

THE FREETHOUGHT REVIEW.

SCIENCE. RELIGION. PHILOSOPHY.

VOL. I.—No. 7.

WANGANUI, N.Z.: APRIL, 1, 1884.

PRICE: 6D. [6s per annum; or, post paid to any part of N.Z., 6s 6d.]

English politicians have just discovered that a vast mass of the population of the large cities is living in dwellings utterly unfit for human beings. The political economists are discredited by socialistic schemes of reform, and less is heard of cheap food and buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market. Lord Salisbury is in favor of applying the borrowing and taxing powers of the State to the erection of model dwellings. Mr. Chamberlain traces the evil to the ground landlord, and would make him find the remedy. The 'Saturday Review' thinks the discussions have established three things:—"First, the existing rookeries must come down as soon as possible. In the next place, it is manifest that the poverty of the poor, with the consequent degradation which make them put up with styes for homes, is the result of two main causes—over-population and drink. No laws, no reform, no franchise, no revolution, can do any good to the enormous class of Englishmen who love to drink." Over-population and drink, however, are due to the absence of the self-regarding qualities which follow upon education and the means of material comfort. The "causes" of the 'Saturday Review' are but the effects of economical causes associated with the laws governing the distribution of wealth. It is here the permanent remedy must be looked for.

And will "no laws, no reform, no franchise, no revolution" do good? This is just the problem that awaits solution. It is not in socialism the remedy ought to be sought until political economy and individualism have failed. Now there is one natural and economical law that has not been discredited—namely, that the supply shall not, without suffering depreciation, exceed the demand. The working classes have yet to understand that if they increase their number at a rate faster than that in which they can be maintained in a state of comfort, degradation must follow. If again the laws, by artificial arrangements, foster the hoarding of wealth in the hands of the few, the many will be impoverished. Let social reforms go on apace, but we incline strongly to the opinion that the secret of promoting the prosperity of the mass is in political rather than social reform; or in other words, that social improvement must follow those changes which political justice demands.

The Congregational Union, meeting about the same time as the Presbyterian Assembly, passed a resolution unanimously in favor of the existing secular system of education. The Rev. Mr. Treadwell must have been unconscious of the fact when he spoke as follows:—"They did not owe the secular system of education to the churches. They knew that the Roman Catholic Church insisted upon the children of her communion being taught her own special belief. There was a grand unity running through the diversities of the various religious denominations, and there could be no difficulty, in

consequence of that unity, in the matter of religious education. He believed the existing secular system was a concession to the Freethinkers. It was to that section of the community that the secular Education Act had been thrown as a sop by the Government of the land." This *rapprochement* of hostile communions is apparently due to the action of the Freethinkers, who seem to have created a feeling of alarm in the breasts of the doughty lieutenants of the Lord of Hosts. The "unity" however is not yet complete: one sect holds aloof, while the Catholics haughtily reject the alliance except on terms humiliating to the sons of the Reformation. The Rev. Mr. Calder, another Presbyterian Minister, assumed a reassuring tone, remarking;—"He did not believe that statesmen, looking at the thing merely from the standpoint of a politician, would for a moment put the avowed Freethinkers of this colony against the combined influence of the churches, were the churches at all united among themselves." There is a fine touch of political philosophy in the way the power of the majority is here invoked. Politicians depend on the breath of the majority we know, and if the Education Act had no more friends than avowed Freethinkers, it would not long remain free, secular, and compulsory. The salvation of the system may be found after all in the fact, that the "united churches" are not the equivalent of a majority of the adult males of the colony, and that the Freethinkers are more numerous than statistics show them to be.

The Rev. Mr. Fraser at the same meeting soared in the region of antithesis and syllogism. "He was an advocate (he said) of a compulsory system of education, but not of a free system. He did not think a free system was at all a corollary of a compulsory system. The State compelled a man to see that his child was fed—it did not feed it; to see that the child was properly clothed—it did not clothe it; so that free education was by no means a necessary consequence of a compulsory system." The style is wonderfully conclusive. It is simply not true that the State acknowledges or discharges any such responsibility as to see that children are properly fed and clothed. The theory is purely socialistic. The following syllogistic argument is *not* from Thomas Aquinas, but is evidently Mr. Fraser's own:—"It was the duty of the State to provide for the moral and intellectual training of its subjects. The basis of all government was good citizenship, the basis of good citizenship was morality, and the basis of morality was the nature of God. The State that did not instruct its people in the nature of God could not imbue them with sound morality, and therefore it cut away the basis of good citizenship, and destroyed the end [the beginning?] of its existence." If *all* government is founded on good citizenship and the nature of God, how is it we have bad governments? Does it arise from bad instruction? Then who are to give the good instruction? The priests? Of course