letters—Mr. T. C. Kirkman. He says: "Herewith my modest contribution. It is but a small registration of my interest in the Cause, and the debt I owe you personally." Those who know Mr. Kirkman will know that this is a compliment worth receiving.

Another, Mr. W. McKelvie, who carries our mind back to the early years, (we have grown up together) although I think I am a few years his senior, says:—

Like others I am very much indebted to the Freethought movement, and take this opportunity to thank you for your personal share in this connexion. More than ever it is essential that the *Freethinker* be maintained on a firm foundation, and bearing in mind your own magnificent efforts over the past fifty years it makes one wish that much more were done. I hope all Freethinkers will realize their responsibility and relieve you of some of your difficulties..

We greatly appreciate a cheque for £3 from the Kingston Branch of the N.S.S., in addition to donations from individual members. W. Angus hopes we shall weather the storm. We have no doubt whatever of that, but the ease with which it may be done will depend upon all who are putting their shoulder to the wheel, and always remembering that the help that lasts longest is that which comes from introducing new readers. Mr. F. C. Hodson thinks that "In a world ruled so much by mass journalistic opinion it is a boon to have our *Freethinker* to serve as an antidote." Our old friend, C. J. Tacchi, congratulates us on our fifty years of useful work, and thoughtfully provides us with a very flattering epitaph, which we intend to keep in cold storage as long as possible.

Mr. J. Kilpatrick sends us a selection of New Testament verses, and says that after reading them, particularly Luke xix. 17, it looks as though Hitler got some of his ideas from them. He suggests an article headed "What Hitler said 2,000 years ago." There seems something in that idea, and there are plenty of verses in the Bible that would suggest raping of enemy women, and the slaughter of civilians.

M. Harry Organ applies to be put on the honours list, he having been a reader and a member of the N.S.S. for forty-eight years. Admission granted, medal in course of meditation. Mr. Maurice Barbanell, editor of the *Psychic News*, enclosing a cheque, says: "The *Freethinker* is conducted with a vigour

and a refreshing candour that must command the appreciation of even those who are not always in agreement with you."

F. Ayerst Slaughter, an old Hall of Science attendant, at the age of 80 hopes to enjoy the *Freethinker* for years yet. We hope he will, and from the cheery note of his letter it looks as though his wish will be gratified. We will do our best to see that the *Freethinker* does not fail him. Mr. J. E. Entwistle writes flatteringly of our paper and his enjoyment for many years of its contents. He adds the articles in his old copies "make wonderful reading." Mr. C. A. M. Sellen thinks that "the story of the *Freethinker* during the last war might well be told to-day." We will think about it. Perhaps as part of our autobiography.

Our apologies to A. H. Deacon, whose subscription of 10s. was not acknowledged. That is the only omission of which we have received notice.

	£	s.	d.
Previously Acknowledged	256	5	6
J. Kilpatrick	5	0	0
J. Lauder	5	0	0
Herbert Anthony	0	5	0
New Reader	0	1	0
Old Age Pensioner and 51 year reader	0	1	0
J. H. Reeve	0	5	0
A. Harvey	1	1	0
H. A. Alexander	0	10	6
T. Roberts	0	5	0
T.A.S.	1	0	0
John Hayes	0	2	6
G. Curwen	0	10	0
Old Age Pensioner (2nd sub.)	0	1	0
H. Blewett	0	2	0
Two Sheffield Pals	0	2	6
J. Burdon	0	10	0
W. McKelvie	1	0	0
C. A. M. Sellen	1	0	0
Two Greenock Readers	1	0	0
J. C. Kirkman	2	0	0
Thos. Owen	1	0	0
W. W. Hilton	0	1	0
G. R. Baulks	0	10	0
John Smith	1	1	0
J. Bryan	0	1	0
F. Ayerst Slaughter	2	0	0
J. T. Entwistle	0	10	0
Basil Dixon	0	2	6
Kingston Branch N.S.S.	3	0	0
T. Griffiths	3	3	0
J. W. Barker	1	0	0
D. Fyfe	0	1	0
P. Moss	0	10	0
A. J. Watson	0	5	0
W. Angus	5	0	0
F. C. Hodson	0	5	0
A. H. Deacon	0	10	0
C. M. L. Morgan	1	10	0
Miss J. Dixon	0	2	6
Mrs. Clara Bartram	1	0	0
E. W. Henstridge	1	1	0
C. J. Tacchi	1	0	0
H. Pollard	0	10	0
Maurice Barbanell	1	1	0
Arthur Forbes (sent by A. W. Scott)	0	10	0
D. Longmuir	0	10	0
A. W. Scott	0	2	6
W. Baker	0	2	6
T. Clark	0	2	6
C.H.	0	1	3
H. Sylvester	2	2	0
J.A.W.	0	2	6
A. J. Tanner	0	5	0

Three Admirers (Birmingham) ...	1	0	0
H. Organ	0	5	0
W. W. Pearce	2	0	0
J. T. & M.A.	0	10	0
W. A. Brend	1	1	0
A. T. Stevens	0	10	0

Total £310 10 3

The above represents sums received up to and including October 23. We shall be obliged if errors either in names or amounts are pointed out.

CHAPMAN COHEN

THE FREETHINKER

FOUNDED BY G. W. FOOTE

61 Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4
Telephone No.: CENTRAL 2412.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Will all those who have written Mr. Cohen on matters that cannot well be answered in this column please exercise patience in getting replies. Mr. Cohen has no secretary, and therefore has to handle all letters himself. That together with his "Views and Opinions" and other contributions to the paper keeps him pretty busy, and the time limit for letters has to be elastic.

R. G. MAHOMED.—Certainly an anthology of Freethought poetry from the days of the Greeks would be a treasure, particularly if the poetry of the east was included. But it is too great a task for us to undertake, even if we had the necessary equipment. Why not send us a few specimens for publication in these pages? It might incite others.

W. MORGAN.—Thanks for addresses.

C. M. L. MORGAN.—Sorry to hear of your accident. Best wishes for a speedy recovery.

J. LAUDER.—Many thanks for your kindly thought. It is a case of bread thrown unknowingly on the water which has returned with the kind of interest the recipient at least appreciates.

JOHN SMITH.—Pleased to read what you say. We do not find the work "arduous," even though we should sometimes like to take it a little easier for the time being.

"ISHMAELITE," J. HUMPHREY, and J. W. BRAY.—Much obliged for names of likely new readers; paper being sent for four weeks.

J.T. & M.A.—We shall be there so long as there is room to get the paper printed.

W. W. PEARCE writes expressing the hope that we shall make the extra nine years and then have a diamond jubilee.

H. SYLVESTER.—Knowing you for so many years we are always assured of your loyal support of both the Cause and the *Freethinker*.

C. A. MORRISON.—The true authorship of *Mein Kampf* was given soon after the rise of Hitler to power, and so far as we know it has never been contradicted. It is certain that Hitler has not shown any ability in the direction of writing anything else. We are quite acquainted with the fact that Poland was ruled by a dictatorship, and that the mass of the people were very badly treated. It was a land of large landowners and very poor peasants. The latter are likely to be better off under Russia. But in the circumstances we think our phrase "Poor Poland" was justified.

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.

Freethinkers and the Army

Will all who read this note be good enough to inform us whether they have or have not experienced difficulty in making an affirmation in place of the religious oath when joining any branch of the military or naval or air services. We are collecting matter to place before the authorities.

We again remind all who wish to affirm that they have the legal right to do so, and should refuse to permit themselves to be scheduled as believing in any form of religion. Officers *must* take down the description as given, and recruits who have been induced to place themselves in some religious group may at any time claim to have the misdescription corrected, even though they may have consented to their being so entered.

CHAPMAN COHEN,

President, N.S.S.

Sugar Plums

We much regret that last week's paper contained a blunder concerning the date of Mr. Cohen's visit to the Secular Hall, Leicester. This was wrongly given as October 22, although it was correctly given in the preceding issue of the *Freethinker*. Mr. Cohen will be at Leicester to-day (October 29). The lecture will commence at 3 o'clock, so that all may get home before complete darkness sets in. Subject: "Fifty Years of Freethought." On Sunday next, also at 3 o'clock, Mr. Cohen will speak in the Picton Hall, Liverpool, under the same title, but not necessarily using the same matter.

We regret that owing to want of room we are obliged to hold over a number of letters until next week.

We are glad to say that we have had the pleasure of welcoming quite a number of new readers since the war started. It is rather costly, financially and otherwise, to acquire new readers at the price of a war, but serious occasions have as a tendency to incite the better type of mind to a more serious line of study. We have to thank those who have assisted in this matter, and so helped to make good our hope that the *Freethinker* will come out of the war stronger than it went into it.

We wish to call attention to the note in this issue concerning Freethinkers joining any of the armed forces. In the large number of cases where recruits have given way and have been entered as belonging to some religious body, soldiers and others have the right to have their descriptions altered at any time. They might even travel round all the sects, if they wished, by joining a fresh body every month.

Mr. J. T. Brighton is still carrying on his propagandist work in the North despite the inconvenient war-time conditions. He is also getting a number of very useful letters into the press. This press correspondence is very valuable when it is done in the right way, and there are many opportunities now offering themselves. The Ministry of Information is divesting war news of much of its interest, and lessening the demand for newspapers. That,

of course, is the effect of a censorship in any direction. When people feel that they are being told only what certain other folk think it right for them to know, no-one can be certain that what they know is really worth the knowing.

Collins publish *The Hero of Delhi*, by Hesketh Pearson (12s. 6d.). The "Hero" is John Nicholson, who played a leading part in suppressing the Indian Mutiny in 1857. In his review of the book, Mr. H. A. Milton, in *Reynolds*, says:

He had no respect for human life. He killed a bandit himself, cut the head off, and put it on his desk to warn others.

His attitude to Indians was fair, even friendly, until they dared to turn against the company which employed him to keep them in subjection, then he was ruthless in exterminating them. Yet he was, or fancied himself to be, a fervent Christian, always quoting the Bible, with pious phrases frequently on his lips.

The "good book" is still a companion volume to *King's Regulations*, though there is not much likelihood of it surviving *Indian independence*.

Mr. A. A. Milne, the author, in the course of his biography published by Methuen, relates that only once did he receive a visit from a bishop. And on his lordship's departure, five threepenny-bits were found on the sofa on which he had been sitting. "We couldn't help wondering," says Mr. Milne. . . . Certainly, even an odd trousers-button would have been *conclusive*, evidence, we think.

How Green was my Valley, by Richard Llewellyn (Michael Joseph, 8s. 6d.), is the story of a South Wales Valley, beginning in days when (according to the author) a

collier's family dined on Saturday off "a baron of beef and a shoulder or leg of lamb, with chickens or ducks or turkey or goose," after starting on leek soup with a big lump of ham in it.

But, they were so religious that the older ones disapproved of attempts to form a Trade Union and urged that better wages could be secured by prayer. No kind of entertainment was allowed save chapel-going. . . .

A sort of descent to Avernus!

The Inheritance of Defects

GENETIC science is giving more and more exact knowledge about hereditary defects. The precise nature of heredity was unknown to Darwin and his immediate followers: the resemblance of offspring to parent was somehow accounted for by "the strong principle of heredity" (Darwin), and the differences between them were obscurely accounted for by "variation."

But as Nietzsche, for one, recognized, "Heredity as something quite incomprehensible cannot be used as an explanation, but only as a designation for the identification of a problem." (*The Will to Power*).

To-day, as a result of investigations started by De Vries and Mendel, the whole study of heredity has been brought to a material basis, namely, the behaviour of chromatin. Instead of a vague "Life Force" guiding the constituents of the mother's blood to their appointed places in the embryo we are beginning to understand how the ultra-microscopic units of heredity, the genes, build up features such as eyes, ears, etc., even to our mental calibre.

Thousands of genes are passed by each parent into the ovum, and Mendelian researchers have studied and formulated laws relating to their behaviour. "Mendelism," remarks Dr. R. A. Fisher, who has done much useful work with J. B. Haldane, "supplies the missing parts of the structure first created by Darwin." (*The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*).

And so "the study of heredity has become more and more explicitly materialistic" (Lancelot Hogben), and this, he adds, applies not only to physical, but also to mental inheritance. The behaviour of the chromosomes is perfectly deterministic; there is no room for any semi-religious theories of inheritance such as were, perhaps only naturally, entertained by the early investigators like Kölreuter (1733-1806) and his followers Knight (1799), Goss (1822), and Naudin (1862). The chromatin of the resting cell consists of a threadwork of material in the nucleus, whose surrounding wall disappears as the cell is about to divide. The chromatin condenses into chromosomes (dark staining rod-shaped bodies), of which each plant or animal has a characteristic number. It has been shown that Mendel's "atoms of heredity" have their material basis in the chromosomes, in which they are spacially localized.

Chromosomic structure is thus atomistic, and the genes have space dimensions. T. H. Morgan (*Scientific Basis of Evolution*) has extended Mendelism and can furnish exact descriptions of the interrelation of genetic factors; he can identify the particular chromosomes affected by a mutation (induced), and has arrived at an exact "Law of Linear Alignment" of the genes. The name Biometry is given to that branch of Biology dealing with the measurement of living things (linear alignment, weight, volume and number).

The conditions relating to the transmission of characteristics have been explored to such effect that a most useful stock of knowledge is to-day at the disposal of the eugenicist. Predictions are facilitated by (a) empirical observation and (b) mathematical expectation.

Confronted with facts relating to the inheritance of defects, including mental deficiency and feeble-mindedness, the average person, especially if he is politically Left, is perhaps prone to delve into his personal experiences and acquaintances and retail some anecdote which he apparently hopes will disprove the contentions. The production of a case of a paternal defect not apparent in the offspring might, for instance, set us inquiring after the quality of the mother; it takes two to make a marriage. He forgets, too, that a recessive abnormality may be masked for generations by being associated in the chromosome with a dominant gene for normality.

If a dominant and a recessive gene are associated, the former is displayed outwardly, the latter carried inwardly. The dominant may be either for normality or abnormality, or for some teleologically neutral feature such as brown eyes. Either the dominant or the recessive can be transmitted to each offspring.

If two dominant genes are together, naturally the dominant character is both displayed and transmitted; if two recessives, then the recessive becomes outwardly manifest and is transmitted.

In a simple case, suppose the marriage of two partners, one normal on both sides, having inherited normality from both parents, and the other carrying normal and defective genes (one from each parent). The first may be termed NN, the second ND (normal and defective).

Statistically, for every four offspring the NN will transmit N (normality) every time (100 per cent), while the other will give N, N, D and D. This will result in the offspring having the following characters: NN, NN, ND, ND; that is, half of them normal, half heterogenous. If the defect is dominant, these latter will be outwardly defective, yet will carry the possibility of transmitting normality (a chance of 50 in 100). If, however, the defect is recessive, it will be masked, yet the bearer will pass it on to (statistically) half his offspring.

Where defects are dominant they are easy to detect. If they are cut off right away by non-reproduction they are abolished in one generation.

This applies to aniridia (an eye defect), brachydactyly, lobster claw, diabetes insipidus (excessive production of urine), Huntingdon's chorea (a nervous ailment), and one form of night-blindness. The finger defect, brachydactyly, is chiefly associated with a small locality in N. Wales, and serves as a warning to take care not to base statistics always on the whole population.

Where the deficiency is from a recessive gene, detection is of course harder. Again, in a simple case, let us posit two outwardly normal parents each masking the recessive defect. Each may be termed ND and each will transmit N and D equally. Statistically the characters of every four children will be NN, ND, ND and DD. This grouping can be proved by the reader on a set of playing cards. Shuffle two sets of 26, each containing 13 reds and 13 blacks. Deal one set out in ones and cover with the other set so as to get 26 pairs. If this goes on long enough it will tend towards an average of 25 per cent Red-Red, 25 per cent Black-Black, and 50 per cent Red-Black. This average may even be attained after very few shuffles.

In other words, out of four offspring from this type of marriage, one will be completely normal, two outwardly normal, but masking the defect, and one abnormal.

Had the defect been dominant, the parents would of course have both been outwardly defective, and would have produced one normal child and three defective ones, two of whom would have carried the chance of transmitting normality.

The reader could amuse himself by working out the results of other types of marriage, say ND and DD, or posit a small community for the purpose of proceeding to the third or fourth generation, or work out the possibilities of cousin marriages (given desirable qualities in the whole genetic constitution these could be highly beneficial.)

It must be remembered, however, that cases are not without complications, some characters being linked with others. The sex-chromosomes carry other factors; e.g., for colour blindness. Women have two large sex-chromosomes. The abnormal is recessive. Their sons have only one large sex-chromosome, taken from the mother, and so half the sons of those women transmitting the recessive will be colour-blind, having no complementary gene to dominate the recessive. On the other hand the daughters, presuming they get the recessive abnormality, have, being female, two large sex-chromosomes, and so the abnormality is masked.

Colour-blindness is therefore sex-linked, women being the carriers, in view of the mutation on their extra sex-chromosome, and men the sufferers.

Nevertheless, as will be seen, the possibility of a colour-blind female arises from the marriage of a colour-blind man with a woman carrying the recessive for colour-blindness, in which case the daughter, presuming she received the recessive abnormality from her mother, would also receive it on the other chromosome given by her father, and the recessive, unrelieved by a dominant, would become manifest.

The same applies to hæmophilia (bleeding), another apparent mutation, carried by Queen Victoria (see J. B. S. Haldane's *Blood Royal*). The royal families of Spain and Russia showed this defect in certain of their male members. With regard to the treatment for this defect Haldane remarks that sterilization "would probably kill the males," and suggests sterilizing the female carrier after the birth of the first

hæmophilic son, but regrets that this would cut off the supply of normal offspring.

Yet another mutation is "taste-blindness," discovered by Fox in 1931. An organic compound, phenyl-thio-urea, has a bitter taste to those who, having the dominant gene, can taste it. A recessive mutation prevents this in some. In nature dominant mutations are rare, save in human beings.

Opinions differ as to whether mutations are on the whole biologically useful. Haldane thinks not. They very often produce recessive abnormalities. Otherwise many appear to be teleologically neutral, like the rose comb of the Wyandotte fowl, a (dominant) gene substitution from a single-comb ancestry.

It will be seen that defects which arise on a recessive gene are much more difficult to eliminate. Haldane estimates that in ordinary recessives there would be no noticeable effect of sterilization in less than 30 to 40 generations. This is as far removed from us as the Norman Conquest. He predicts in *The Inequality of Man* that it would take hundreds of generations before the proportion of deaf-mutes were halved.

He tentatively suggests the prohibition of cousin marriages, which account for juvenile amaurotic idiocy to the extent of 15 per cent, for congenital deaf-mutism by 25 per cent of such cases, and for xeroderma pigmentosum, a fatal skin disease, by nearly 50 per cent. Most of the offspring of cousin marriages are, of course, normal. Albinism is associated with "fair-blindness," and often with a lack of robustness, and cousin marriages, according to L. T. Hogben (*Nature and Nurture*) bring the chance of Albinism from 1 in 70 to 1 in 8.

Hogben suggests sterilization might be reserved only for cases for which no cure is promised. Amaurotic family idiocy and juvenile amaurotic idiocy are yet incurable, but here nature takes a hand, bringing death before maturity.

Another relevant feature is the effect in at least one case (Mongolian imbecility) of the age of the mother, and there is a parallel here with polydactylus guinea-pigs, also resulting from pregnancy at an advanced age.

Hogben shows that selection eliminates recessives very slowly, and the stud book or pedigree method often fails to detect. The carrier gives no outward sign.

It is next hoped to turn from physical to mental defects.

G. H. TAYLOR

Correspondence

AGNOSTICISM AGAIN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "FREETHINKER"

SIR,—The other day I read the report of a sermon in which the parson, attempting to answer some member of his congregation who had asked why God took the lives of little children and allowed Hitler to live, and in effect: "I believe that there is a loving God who rules our lives, and therefore I do not ask that question." He then considered that he had settled the whole thing out of hand. I hope you will not consider my comparison irreverent when I say that your cool request that I should clarify certain phrases in my letter of enquiry reminded me of that parson. Naturally, I have not the enviable clarity of your pen, and I am unable to express difficult philosophical ideas in words of one syllable, but I will repeat my central question in the simplest language which I can command. Will you please give me an answer which is something a little more than a Hyde Park orator's evasion? Here is the question: "Do you believe that the universe was created or set going by a personal

power?" If I am asked that question I answer, quite frankly, "I don't know." What reply you would make is what I wished to ascertain.

Perhaps you will permit me to add that I feel a calm discussion of this sort can best be carried on in peaceful terms. To say that my phrases read like "a badly bungled rationalizing of the Athanasian Creed," may be a well-earned conclusion to a sentence, but it is no more helpful than if I said (which I hasten to add I do not) that Mr. Chapman Cohen's leading article about the *Church Times*, in your issue of October 22, reads like a badly-bungled paraphrase of Mark Twain. I am trying, as I am sure you are, to settle a philosophical question which has too long divided those of us who are against the dictatorship of the pious, and I think that courtesy is due on both sides. I am sure that, with the customary freedom of the *Freethinker*, you will print this letter in its entirety.

JOHN ROWLAND

REJOINDER TO MR. ROWLAND

I REGRET that Mr. Rowland should have misunderstood my act of consideration for a "Hyde Park orator's evasion." I can, at any rate, assure him that I do not expect him to "express difficult philosophical ideas in words of one syllable." All I ask is that a proposition that is put before me shall be at least intelligible. When that is done I do not care whether it is expressed in single or multiple syllables. And after re-reading Mr. Rowland's letter I must repeat that his questions are not understandable—at least by me, or, I suspect, by others. As put they mean just nothing at all. In his second letter Mr. Rowland reduces his questions in number, but still the one given has no further commendation save that of brevity. Consider Mr. Rowland's question:—

Do you believe that the universe was created or set going by a personal power?

Mr. Rowland, it will be observed, does not condescend to say what he means by this sentence, evidently taking it for granted that it is so clear its meaning is self-evident. On the other hand, I insist that when a question is asked it should have some definite meaning. I mean by that it should signify something known or understood. The words should have reference to something that one understands.

Now the expressions that call for notice are these—"universe," "created" "personal power." As Mr. Rowland does not say what he means, I can only proceed by taking the words at their face value, or in current verbal coin.

Created. This has, in relation to the question asked, two meanings. Theologically it involves the statement that the world was created out of nothing. But I do not think that Mr. Rowland will deny that this is a quite nonsensical statement. The second significance of the word is that of the creation of an artist's brush, a piece of music, which is the welding together of musical notes, the design of a building, and so forth. But this does not carry us outside the range of human effort, and so cannot assist Mr. Rowland, or anyone else in settling the question of Agnosticism.

Universe. There is a possible double sense here, and often leads to confusion. Thus, Dean Matthews, who for some stands as a philosopher, admits that evolution may explain the origin and development of all individual forms, but it cannot explain "evolution as a whole." But there is no such thing as "evolution as a whole" apart from individual cases of evolution. Evolution must refer to a planet, of a complex substance, of an animal. The fallacy here is that Dean Matthews thinks first of all of particular cases of evolution, and then thinks of another evolution which he speaks of as a whole. And that is just non-sense.

I think Mr. Rowland has, unconsciously fallen into the same error. All we know are individual things. We can only think of individual things. This world of ours is a world of particulars. We may conveniently call this collection of individual items a "universe." But we must not assume that this summing of all individual things by a collective phrase points to anything more

than is indicated by the collective word "tree." There is no such thing as a tree that is not a particular kind of tree. To think otherwise is to get back to the fallacies of the medieval schoolmen.

Personal Power. Power means, briefly, the ability to do something, never any more than this, even though it be spelt with a capital P. Personal means something pertaining to a person, a human being, although I have no objection to it being enlarged so as to include animals.

I have now done what I asked Mr. Rowland to do, that is I have given an intelligible meaning to his words—not my meaning, it must be noted, but the only legitimate meaning these words carry. But what Mr. Rowland wants to know (there is a rather familiar sound about that last sentence) is what reply would I give to such a question.

Well, if that question were put to me at the end of a lecture I should probably reply:—

I must put this question into plain English before replying to it. I have been asked whether I believe that every thing has been created by some manlike power—this is what I understand by personal power, because if it means that everything has arisen out of preceding conditions, the question has no connexion whatever with "God." If the first meaning is intended then I must know what it means. Until then I cannot say I do not know, because even to say that one does not know one must know what it is of which he pleads ignorance. If a question is asked in Greek, how can I say whether I agree with it or not unless I have some understanding of Greek? I do not know and cannot conceive any personal power except that manifested by man. So will you please go home, write out the question you have in mind, giving it an intelligible meaning, so making it a topic for probable fruitful discussion, and I will see what can be done. At present all the good that has been done by your question depends upon whether I have made it plain that philosophy does not consist in posing unanswerable questions clothed in non-understandable language, but in properly framing an enquiry resting on a known basis, and to work from that known basis to further understanding. And in doing this it may help by bearing in mind the fact that profound truth is nearly always simple. It is only complicated error that looks intellectually impressive—until it meets with exposure.

I am afraid I cannot say what kind of "orator" appears in Hyde Park. It is many years since I was there, except merely to pass through. But from Mr. Rowland's letter, and his suggestion of the way in which they would speak, I gather they are worth listening to. But if a change is wanted I am informed that there are speakers in Hyde Park always ready to inform the world that in the unlimited, unfathomable, and inconceivable depths of nature there are many secrets that may be made known to those who approach them in a proper spirit of humility.

So I conclude by asking Mr. Rowland, does he believe that there may be somewhere beyond everything a huge manlike thing who is responsible for all things?

I ought, perhaps, to apologize for taking up so much space, but I wished to answer Mr. Rowland's question fully, as I think he will prefer it so. Besides the question may be of interest to others.

CHAPMAN COHEN

FREETHINKERS IN THE ARMY

SIR,—In view of the controversy surrounding the "red tape" attached to religion in the Services, I thought you might be interested in an experience of my own.

The other day I went to one of the R.A.F. training depots to pass the attestation officers and be sworn in for service in the R.A.F., during the present war. On the form I had to fill in, opposite the words "Religious Denomination," I had written that I was an Atheist, although the recruiting officer had advised me to write "Church of England." When the attestation officer saw this he endeavoured to get me to change it to one of the recognized religions, and said that I must have a re-

ligion. When I asked him why I should have a religion he did not answer, and I am afraid to say that he was not at all sure how an Atheist had to be sworn in. I told him that he would have to change the words "Almighty God" in the oath, and that I would attest by affirmation, by my own integrity. He replied by saying that an Atheist couldn't have any integrity. Perhaps you can guess my reaction to this piece of unprecedented "cheek." I told him that an Atheist had more integrity than a Christian could ever have, because an Atheist used common sense in being what he was. Furthermore, I let him know that an Atheist had the integrity to be not afraid to stick to his principles in the face of all intimidation and opposition, and that whatever trouble I had to put up with in the R.A.F. I would continue to stick by them, and not insult them by telling lies for the sake of a lot of red tape and hypocrisy.

He did not answer me, and I was sworn-in in the manner I desired—with all the supernatural trappings absent. All the other fellows picked up their Bibles and went through the swearing-in like a lot of sheep, because they were afraid to be different from the usual procedure. I knew full well that most of them had no belief in the supernatural, but they were afraid to admit to the R.A.F. that they were Atheists. But I am proud to say that I stood by reason and my principles and got what I desired; and one of the sergeants congratulated me afterwards for sticking up for my rights. I did so because I am a true Freethinker, and I shall never be afraid to tell anyone that I am.

The best of success to your paper, of which I am an enthusiastic reader every week, and with whose help I have shown several people the road to reason.

W. TOLSON

"THE ENIGMA OF MOSCOW"

SIR,—I should like to draw the attention of Freethinkers to an important article which appeared recently in *Izvestia*, the chief mouthpiece of the Soviet Government. This article gave the principles on which the Soviet has been actuated, but was ignored or garbled by our newspapers, so that the "enigma of Moscow" myth might be kept up.

The articles stated a principle with which I think all Freethinkers will be in agreement—namely, that one cannot and must not fight ideas with force, so that a war against "Hitlerism" simply won't wash. There ought to be specific and concrete objectives, not abstractions which can mean anything or nothing. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the article said, Trotskyism was fought with ideas, while it remained an expression of ideas; when it became a matter of conspiracy and terrorism, then it was fought with force, and then only.

It is only because people imagine that the Soviet Union has wanted a "crusade" against Fascism, that they see inconsistency in the Soviet's actions. The U.S.S.R. wanted action against aggressors, in order to preserve peace; however much it might detest the social and cultural aspects of Fascism, it has never for a moment envisaged a suppression of Fascism in Germany or elsewhere by force from outside. The overthrow of Nazism must be the task of the German people and no one else.

Consequently when the total rejection of the Voroshilov Plan made war inevitable, the Soviet Union felt compelled into isolation. It wasn't going to play into the hands of people who wanted Hitler to advance through the obviously hopeless Polish resistance on to the Soviet borders, so that Russia would be left to wage a war single-handed, while the Siegfried Line held up any movement from the West and Hitler's Allies in the East attacked the Siberian side. The total inability of England and France to aid Poland showed how correct the Russians were in their estimation of the fix in which they would have been landed if they had let things drift. They had previously warned the world clearly that they would pull "no one's chestnuts out of the fire."

Their lone-hand strategy, however, has successfully broken up the Anti-Comintern; isolated Hitler from Franco, Mussolini, and Japan; worked strongly in China's favour; and finally by changing the whole balance of power in Eastern Europe has once for all entirely blocked

Hitler from any "expansion" into the Baltic or the Balkan areas. In view of this total change of the balance of power, so drastically to Hitler's disadvantage, the Soviet considers that a clever handling of the situation, by means of an international conference, could put Hitler "on the spot" without recourse to a world-war. And this is Russia's "enigma" and "betrayal!" Why Russia is so enigmatic in our world is that she keeps a consistent course and believes in principles!

JACK LINDSAY

Obituary

ELSIE BERRY

WE deeply regret to report the death of Elsie Berry at the early age of seventeen. With her parents she was a staunch Freethinker, a regular attendant at our meetings, and ready to do anything to assist that lay within her power. During the whole of her illness she showed the greatest patience, her chief concern being the grief her death would cause her parents. She was a girl of remarkable clarity of mind, and one who promised to be of great use to our movement. Those who knew her loved her, and her influence on those who had the pleasure of her acquaintance will have left with them the memory of a bright intelligence that has been too soon lost to the world. The sympathy of all will go out to Mr. and Mrs. Berry in the loss they have sustained.

A Secular Service was conducted at the graveside by Mr. J. T. Brighton.

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, Debate—"Should the Freethought Movement be Political?" *Affir.*: Allan Planders. *Neg.*: L. Ebury.

COUNTRY

INDOOR

BIRKENHEAD BRANCH N.S.S. (Beechcroft Settlement): 7.0, Dr. Elizabeth Berndt—"Dreams and Dream Interpretations."
GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (McLellan Galleries, Sauchiehall Street): 3.0, Mr. Andrew Stewart—"Can We Save Civilization?"
LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 3.0, Chapinan Cohen—"Fifty Years of Freethought."
STOCKTON (Jubilee Hall): 2.45, Mr. J. T. Brighton—"Fighting for Freedom."

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

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 PROPHECIES AND BROKEN P. OMISES. 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.

CREED AND CHARACTER

The Influence of Religion on Racial Life.

By

CHAPMAN COHEN.

Price 2d.

Postage 1d.

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

Letters To a Country Vicar

BY

CHAPMAN COHEN

Paper 1s. Postage 2d. Cloth, gilt 2s. Postage 3d.

History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science

BY

Prof. J. W. DRAPER

Price 2s.

Postage 4½d.

The Christian Sunday : Its History and Its Fruits

By A. D. McLAREN

Price 2d.

Postage ½d.

SEX and RELIGION

BY

GEORGE WHITEHEAD

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price - 9d. Postage 1d.

THE MIRACLES OF ST. MARTIN

BY

G. CLAYTON DOVE

Price post free

7d.

THE FOURTH AGE

By

WILLIAM REPTON.

Price 1s.

Postage 1d.

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

PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS IN MODERN THOUGHT

CHAPMAN COHEN

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

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

FOUR LECTURES on FREETHOUGHT and LIFE

By Chapman Cohen.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.)

Price - One Shilling. Postage 1 d.

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

The Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus

BY

W. A. GAMBELL

Cloth 2s. Postage 2d.

SOME CHRISTIAN TYPES

by

CRITICUS

Price 4d. By post 5d.

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

LETTERS TO THE LORD

Chapman Cohen

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

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

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

220 pages of Wit and Wisdom

BIBLE ROMANCES

By G. W. Foote

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

Price 2/6 Postage 3d.

Well printed and well bound.

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

Historical Jesus and the Mythical Christ

BY

GERALD MASSEY

Price 6d. Postage 1d.

Footsteps of the Past

BY

J. M. WHEELER

Price 3s. 6d. Postage 3d.

Paganism in Christian Festivals

BY

J. M. WHEELER

Price 1s Postage 1½d.

Realistic Aphorisms and Purple Patches

By ARTHUR FALLOWS, M.A.

320 pages.

Paper Covers 3/6. Postage 4d.

(All Cloth copies sold).

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

By

G. W. FOOTE

Before LORD COLERIDGE in the
Court of Queen's Bench

Price 6d. Postage 1d.