

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXX.—No. 23

SUNDAY, JUNE 5, 1910

PRICE TWOPENCE

The thought of death deceives us; for it causes us to neglect to live.—VAUVENARGUES.

Views and Opinions.

INSTEAD of writing a formal article I propose to let what I have to say this week, and perhaps next week, take the shape of paragraphs. This will enable me to ease my mind on several topics, and perhaps to entertain my readers with an agreeable variety. At least I hope so. Nor will the absence of the formal article from my pen matter very much for a week or two. I have written some fifteen hundred articles, first and last, for the *Freethinker*, and I dare say the world would continue to go round at the same old rate if I never wrote another.

* * *

Amongst the books I took away with me on my holiday was Oscar Wilde's *Intentions*. It is the ninth volume of the new twelve-volume edition of his works, and contains some of his most characteristic prose. I am not recommending it to my readers; it would only repay a very special few of them for the trouble of perusal. Nothing seems to me more extraordinary than the idea, which some people entertain, that Oscar Wilde was a great writer. His plays are cleverly written, but on stock themes; their novelty is not in their subjects or treatment, but in the constant and sometimes strained effort at wit, which is often more verbal than substantial. His poems are frequently fantastic, and rarely, if ever, strike the large universal note. His paradoxes are too apt to run into mere nonsense or perversity. He gets new views of things by standing on his head. He takes a proverb or a truism and turns it upside down. Slow readers take it momentarily for a stroke of genius and a notable discovery; and before they can perceive how they have been caught the con-jurer passes on to the next performance. Generally speaking, it seems to me that Wilde is a shallow poser, with all the egotistical airs that such men must give themselves to maintain the imposition upon their readers. But, after all, there was *something* in Oscar Wilde, if he had only possessed the sincerity to do it justice. He was a born poser. He posed to the very last in *De Profundis*. Not even his downfall and his terrible punishment could burn up the filthy rags of his vanity. His great defect, and his ruin as a writer, was that he could not be sincere. But now and then, and no doubt quite unconsciously, he drops "monkeying" and talks like a man; and in these lucid intervals he occasionally utters a true thought in an interesting way. Take the following instance:—

"England has done one thing: it has invented and established Public Opinion, which is an attempt to organise the ignorance of the community, and to elevate it to the dignity of physical force."

The taint of Wilde's literary vices is still here, but it need not blind us to the fact that he has, if somewhat perversely, stated a real and important truth.

* * *

I thought of that sentence a good deal on the funeral day of the late King Edward VII. There is, of course, a Public Opinion that is indispensable to the very existence of human society. But that is something very different from the Public Opinion of

1,506

the day and hour, which one reads of in the newspapers and hears shouted from the housetops; it is the mental and moral pressure, age after age, of society upon the individual. That pressure, however, is balanced by the pressure of the most energetic, original, and gifted individuals upon society. Now this is what the noisy Public Opinion of the day and hour either ignores or seeks to drown. At present it is chiefly expressed through, and mainly organised by, what is called "the press," and by the spokesmen and principal representatives of public bodies. And this is one of the great dangers of what is called democracy. During the fortnight between King Edward's death and King Edward's burial the newspapers, without a single exception that I am aware of, worked up the people into a perfect fever of "loyalty." The wretched sentimentalism, couched in wretched English, which appeared day after day—each day's performance necessarily outdoing its predecessor's—was the most disgraceful exhibition that has been witnessed in my time. And the ease with which the nation was intoxicated and befooled bears witness to a certain amount of truth in the assertion of England's decadence. Some people were disgusted at the use being made of the King's dead body. Instead of a decent funeral, marked by such grief as was natural to the occasion, there was a stage-managed display of the Barnum and Bailey order; the whole circus-show being obviously got-up by the ruling classes who see that the masses may be bamboozled, and therefore governed and exploited, by means of their inherited monarchical sentiments. When I was going home from the first Jubilee show, in 1887, I said to my dear old friend and colleague, Joseph Mazzini Wheeler, "Here is something that threatens to swamp us all." It was a splendid display of militarism. Nothing else in the life of England was represented. It was the Widow of Windsor and her Army and Navy. Every monarchical exhibition since has been better organised and more effective. One fancies the climax was reached at King Edward's funeral. But you never can tell. What is certain is that the great circus-show, and the hysterics of the newspapers, and the silly impertinence of municipal bodies, produced a Public Opinion which made the slightest dissent positively dangerous. The Socialists were cowed, the Labor Party were cowed. Only a few old Republicans showed a stiff upper lip. And the cream of the bad joke was that the most hypocritical nation on earth was once more playing the hypocrite on a national scale. Every city clerk, every girl typewriter, went into mourning; as cheaply as possible, of course; the general symbol of grief was a shilling black tie. Nine-tenths of the farce was played through fear. Smith was afraid of Jones, Jones was afraid of Brown, and all three were afraid of Robinson, who was equally afraid of them. It was the thing to wear black; the newspapers said so, the new King said so, the upper classes said so; and all the flunkeys cried "Amen!" So the mob wore black, and looked daggers at the few rational people who object to being told what they shall wear, and fail to perceive any real connection between black raiment and a sorrowing heart.

I was seeking health away from home on the day of King Edward's funeral, but my eldest daughter

wrote telling me that a Memorial Service was held at the bandstand on the cliffs of the town in which I reside, and that the master of the ceremonies was the Chairman of the Entertainments Committee. The docile crowd allowed these gentlemen to tell them when they were expected to stand up, uncover their heads, and look devout.

English crowds are famous for their "good behavior." Yes, and so are sheep. Before praising people, or blaming them, we should know the facts. Macaulay remarked that a man might be above revenge or below it. A crowd, also, may be above or below rioting. It may be self-controlled or cowardly. I am afraid that my countrymen's docility means that they have hardly a kick left in them. They certainly put up with more aristocratic and official insolence than they did forty or fifty years ago. Millions more of them have the vote now, and fancy it means everything, whereas it means nothing without enlightenment, courage, and self-respect.

Do not let the reader suppose that I am writing politics in the *Freethinker*,—above all, party politics. The man who thinks that another person was born to govern him is not a politician. He is a slave. Hereditary power over others is a thing which no new nation ever sets up. It only exists in old countries. It comes down by inheritance from a barbarous and superstitious past. All the dialectical hocus-pocus in the world cannot obscure this fact. Professor Frazer, one of our greatest masters of the science of society, has conclusively shown that kingship, for instance, has always and everywhere rested upon a basis of superstition. Our own King is still Defender of the Faith. The very coinage declares that he reigns by the grace of God—though the declaration is half-concealed in abbreviated Latin. The King's coronation is, indeed, a religious ceremony from beginning to end; and the coronation oath pledges him to maintain the Protestant religion against the Catholic religion, which he has to brand as false and idolatrous. He becomes the head of the Established Church, and appoints (ostensibly, at least, through his ministry) all the Bishops. He is thus an ecclesiastical as well as a political functionary. And this has been the law of monarchical government from the days of the remotest Pharaohs to the days of Nicholas of Russia, and Francis Joseph of Austria, and William of Germany, and Alfonso of Spain, and Edward of England (George isn't coronated yet).

Whenever a king rebelled against the theocratic yoke he was marked out for destruction. The greatest power was not the throne, but the power behind the throne. Those who witnessed *False Gods*, by Brioux, at His Majesty's Theatre, will remember the scene between Pharaoh and the High Priest. The former lost his temper in the quarrel and drew his dagger, but the representative of the gods, so admirably personated by Sir H. B. Tree, only smiled at the king's violence, and asked him where his power would be if he were denounced as having incurred the divine anger. Pharaoh put up his dagger at once and cooled down. Not the power before the footlights, but the power behind the scenes, was supreme.

Lobengula, the Zulu chief, whom we treated so badly, laughed at the mystery men of his nation and called them the greatest wretches and scoundrels in his dominions. This was in a private conversation with some white visitors, who asked him why he did not hunt them out of the country. He smiled and shrugged his great shoulders. He could not afford to quarrel with the mystery men. If he did so he knew that he would not live a week. He told his visitors so. He was wiser than they.

When the band strikes up "God Save the King" (which is not a great tune, and the words are

despicable) the average Englishman takes off his hat and looks in it devoutly, as if he were in church. And he is in church,—not bodily, but mentally. He gives himself up to a religious emotion. The King is almost as much an abstraction as God. Directly the breath was out of Queen Victoria's body the deification of the ex-Prince of Wales began. In a few weeks he became a different personage altogether. One now beholds the apotheosis of another ex-Prince of Wales. The truth is that the attributes belong to the office. They go with the throne and crown. Divine right and the grace of God are an ample antiseptic even to the vices of a George the Fourth.

My own view of Kings—or other hereditary functionaries—is the view of Milton, of Shelley, of Byron, of Landor, and of Swinburne. Political and social ostracism is the penalty of my Freethought, but it does not terrify me, it does not diminish my self-respect. Mentally, I have always lived in the best society. To how many men in England did George Meredith write as he did to me? My "wicked" opinions on most subjects are those of the *élite* of mankind. I labor and fight for something better than the prizes of "the world." What is wealth, what is high position, what is popularity, compared with a tribute like the following from a working man who is a wide reader and a deep thinker, and a solid and excellent writer?

"I was glad to see that you were able to occupy the chair at the Conference. I should like to have been there too. When I lived in London I never missed a lecture of yours, and I used to walk home to my lodgings oblivious to everything, with my feet in the gutter and my head among the stars. That was nearly twenty years ago. But what a glorious time it was! Life was worth living then."

That tribute has touched me. I also remember those old days—and how I lavished my mental and physical vitality on those lectures, after putting no end of work into the *Freethinker*. I never thought of who were listening to me. It was too much a labor of love for that. Yet good men and women have told me from time to time, with the thanks that go perilously near the fountain of tears, how they profited by hearing me. Yes, my work has not been in vain; and it has been for what Meredith, in one of the letters that I prize above gold, called "the noblest of causes." I envy no king, or aristocrat, or plutocrat. I am satisfied with my lot. I would not change it for the proudest or wealthiest position in the world. I have better than blue blood in my veins. I share in my humble degree the best blood on earth—the blood of the Pioneers. G. W. FOOTE.

The Providential Order.

BUTLER'S famous *Analogy* was a triumphant reply to the Deistic arguments against Christianity. Addressed to believers in God, that great treatise may be thus summarised: The objections which you raise against Christianity, and on account of which you reject it, might be levelled, with equal relevancy, against the whole course of Nature; and if you loved consistency you would disbelieve in the latter as well. It was a thoroughly sound argument. Taking it "for proved that there is an intelligent Author of Nature and natural Governor of the world," there is no escape from the inevitable conclusion that, if there is a similarity between the course of Nature and what is called religion, whether natural or revealed, it is not logically permissible to formulate an argument against the latter from anything of a like character in the former. But whilst Butler's reasoning was eminently calculated to silence the Deists, it was equally fitted to weaken the case for religion. There is no evidence, however, that the decay of Deism in Great Britain was attributable to the influence exerted by the *Analogy*. In fact, there arose thoughtful divines who perceived that Butler's

argument, logically handled, so far from establishing the truth of religion, could be effectively employed against the belief in the existence of a Benevolent Deity; and it is probable that the collapse of Deism was due, not to the triumph of Christian Theism, but to the perception of its inherent unreasonableness.

And yet there are theologians to-day who are under the dominion of the Butlerian method of reasoning. For example, in "The Correspondence Column of Rev. Professor David Smith, D.D.," in the *British Weekly* for May 26, an attempt is made to answer a pertinent question propounded by a theological student. The question, briefly stated, is this: If Christ was God's gift to men, why was he sent only to a small section of the world, and at a period when countless myriads of people had already lived and died without him; and why is it that even now, after nineteen hundred years, the overwhelming majority of mankind still live and die without him? This is a staggering problem which puts the stoutest intellect on its mettle. Professor Smith is afraid to face it, but contents himself with winking at it from a safe distance. Adopting the Butlerian style, he says:—

"The problem for you is why the bestowal of a blessing so desirable has been so tardy and so partial; and you have only to state it thus to perceive that it is not an isolated problem. That is the constant method of the Providential Order. Think of the blessings of civilisation. None of them has ever burst upon mankind like the morning light. They have all been tardily discovered, hardly won, and gradually appropriated; and at this moment, while Europe is bewitched with cunning inventions, there are myriads of mankind still in savagery. This is the providential method, and it is foolish to cry out against it. The Providential Order is an established fact, and our business is not to criticise it, but to accept it, and accommodate ourselves to it."

That is how Professor Smith burkes the inquirer's question. He *assumes* that Christ is God's gift to men, "and that it were good for mankind to know him and enjoy his influence"; but he cannot get away from the fact that only to a tiny fraction of the race has the beneficent and saving knowledge of him ever come. He admits that here there is an insurmountable difficulty; but, instead of trying to remove it, he deliberately evades it by diverting the inquirer's attention to another difficulty of a similar kind. It is as if he said: "Yes, what you point out is a great mystery, but do not feel discouraged, because it is by no means an isolated mystery; the Universe teems with similar mysteries." We have now two assumptions to deal with; the first, that Christ is a gift of God, and, the second, that the slow evolution of civilisation in certain parts of the globe, while there has been none in other portions, indicates "a Providential Order," which we are bound to accept, and have no right to question. Professor Smith congratulates the theological student upon his recognising that Christ is a gift of God, and then consoles him in his dilemma by exclaiming, "That is the constant method of the Providential Order." Judging by the tone of his question, one feels quite sure that the theological student will not be satisfied with such a palpable evasion of the issue that he raised. What the inquirer asks for is some light on the dark enigma, and what he gets is another enigma, equally puzzling, ostentatiously thrown at him, with the strange direction, "Put them side by side, and be comforted by the fact that, though wholly inexplicable to us, they represent God's invariable method of working."

"The Providential Order" is the intellectual coward's refuge. Whatever he cannot explain, whatever perplexes the understanding, whatever seems to block the way of faith is coolly referred to as illustrating "the Providential Order." As a matter of fact, however, "the Providential Order" is a theological illusion of the deepest dye. At best, "the blessings of civilisation" are often highly doubtful commodities. Civilisation, as every student of history knows, is nothing but social polish, refinement, culture, the exact character of which is determined by a great variety of conditions, which are now

being carefully investigated by sociologists. But even to imagine that civilisation is a gift of God is to give God an intolerably bad character. Is it to the honor and glory of "the Providential Order" that, "while Europe is bewitched with cunning inventions, there are myriads of mankind still in savagery"? It is easy enough to say that "one of the lessons which history teaches is that there is a purpose behind all the seeming confusion, and that the long circuit has ever been the best road to the goal," but if that were true there would be nothing in all history to condemn. Every bloody war, every bitter controversy, every cruel persecution, every heartless tyranny, every foul massacre, on whatever scale, every deed of darkness, of whatever kind, would be fully justified, being all indispensable to the working out of the purpose. Is Dr. Smith prepared to endorse that? Logically, he must be; but the moment he does so his loving Heavenly Father becomes an Almighty Fiend.

Professor Smith's treatment of "the Providential Order" is anything but complimentary and kind. The inquirer wished to know why Christ was born, lived, and taught "among the Jews, and not among the intellectual Greeks or the scientific Chinese." The Professor is surprised that his College discipline has not purged the student's mind of that crude stuff; and we are fully as surprised that his life-discipline has not purged the Professor's mind of the following much cruder stuff. He says:—

"Grace is the heart of the Gospel, and therefore the Savior came where he was most needed. He surveyed the wide world, and he saw no corner of it so dark, so despoised, so sorrowful as the little land of Palestine, and so he said: 'There will I make my earthly home; that shall be the scene of my gracious visitation.'"

Look on that picture, and look also on this, and then compare the two:—

"Surely you have never studied the amazing, the indisputably miraculous history of Israel, or you would have recognised that Palestine was the only possible cradle of Christianity. Nothing comes without preparation, and the history of Israel was the providential *preparatio evangelica*. Has your mind never been fascinated by those transcendent miracles of the Old Testament—Prophecy, Sacrifice, the Messianic Hope? The suggestion that Christ could have appeared elsewhere than in the land of Israel, the stage which had been a-building during long centuries of wise and patient providence for the enactment of the drama of the Incarnation, is a provoking ineptitude."

Holding those two extracts face to face, one is tempted to ask whether the student or the Professor is the victim of "a provoking ineptitude." According to the one passage, the little land of Palestine was the darkest, most despoised, and most sorrowful corner on earth, and Christ chose it as the scene of his "gracious visitation" because of its supreme need; but, according to the other, Palestine was a specially favored spot, the land occupied by Heaven's chosen people, who for many centuries had been under Divine tuition, with the one object of preparing them for the advent of the Christ. Where lies the "provoking ineptitude" now?

"The Providential Order" has calamitously broken down in Dr. Smith's own hands. His very treatment of it has covered it with everlasting disgrace. The theology of "the Providential Order" is thus seen to be an extremely "crude stuff" indeed. It contradicts itself at every turn. It is the most self-destructive thing under heaven. Faith in it is of necessity blind, and faith, in the Christian sense, is not faith unless it is blind, perfect blindness being its strongest recommendation. The hymn puts this very well:—

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust him for his grace;
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face."

Judging history "by feeble sense" it is heavy with confusion, and there is often nothing else visible; but judging it by faith the confusion is simply "seeming," and it becomes shot through with an increasing purpose. When one uses one's reason

and points out the horrible cruelty, the terrible injustice, the degrading oppression, and the death-dealing selfishness, the retort is instantly made that all these dreadful evils are but the instruments God employs in "working his Sovereign Will." We cannot see "his bright designs" because they are treasured up "deep in unfathomable mines of never-failing skill." But this is only faith's futile attempt to justify its own blindness. The eternal purposes, the "bright designs," never show themselves. Nature is fundamentally inconsistent with Divine Benevolence. All we can see is a more or less orderly development, with no trace of an intelligent purpose anywhere. What Nature is, and why she works, what we ourselves are, and why we are what we are, this is as yet an unsolved problem; and Dr. Smith knows no more about it than the theological student who appealed to him for guidance. The Professor makes this learned quotation from Pico-dilla Mirandola: "Philosophy seeks for Truth; Theology finds it; Religion possesses it." Only the first clause is true, the other two being but vain, dogmatic assertions, absolutely insusceptible of verification.

J. T. LLOYD.

Freethought and Reform.—II.

(Continued from p. 338)

It is necessary to guard against misunderstanding by pointing out that I am not claiming that man, at any stage of his evolution, is independent of the material or economic side of his environment. In the make up of the whole man everything has to be considered; and at no stage does the influence of climate, soil, food, and, at a more advanced stage, rate of wages, and housing, cease to exert influence on his mental and moral nature. It is a question of the relative importance of various factors, and also whether certain forces, having arisen in the course of human evolution, these later factors may not overshadow the earlier ones. In other words, the question at issue between the militant Freethinker and the Freethinker who argues that, to change religious opinions we must first change the economic conditions, is ultimately one of the nature of the social forces. And not merely social forces, for man is not the only social member of the animal world, but the distinctively human social forces. Is it correct to argue that morality and religion, the whole mental and moral life of man, is the expression of mere economic groupings? Are there qualities of human nature that do not arise out of the economic conditions? Or do material conditions give rise to qualities that so increase in importance that they eventually become dominant? If we answer the first question in the affirmative, then all direct Freethought propaganda is waste of time, and our influence on opinion is illusory. We have to change our plan and modify the economic conditions direct. If the latter questions are answered in the affirmative, our policy of attack is not only justified, but it becomes a powerful instrument of social advancement.

In what follows I hope to show that the purely social forces are, as a matter of fact, really psychic in character, and their manipulation, therefore, becomes a problem in social psychology. And this problem presents itself in both an objective and a subjective aspect; each of which will be dealt with in its order.

First of all, we may note that in human evolution it is the growth of mind and the stored up products of mind that are of paramount importance. Although the picture is neither historically nor scientifically accurate, we can at least conceive a time when man is so subject to thermal fluctuations, to variations in the food supply, or other physical conditions, and so dependent upon his personal strength for protection from attack that the material aspect of his surroundings is all powerful. But man guards himself against

attack by inventing weapons, against extremes of heat and cold by clothing and shelter; he gradually annihilates distance by methods of locomotion, other instruments add to his personal qualities by increasing their efficiency or remedying their defects. In a thousand and one ways mental qualities increase in strength and importance, while physical qualities become of relatively less importance. In other words, the whole story of human development is substantially the record of the development of the power and efficiency of the human mind.

In saying what I have said, more has been conceded than is actually necessary. For man never is wholly at the mercy of his material environment, nor does he ever pay the full penalty of individual weaknesses. Man starts his existence, as man, as a gregarious being, with untold generations of animal gregariousness behind him. But in saying this we are lifting social life away from the dominance of economics altogether. For gregariousness is not something that depends upon economic forces; it is the other way about—economic forces depend upon gregariousness. Gregariousness, in other words, is not a physical but a psychological fact. It depends for its existence upon feelings of sympathy that lead us to look to others for companionship, upon a feeling of confidence that one's fellows will act loyally towards one, upon the conviction that justice will be observed between ourselves and others, and upon a general sense of the duty of subordinating self in the interests of the whole. And in saying this I am saying that human life—and by that is meant social life, for there is no real human life apart from social existence—rests upon a psychological foundation, and lives by constant appeal to certain feelings and ideas.

Human life never did and never will rest upon a purely economic basis. To assume that it does is to commit the mistake of the old school of political economists, with their "economic man," although in another direction. Most political economists are compelled to admit the existence of certain "needs"—the need for leisure, literature, art, music, social intercourse, etc.; which is really an admission that you can neither ground society on economic conditions nor modify its structure without considering other factors.

And these desires—purely mental in character—are not only irreducible to economic conditions, but they overshadow them and become the transforming power of social, civilised life. To satisfy them men will set material advantages at naught. No amount of economic advantage will make good their absence. Without the satisfaction arising from music, literature, art, the search for scientific truth, or the satisfied sympathy that comes from social intercourse, life becomes hardly worth the living. These desires even determine new social forms and institutions. The growth of the platform, the press, clubs, and the hundred and one institutions for social intercourse, are all so many proofs of this. Nay, in the absence of these desires any alteration in the material or economic conditions is an impossibility. For what is the first step in an economic revolution but to arouse in a dormant class the appetite for pleasures to which they are oblivious. The pig that has no desires beyond the sty cannot be lifted out of its unclean environment; or, if it is lifted, it is by no effort of its own, but by the reflected desires of other pigs of a more cleanly nature. There is no greater obstacle to reform than the absence of a desire for better things in the class that most needs reforming, and no surer certainty of its realisation than the creation of strong desires of the right character.

Not only does social life thus rest upon a psychological basis, but the struggle for existence in human societies—and also in many animal societies—can only be properly expressed in terms of psychology. By union with his fellows man does not pay, as he would otherwise, the price of his individual shortcomings. If he has neither the strength nor the inclination for fighting, he may serve society in some other capacity. If neither strong enough nor skilful enough for one kind of labor, he may take up with

another. The division of labor provides him with the scope for his peculiar qualities, while the integration of the social parts gives them their due value. His fitness to survive is not therefore expressed in terms of his individual capacity to secure his own food and guard his own life, but in terms of his fitness to form a part of the social organism. It is this fact, and this fact alone, that can at all justify our likening society to an organism. Society is an organism because its parts are so linked together that they would not be what they are but for the association. And man's fitness to survive is expressed—certain necessary conditions granted—in terms of his mental and moral capacity for forming part of the social structure.

For the environment to which man has to adapt himself to become, in Leslie Stephens' phrase, a "cell in the social tissue," is, in an increasingly powerful degree, a mental environment. The most important parts of the human environment is the mental life of the past as transmitted in institutions, language, etc., and the mental states of all who compose a particular human group. Each individual mind is undoubtedly the function of a particular physical structure, but when we come to seek for the meaning of the contents of the individual mind, we are forced back for an explanation, very largely, upon its relations to other minds. In other words, man's mind is essentially a *group* mind. This is seen if we ask ourselves by what means man becomes a member of a social group? Not by a community of social needs—food, clothing, shelter—else a European would be socially at one with a Bushman or a South Sea Islander. A man is a member of a European society, and not of an Asiatic group, or *vice versa*, in virtue of his joining in a common set of ideas, beliefs, and moral aptitudes. In other words, it is the possession of a common mental life that constitutes a human society, and social life only commences with the formation of this common mental life—a process that began with man's gregarious animal ancestors. The same truths hold of smaller social groups, formed by classes within the State. Politicians, artists, and all the other social classes owe their existence as a class to a mental life they live in common. Destroy this and the social group disappears entirely.

The first to give this truth a scientific form was, I think, George Henry Lewes, although it is to be found in substance in Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. So far back as 1879 Lewes said:—

"The distinguishing character of human psychology is, that to the three great factors, organism, external medium, and heredity, which it has in common with animal psychology, it adds a fourth, namely, relation to a social medium, with its product, the general mind."*

And again:—

"The experiences of each individual come and go; they correct, enlarge, destroy one another, leaving behind them a certain residual store, which condensed in intuitions and formulated in principles, direct and modify all future experiences. The sum of these is designated as the individual mind. A similar process evolves the General Mind—the residual store of experiences common to all. By means of language the individual shares in the general fund, which thus becomes for him an impersonal objective influence..... Men living always in groups co-operate like the organs in an organism. Their actions have a common impulse and a common end. Their desires bear the common stamp of an impersonal direction. Much of their life is common to all. The roads, market places, and temples are for each and all. The experiences, the dogmas, and the doctrines are for each and all. Customs arise and are formulated in laws, the restraint of all. The customs born of the circumstances, immanent in the social conditions, are consciously extricated and prescribed as the rules of life; each new generation is born in the social medium and has to adapt itself to the established forms..... A nation, a tribe, a sect, is the medium of the individual mind, as a sea, a river, or a pond is the medium of a fish."†

It is in this way that the determining factor in every social group becomes, in a rapidly increasing

measure, its psychological life. Even were it granted that in the very earliest stages of human life physical conditions determine association, it still remains true that this association can only be maintained and cemented by the development of a mental and moral life held in common. A church, a society, is held together, not in virtue of any common economic advantage—all experience shows that this is of all bonds the weakest upon which to rely for co-operation—it is a common mental life, in which each member of the association has a share. And this truth holds equally well of the larger group, the State or the nation. After all, the differences in the relation of master and servant, or the modes of producing and distributing food all over the world, do not differ nearly so much as the mental characteristics of different peoples. Consequently, it is not in that which is most common to all, but in that which differs most with all that the reason for social differentiation is to be found. Sociology, if it is to be scientific, becomes more and more a study of the interaction of minds and mind forms, with a study of those objective conditions that hasten or retard mental development.

C. COHEN.

(To be continued.)

A King's View of Death.

"Death and his brother sleep."—SHELLEY.

MONARCHS have rarely been philosophers. Frederick the Great delighted in the society of Freethinkers and attracted the best brains of Europe to his court. Catherine of Russia befriended Diderot, and Marguerite of Valois, to her eternal credit, held out her hands to the Freethinkers of her day, at a time when to avow heterodox opinions was a matter of life and death. Once only, however, has a philosopher sat on the world's throne and materialised the dream of Plato, who sighed for the fulfilment of his ideal of a philosopher-king.

Marcus Aurelius was no "feather-bed soldier." His philosophy was thought out amid the storm and stress of battle and the elation of victory. What others learnt in calm he learnt in tempest. The most perfect expression of old-world philosophy was produced to the dread monotone of war. Far away on the wide Roman marshes might be heard the endless, ceaseless sound of beating horses hoofs and marching feet of men. The enemy was gathering in multitudes. Who could say what the morrow would bring forth?

The Emperor died in the camp. "Why weep for me?" were his last words. They were characteristic of the noblest Roman of them all. His legacy to posterity was his book of "Meditations," which he never intended for publication and in which he recorded his reflections on life and death.

This life, he tells us, is all that concerns us:—

"Though you were destined to live three thousand or, if you please, thirty thousand years, yet remember that no man can lose any other life than that which he lives now, and neither is he possessed of any other than that which he loses."

Epicurus bade his followers depart from life as a satisfied guest from a banquet. Marcus Aurelius, in sterner language, bids us leave life's stage as an actor who has performed his part. It is the same view of things which has caused the "Meditations" of Marcus Aurelius to become, in Renan's phrase, "the gospel of those who do not believe in the supernatural." It is this wise Secularism which takes tired people back to Marcus Aurelius when all other philosophers have failed them. What a book might be written of the great men who came to the "Meditations" in the bad moments, when fame and fortune and honor itself seemed unreal. For, by the irony of fate, this austere wearer of the imperial purple has become the great consoler of men. His golden book of the "Meditations" is one of the most

* *The Study of Psychology*, p. 139.

† *Study of Psychology*, pp. 161-6.

precious heritages handed down the centuries by the Masters of the World.

"Great minds jump together," and Shakespeare, the uncrowned king of the world's literature, held the same views as the Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, on the subject of death. Listen to his deep utterance:

"We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."

Claudius' imaginary fears of death are silenced by the Duke in *Measure for Measure*—

"Thy best of rest is sleep,
And that thou oft provokest,
Yet grossly fear'st
Thy death, which is no more."

The permanent direction of Shakespeare's thought was towards Secularism. On the deeper grounds of religious faith his silence is most remarkable. Often as his questionings turn to the riddle of the universe he leaves it a riddle to the last, disdaining the common theological solutions around him. For dramatic reasons he brings Hamlet's father's ghost "piping hot from purgatory"; but his thought is that death is the "bourne whence no traveller returns." When Hamlet dies he is made to utter the significant words, "The rest is silence."

The Master saw in the scheme of human things a mystery too complex to be confronted with the trite, trumpery tergiversation of theology. He deals with the deepest issues but he never points to the Cross as the solution. In an age when religious wars and schisms were convulsing Europe it is remarkable that he regarded Secularism as the true philosophy of life. It is well. His splendid genius is the interpreter of "the soul of the wide world dreaming on things to come."

MIMNERMUS.

Acid Drops.

Now that the hysteria connected with the death of Edward the Seventh is beginning to subside, some of the better class writers on the daily press seem a trifle ashamed of the immoderate and senseless eulogies that were poured forth—doubtless to order. Nothing like a balanced judgment on the late King was attempted, or permitted. In fact, had one taken all the eulogies seriously, one would have had to accept the theory that for the past nine years at least the only force that counted in the world's affairs was Edward VII. Had Spencer been alive he would have found some useful illustrations to add to his contemptuous denunciation of that social supernaturalism—the worship of the great man. We observe that even *John Bull* had the impertinence to suggest that a whip should be laid about the shoulders of the editor of a certain Welsh paper who had dared say that the death of the King would make no difference to the mass of the people. Evidently we are in a bad way.

We are also pleased to note that protests are being raised in several quarters against the character of the procession that accompanied the King's body through the streets. As usual in such cases, the military folk were everywhere, except where the clergy occupied space. Art, literature, science, industry, commerce, were unrepresented. Even the "Gentlemen of the House of Commons" were ignored. All that a great and civilised nation ought to be proud of was left on one side. Brute force and stupid cunning, the army and the clergy, were held up as the real representatives of English life. Much was said of the mediæval splendor of the procession, and there certainly could be no doubt as to its mediæval spirit. It was mediæval even to the leading of the horse behind the coffin. In earlier times the horse would have been killed on the grave, so that its ghost might serve the ghost of its master in the next world. We have outgrown the phase of the ceremony that gave it a real significance, but retain it when it is quite meaningless, except so far as it serves to impress a befooled populace. And with a population mourning to order, the only one we can feel certain about is the little dog that followed the corpse. And even in its case intelligent good feeling might have left the poor creature at home.

The person we feel that most deserves our sympathy is ex-President Roosevelt. The poor man was obliged to

enter England in quite a tame manner. He, too, may have felt genuine sorrow at the King dying when he did.

"Old Moore" had better be careful, or else he will find that he has unconsciously founded a church. He forecasted the King's death and the Whitehaven disaster, and Isaiah and Jeremiah could not have done much more for a penny.

Oxford University canonised "General" Booth, and Cambridge University has feted "Teddy Bear" Roosevelt. The lineal descendant of George Washington did a lot of talking, but he did not apologise for his description of Paine as a "dirty little Atheist," which is a Yankee record of three lies in three words.

Little Paul Dombey asked his sister, "What are the wild waves saying?" If he toddled along the beach of most seaside resorts on a Sunday he would hear a lot of language concerning hell from flannel-mouthed mountebanks, who imagine that it is their mission to frighten little children with mediæval horrors culled from the Bible.

The Rev. Frederic Spurr, of Melbourne, is Christianly angry and piously abusive once more. This time it is not against *John Bull* that his wrath burns so hotly, but against the Melbourne Secularists, who seem to be multiplying rapidly by means of a vigorous propaganda carried on on the Yarra Bank and elsewhere. Naturally, the Churches resent the prosperity that attends the Secularist mission, and upon Mr. Spurr's initiative, "the Council of Churches undertook, on four blazing Sunday afternoons last December, the work of evangelising on the Yarra Bank." The undertaking proved a dismal disappointment. The evangelists were not welcomed by eager crowds, crying out for God and salvation, but experienced such determined opposition that the mission had to be discontinued. The people on the Yarra Bank were not the slaves of superstition, and the Council of Churches wisely retired, tacitly confessing that the enemy was too securely fortified to be dislodged by the emissaries of the Cross.

Mr. Spurr, however, challenged the Secularists to select their best man, whom he would gladly meet in debate. The debate came off six weeks ago, and Mr. Spurr admits that his "antagonist was an earnest, courteous man, who, throughout the debate, sustained himself with dignity." The reverend gentleman modestly refrains from "speaking of the merits, or otherwise, of the debaters," nor does he inform us what the result of the debate was. He does tell us, however, that the statements of his opponent "were applauded to the echo by a densely packed audience of men."

Our object in referring to this Melbourne debate is to emphasise the fact that Mr. Spurr, in his anger against the Secularists, is guilty of the grossest injustice towards them. He charges them with the offence of assailing Christianity in total ignorance of its true nature. Well, we challenge Mr. Spurr himself to tell us what Christianity really is. What he calls Christianity is repudiated as a damnable heresy by the great majority of professing Christians. He despises his opponent because "he quite imagined that the first of Genesis taught a creation of the Universe in six days of twenty-four hours"; but if the reverend gentleman is honest, he must admit that the view of creation attacked by his opponent has always been the generally accepted view, and that even to-day millions of Christians can tolerate no other. Moreover, it was clearly the view held by Biblical writers, as is shown in the law of the Sabbath (Exodus xx. 8-11). Undoubtedly, the Secularist was perfectly justified in attacking the Bible because of its scientific inaccuracies, as well as on other grounds.

If Mr. Spurr has sufficiently cooled down, he now probably regrets having written the letter which appears in the *Christian World* for May 26. Were the latter half of this communication to be made public in Melbourne, it would render an incalculable service to the cause of Secularism. Fancy a mediocre Baptist minister calling an accomplished scholar like John M. Robertson "a clever manipulator and myth-maniac," and characterising the biological teachings of such world-renowned giants as Professors Haeckel and Ray Lankester as "obsolete science." We heartily congratulate the Melbourne Secularists on possessing such an invaluable ally in disguise as the Rev. Frederic Spurr. His abuse of them is above price.

Mr. R. J. Campbell may now go his way rejoicing. In spite of all his philosophical and theological heresies, Dr.

Horton has at last pronounced a beatitude upon him. He is really a man to be envied and imitated, but on no account to be boycotted and excommunicated. In future, Dr. Horton is going to confine his curses to such degenerates as Haeckel and the militant Secularists. We have our consolation, however, in the fact that neither his curses nor his blessings are of the slightest account.

"If we could have the devotional atmosphere of the Church of Rome, combined with intellectual freedom, it would be ideal," said the Rev. R. J. Campbell, the other day. The Church of Rome knows its own business well enough, and it is not likely either to give freedom or relax its devotional atmosphere. If Mr. Campbell wants the "devotional atmosphere" of the Church of Rome he will have to go to Rome to enjoy it. And we should not be greatly surprised if, one day, he decided to take the step.

The Rev. R. Stuart King, rector of Leigh, Essex, explains in his parish magazine that the Rogation days date from the time of a fifth century bishop who called for a united act of humiliation and prayer that the plague might be averted. The Rev. R. S. King says "God's Hand still controls our destiny, and while such awful sins as drunkenness, unchastity, and irreligion abound, there is ample scope for public penance." It is a far cry from the fifth to the twentieth century, but the dear old stick-in-the-mud Christian religion does not move unless it is pushed. Petticoated priests live in a world of their own, and have no concern with the men and women around them.

Since the author of *Three Men in a Boat* depicted the "Man of Sorrows" as a paying-guest in a lodging-house in *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, the novelists have been getting bolder. Here is Mr. Coulson Kernahan, in *Dreams*, remarking that "when we come to die, and when God, the Great Humorist, shall, with a smile upon His lips, make clear the humorous side of it all to us, we shall laugh as unconcernedly as a man laughs at the tear-shedding of his childhood." In the days of faith this would have cost Mr. Kernahan a few smiles—on the rack.

In another novel, *Simon the Jester*, by W. J. Locke, we are told the high gods "have an elementary sense of humor—like that of the funny fellow who pulls your chair from under you and shrieks with laughter when you go wallop on to the floor." It is fortunate that hell has been abolished, or else we should tremble for Mr. Locke's eternal welfare.

Judge Arthur O'Connor, a Roman Catholic, told the Divorce Commission he did not believe in divorce under any conditions. He based his opinion "on Adam and Eve, and the primary institution of marriage in the Garden of Eden." What a curious back number Judge O'Connor must be! But he ought to reflect that the analogy is hardly a fair one. The opportunities possessed by Adam and Eve for furnishing occasion for a divorce were very limited indeed. And when opportunities for divorce did arise, Moses granted facilities, although it was a one-sided privilege possessed by the husband alone. Besides, one could hardly quote Genesis as a precedent in a court of law. Too little is known about the parties concerned; and the document itself is of such doubtful authenticity.

A lay speaker at the London Diocesan Conference, the other day, told the meeting some plain, if not pleasant, truths. The Bishop of Kensington had been complaining of the small number of communicants in London in proportion to the population. Whereupon Mr. S. Gay, of Enfield, told the assembly that in hundreds of parishes people would not go to church because the sermons were "rotten." Truth crushed to earth will rise again; but the suddenness of its ascent in this case is quite pyrotechnic in character.

Dr. Campbell Morgan says that we have no right to spend money on our pleasures, but are in duty bound to devote every penny we can spare to the support of the Church at home and abroad. But Foreign Missions are languishing for lack of funds, and the deficits of the Societies are becoming more alarming every year. Dr. Morgan is quite right when he says that the failure of Foreign Missions is due to the decay of loyalty to Christ in the home Churches. But the decay of loyalty to Christ is merely a symptom of the decay of faith in him, or, in other words, of the fact that Christianity is a dying superstition. Clever speakers like Dr. Morgan are still waited upon by eager throngs, but Christ, as Christ, is no longer attractive, and the crowds are deserting him.

An exceedingly fervent but woefully unintelligent man of God exclaimed the other day, "Jesus Christ is the Absolute." Since the "Absolute" means the self-existent, self-sufficing, unrelated, and unconditioned, it follows that Jesus Christ can be neither Savior nor Lord, nor can he stand in any relation whatever to mankind. The reverend gentleman was totally ignorant of the meaning of the word.

Mr. Keir Hardie has been giving French Socialists some advice on religion, which they no doubt heard with politeness, while mentally they "winked the other eye." He told them it was a mistake to leave Christianity as a monopoly in the hands of their opponents, because the "average man" cares about religion and will have it. He admits that Socialism on the Continent is "frankly materialistic," but adds that religion can only be neglected so long as Socialism is confined to "the intellectuals." Which looks as though Mr. Hardie, as a politician, is convinced that the average man needs a certain amount of humbug, and that this will be supplied by religion. Well, we do not gush about the average man quite so much as Mr. Keir Hardie, but we decline to accept the teaching that, while the truth may be all right for a few, it is not healthy for the many. We believe it is good all round, and the more of it the better. Perhaps, however, this was only Mr. Hardie's way of getting religion in somehow. He would have been laughed at had he talked about Socialism and religion as he has talked about them in England, and so religion is advised as good tactics. We do not know whether there is a French equivalent for the English advice about teaching one's grandmother to suck eggs, but if there is it must have been in the minds of many of his hearers during his speech.

"Religion," says Mr. Hardie, "made me a Socialist." Evidently he imagines that that settles the matter, and that those who leave religion out have something wanting. Well, what made Marx and Lassalle, to say nothing of the founders of English Socialism, Socialists? We beg leave to doubt the truth of the statement even in Mr. Keir Hardie's own case, but it is simply farcical if the confession is meant to imply that Socialism is based on religion. And if this is not intended, we have merely a confession of Mr. Hardie's personal idiosyncracies, of no particular value to anyone but himself.

Things are happening in America. The Presbyterians are becoming so filled with the thirst for reform that they are surrendering the good old Christian doctrine of the damnation of unbaptised infants. It was agreed at a General Assembly held in Lewisberg, Virginia, that for the future "It is not the belief of the Presbyterian Church in the United States that any infants dying are lost." Who will say, after this, that Christianity does not exert a civilising influence? It is true that infants born prior to 1910, and dying unbaptised, have all been damned; but in future unbaptised babies will be all right—thanks to the humanising influence of Christianity.

The Centre Congregational Church in New Haven, U.S.A., is also revising its confession of faith in such a fashion that it drops altogether the Apostles' Creed. Further, "no formal expression as to the divinity of Christ" is to be required of any member of the church. The aim seems to be to so frame a formula of admission that it may mean almost anything to those who subscribe. One of the American religious papers says that the object is to transform the church into a club. Well, but that is exactly what many of them are becoming. With billiard-rooms, and cafés, and concerts, many of the churches are practically clubs. The only drawback is the presence of a parson and occasional services. Time, however, may remove these inconveniences.

Speaking at a Unitarian meeting the other day, a Dr. Foot, of Richmond, said that the only difference between the child and the adult was that the child had most religion and the adult very little. This may be true as a mere statement of fact, but how much religion would the child have if its helplessness was not taken advantage of by religious instructors? The truth is that parents and teachers tell children "religious truths" they would not dare to tell an adult, with the result that the adult spends many years of his life unlearning what has been taught him in his early years. The unfairness of it to the child never appears to dawn upon those who have the control of its education.

The Pope has granted a dispensation to American women permitting them to give up the use of scapulars when they interfere with the wearing of low-neck dresses. The Archbishop of Milwaukee, in issuing the dispensation, says the

Holy Father is desirous that women should be unrestricted with regard to their dress proper for social requirements. Evidently the "Holy Father" feels that if it is a question of Fashion *versus* the Church the Church may come off second best, and it is as well to surrender with a good grace.

A well-known religious writer declares that "an infinite Universe would not be infinite were there not an infinite intelligence to understand it." What does "an infinite Universe" care whether it is understood or not? To the highest intelligence known to us the Universe is still an unread riddle. On the other hand, if infinite intelligence exists, how terribly ashamed of itself it must feel as it contemplates the fruit of its labor. We know that Nature has produced intelligence, but it is inconceivable that infinite intelligence can have produced Nature.

Father Adderley, that delightful High Church clergyman, has published a booklet full of unconscious humor, entitled *The Parson in Socialism*. It is eloquently written, but it is full of theological "shop." The reverend gentleman gets right off the rails when he suggests that Socialism is "the voice of God." If this means anything, it means that all Socialistic literature is divinely inspired. Socialists might regard this as correct with regard to the "true-blue" tyrant-queller, Harry Quelch, but surely the inspiration dries up when Blatchford writes for the *Daily Mail*. Father Adderley must try again.

There is one step from the sublime to the ridiculous, and the brave compositor is always ready to take it. A provincial paper, in reporting the King's death, had occasion to quote a line of Tennyson's, which appeared in print as "God's finger touched him and he *slipped*."

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy" sang Wordsworth. This provoked the caustic prose comment of Sir James Stephen, "When we grow up we lie about heaven."

Mark Twain said that the English were mentioned in the Bible. When asked for the reference he pointed out the text, "The meek shall inherit the earth."

Some of the "upper ten thousand" rather resented the late King's preference for Jews. They overlooked the fact that one half of Europe worships a Jew and the other half a Jewess.

"The Church of England is only just holding its own," said the Bishop of Kensington at the London Diocesan Conference. "In London, with a population of four millions, there are barely five per cent. of communicants, and the candidates for confirmation only one-half per cent." If this be so with the State religion the "fancy" religions must be in a parlous state.

The *Daily Express* for May 28 says: "The Churches are like a business which is sinking because it has too many branches, and clergymen and ministers, instead of falling on their knees to pray for better times, should call in the assistance of the Institute of Chartered Accountants." The Parrot is repeating our own sentiments.

The Church of Christ, which was founded by a tramp, emulates its founder by a career of unblushing mendacity. Although priests take money with both hands, they do not give much away. A notice in the "St. Clement's, Leigh, Parish Magazine" states that "neither the clergy nor district visitor are able to lend or give money." Evidently "Ask and ye shall receive" applies to things people do not want.

Without religion, no morality. Proofs of this statement are numerous. Here is one. A man named Gordon was kneeling in prayer at the Church of the Holy Ghost, Balham. When he left the church he was arrested and charged with stealing a flower-vase from the South Western Police-court—the said vase being then in his possession. Really, a man who steals a vase from a police-court, and goes straight to church to satisfy his spiritual cravings, must possess a humor that calls for reward rather than punishment.

There is one above who doeth all things well. In Belgium during a recent thunderstorm, four children were killed, three seriously injured, and eighteen slightly injured. Suffer little children to come unto me—and I will lay them out.

Mr. Cecil Chapman, magistrate at the Tower Bridge Police-court, made a statement before the Royal Commission on Divorce that should provide religious people with food for reflection. He said his experience had been, and it was endorsed by clergymen in his district, that "the most scandalous marriages, the marriages which end in greatest disaster, are those which are lightly undertaken, and which are contracted in churches that actually advertise cheap marriages." He also advised that marriage before a registrar should be compulsory in all cases, leaving those who desire a religious marriage to have it in addition to the civil one. He added:—

"I believe that if marriage were always treated as a social contract entered into before a registrar, the young men and young women would look upon it as a social contract entailing obligations which they would fulfil in quite a different way from the way in which they regard the church marriage, which creates a sense of obligation only in the religious mind. It creates a sense of having gone through a ceremony in the minds of those who do not regard it as a serious matter; there is nothing in the nature of a civil obligation at all. In speaking of it to many people I am sure I have found that these people do not look upon it sufficiently as a contract to be performed, because it is a contract which has been entered into under circumstances where some mystery has taken place which they do not realise as entailing civil obligations on their part."

There is "horse sense," to use an American phrase, in Mr. Chapman's remarks. The essence of marriage is, at least so far as the State is concerned, the civil contract entailing social responsibilities, and it is ridiculous that this aspect should be obscured or ignored by religious mummeries. To some extent the question is complicated in this country by our having a State religion, but when Church and State are separated, nothing then should stand in the way of the secular State insisting upon a civil marriage in all cases. Sir Rufus Isaacs professed surprise that Mr. Chapman thought a civil marriage more impressive than a religious ceremony. As a Jew, Sir Rufus should be well aware that the Jewish marriage itself is a civil marriage, and that although religious ceremonies may accompany it they are not vital. A contract of marriage entered into before witnesses is, in Jewish law, quite valid.

Some time back, when an attempt was made to issue a Sunday edition of one of the daily papers, Dr. R. F. Horton was among those who protested against it. Since then he has evidently been making discoveries. In the road in which he lives, he says, there are few people who go to church, and hardly one who does not get a Sunday paper. So the reverend gentleman advises the Religious Tract Society to use the Sunday paper as much as possible, and put in it the kind of material it issues as tracts. Probably the editors might have something to say on this. People don't buy Sunday papers for the purpose of inducing sleep. If they are too wakeful, there is always the church or chapel, and admission there is quite free.

From the "Sydney Bulletin."

THE HEATHEN IN HIS BLINDNESS.

A "NEW PERIL" threatens missionary "werk" in Fiji. According to a panic-stricken speaker at the recent Methodist Conference held in Sydney, Mohammedanism is rapidly spreading in those islands.

Last Words of Christian Missionary "Werker": "Oh, Lord! that I should live to become an ingredient in a stew along with a vile heathen!"

Last Words of Mohammedan Missionary "Werker": "Kismet! That it should be the will of Allah that I must stew in the same gravy with a tallow-faced dog of an infidel! Kismet! It is Fate, also Allah il Allah!"

I should be very grieved to have to go through one of those periods of enfeeblement during which the man once endowed with strength and virtue is but the shadow and ruin of his former self; and often, to the delight of the ignorant, sets himself to demolish the life which he has so laboriously constructed. Such an old age is the worst gift which the gods can give to man. If such a fate be in store for me, I hasten to protest beforehand against the weaknesses which a scintened brain might lead me to say or sign. It is the Renan, sane in body and in mind, as I am now—not the Renan half destroyed by death and no longer himself, as I shall be if my decomposition is gradual—whom I wish to be believed and listened to.—*Ernest Renan, "Recollections of my Youth."*

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

(All early dates cancelled until further notice.)

To Correspondents.

- PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND: 1910.—Previously acknowledged, £214 7s. 7d. Received since:—J. A. T., 5s.
- Will correspondents please note that all letters not meant for Mr. Foote personally, but which contain matter of an editorial character, notices of meetings, etc., should be addressed "Editor of *Freethinker*"? Otherwise they cannot be dealt with in time for the following week's issue of this paper.
- J. HAGGER.—We had not seen the pamphlet, and it may serve as the subject of comment later. We appreciate your efforts to get the *Freethinker* into your local library, but, as you say, with so small a population and so many churches, bigotry must be very strong. Still, time and steady fighting is bound to tell.
- L. HARVEY.—Thanks. Cuttings are always of use.
- W. J. VICKERY.—Glad to hear from one whom the *Freethinker* has been the means of lifting from the "slough of superstitious debauchery." We are not setting the world on fire, but we are making headway, and every fresh recruit means another nail in the coffin of Christianity."
- R. W. SMITH.—The poor creature is really not worth troubling about. Mr. Foote, as you will see, is once more busy with his pen, which is an indication of returning health. We believe his enforced idleness must have been one of the severest trials of his illness, and to be back at his life's work will doubtless act as a tonic to complete recovery.
- H. LLOYD.—It is probable that Mr. Foote may visit South Wales during the coming winter, but we do not think anything is yet arranged. We have handed your letter to Miss Vance, who will write you on the question of literature.
- T. H. HOW.—Thanks. See "Acid Drops."
- R. YATES.—Your medical adviser must be a curious man. We would suggest that you present him with one of the many cheap primers of evolution now obtainable, wherein he will find his difficulties dealt with. With reference to Ferrer, no evidence whatever has been forthcoming of his guilt—so far as the charge of anarchy is concerned. And we may be certain that if any had existed the Spanish Government would have produced it. On the other hand, much evidence has been placed before the world showing Ferrer's strong dissent from methods of violence. Ferrer's real crime was his hostility to the Spanish Church, and those who brought about his death are not likely to hesitate at lying to justify their crime.
- F. WOOD.—Cuttings to hand, for which thanks. Will be of use later.
- H. J. A.—The position of the Rev. Mgr. Grosch, in his Islington sermon, is not quite so foolish as you appear to think—that is, looking at the question from his point of view. In making the Bible subordinate to the interpretation of the Church, Roman Catholicism is acting far more sensibly than Protestantism, which places in people's hands as a rule of faith a book that is thoroughly discredited by modern thought. The inevitable result of the Protestant rule is, as Bossuet saw, division and disintegration. Roman Catholicism is far more successful in holding its people together; although it is, of course, quite powerless against the pressure of an advancing civilisation.
- THE SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED, office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.
- THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY'S office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.
- When the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the secretary, Miss E. M. Vance.
- LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.
- LECTURE NOTICES must reach 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.
- FRIENDS who send us newspapers would enhance the favor by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.
- ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Manager of the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.
- PERSONS remitting for literature by stamps are specially requested to send *halfpenny stamps*.
- THE *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

Sugar Plums.

We are glad to learn from our shop-manager that last week's special number of the *Freethinker* has gone, and is still going, off well. A large supply was printed in order to provide extra copies for those who cared to send them to

friends or others. This particular issue, we may point out, contains a full report of the speeches delivered at St. James's Hall on Whit-Sunday by Messrs. Foote, Cohen, Lloyd, Davies, Moss, Heaford, and Miss Kough, and so makes an excellent propagandist number. The speeches cover ten columns and a half, and as each speaker took his (or her) own line, the presentation of Freethought from so many points of view makes it one of the best propagandist numbers of the paper yet issued. There are still copies of this number on hand, and those who desire them should make application without delay. Those who would like them sent direct from this office to non-readers of the paper, need only supply, when remitting, the names and addresses to our shop-manager.

We note that a long passage, dealing with the Coronation Oath, from Mr. Foote's speech at the St. James's Hall meeting, heads a letter from Mr. F. J. Voisey in the *Western Daily Mercury*. The source of the quotation is duly acknowledged. It may do Christian readers good to see a plea for courteous treatment by Protestants of Roman Catholics coming from one who is the sworn, intellectual, enemy of both.

One result of printing the report of the speeches has been, so Miss Vance informs us, that several persons have sent her applications of membership for the N. S. S. We trust that many more who are, so to speak, trembling on the border, may be moved to do likewise.

Just now, when the indoor lecturing is suspended, and there are fewer opportunities to bring this paper before strangers, we would suggest that this lacuna might be made good by friends inducing such of their newsgagents as would to expose the *Freethinker* for sale.

For sheer heroism in the face of certain death, with none of the cant of religion to mar its grandeur, the story to hand of the sinking of a Japanese submarine boat must take a leading position. The officer in command spent his last moments in writing a record of the accident, while battling against approaching suffocation. After describing the sinking of the vessel, the officer, Lieut. Sakuma, describes the efforts made to refloat the vessel, compliments the men under him on their behavior, and asks that "none of the families left by my subordinates shall suffer." He also says that if the accident will lead to a thorough investigation of its cause, and "so ensure the future development of submarines, we shall have nothing to regret." Lieut. Sakuma wished his compliments to be conveyed to a number of friends and superiors, placed all his papers in order for examination when the vessel should be recovered, and, detailing the gradual strangling effects of gasolene, died. Not a word of religion, not a word of his "immortal soul," not a word about the forgiveness of God. A strong, manly letter from one fearless in the face of death, and strong in his devotion to his country. We raise our hat to the memory of Lieut. Sakuma, and commend his example to Christians, with their cowardly whine as to the necessity of religious consolation in the face of death.

A decision of some importance in relation to the Sunday question was given the other day by Mr. Chapman at the Tower Bridge Police-court. The London County Council had brought an action against a Bioscope Company for opening on Sunday. Mr. Chapman dismissed the case with costs on the ground that the Council had no power to interfere in such cases. The Council was empowered to make regulations ensuring safety at such exhibitions, and it had therefore assumed that it also possessed a power of licensing them. We are glad to see a check given to the municipal Sabbatarians, and we are of opinion that if the cases were properly contested a great many acts of interference by police and councils with Sunday exhibitions would be shown to be illegal.

Another attempt is being made to secure "peace" in the educational world. The proposal comes from the Educational Settlement Committee, which is composed of people who all profess a religion of some sort. With customary arrogance, the only people thought worthy of troubling about are those belonging to religious sects. We may have more to say on this precious scheme later. At present we only note that as it aims at securing "religious teaching as an integral part of school life," and as the teachers are to give the religious instruction, we have no great fear of any "peace" being patched up. Each party wants what the other desires, and both cannot be satisfied. And in that lies the essence of the situation.

Dreams.

THERE is no superstition more widely spread and more deeply seated in mankind than the belief in dreams. This is due to the fact that all the old religions are the offspring of ignorance and credulity, the votaries of which have been taught to believe in supernatural beings, and in the power and will of those supernatural beings to injure them. The Christian religion is no exception to the rule, for it is founded upon a dream—a dream in which it is pretended that Joseph, the husband of Mary, received a communication from “the angel of the Lord”—not “an” angel—respecting his wife and the Holy Ghost.

George Gilfillan, the preacher, in his *Bards of the Bible*, voices the Christian superstition in these words:

“Strange, stuttering, imperfect, but real and direct messengers from the Infinite are our dreams. What man for years watches his dreams—ranges them each morning round his couch, compares them with each other, ‘spiritual things with spiritual,’ compares them with events—without the profound conviction that a superhuman power is ‘floating, mingling, interweaving’ with those dim shades—that in dreams he often converses with the dead, meets with the emancipated spirits of the sleeping upon common ground, exerts powers unknown to his waking moments, recalls the Past though perished, sees the Present though distant, and descends many a clear spot through the mist of the Future?”

Lord Byron, the poet, speaks thus of dreams:—

“Our life is twofold. Sleep hath its own world,
And a wide realm of wild reality;
And dreams in their development have breath,
And tears, and tortures, and the touch of joy.
They leave a weight upon our waking thoughts,
They take a weight from off our waking toils,
They do divide our being. They become
A portion of ourselves as of our time,
And look like heralds of eternity.
They pass like spirits of the past—they speak
Like sibyls of the future. They have power—
The tyranny of pleasure, and of pain.
They make us what we were not—what they will;
And shake us with the vision that’s gone by—
The dread of vanish’d shadows. Are they so?”

And then, in answer to his own question, he proceeds to picture scenes of such exquisite pathos and beauty that they melt our hearts, proving that “love is heaven, and heaven is love.”

Charles Dickens, the novelist, in his fascinating *Christmas Carol*, makes Scrooge to declare that a dream “may be an undigested bit of beef, a blot of mustard, a crumb of cheese, a fragment of an underdone potato.” And then, giving full play to his imagination, he draws pictures of homely life so full of pity and tenderness that the heart of the reader throbs, while lumps rise in his throat and tears struggle to his eyes. These were dreams—dreams of common humanity, not of a spiritual heaven; fond memories of the past, golden hopes of the future; shadows of things that had been, shadows of things that might be.

Dreams, then, whether the dreamer be asleep or awake, are simply emotions of the mind. In them there is no trace of the supernatural, and, though beautiful or terrible, according to the poetic glamor surrounding them, they are simply human fancies—this, and nothing more.

According to “sky pilots,” however, dreams are veritable shadows of the unknown, true messages from spirit land. Are they so? Let us search the Bible and see for ourselves what grounds there are for such an assertion.

The first dream recorded in the Bible to which I shall call attention is that of Jacob, in which he beheld “a ladder set up on earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it” (Genesis xxviii. 12).

Now this dream is represented as coming from God; but there is nothing in it of a purely celestial character—nothing beyond what a lively imagination might readily picture to the mental eye. This absence from dreams of all that is spiritual, of all that is beyond human ken—a grand defect or short-

coming which all dreams exhibit—is proof positive that there is nothing of the supernatural about them. If dreamers of dreams—or, for that matter, Spiritualists—were to tell us something of that which is beyond human knowledge, something of that which we crave to know, but which is incomprehensible to us, one might entertain seriously their pretensions to superhuman aid. But they do nothing of the kind; they tell us only of the earthly, of the materialistic.

What was it that Jacob saw? A ladder! What of that? A ladder is, and was, even in Jacob’s days, a humble means of communication between upper and lower rooms; and Jacob evidently looked upon heaven as being an upper chamber of the earth. What ignorance! A superhuman being could not possibly have made such an egregious mistake. What is popularly called “heaven,” or “sky,” is simply illimitable space. Then as to angels. No one ever saw an angel; and, therefore, man’s conception of such a being must be of the earth, earthy. Angels are represented as having wings, which are fixed to the upper part of the back, and descend to the heels. Such wings would be useless for flying, for they would not serve to lift the body of an eagle. But perhaps they are intended simply for ornament. All this, however, serves to show that Jacob was as ignorant of heaven and its inhabitants as any modern “sky pilot” is, and that his dream had nothing of the supernatural in it. Fancy an angel walking up and down a ladder only a few miles high! The idea is simply absurd.

We come next to Joseph—the modest and chaste Joseph—who, if the Bible be true, was certainly a prince of dreamers and interpreter of dreams. His dreams, and the dreams he interpreted, were, in reality, prophecies—prophecies of events that were to change, not only the current of his own life, but that of powerful nations.

The story of Joseph is a fairy tale of the most fascinating description; but, at the present moment, I am only concerned with his dreams. Joseph began to dream, or to spin yarns, when quite a boy. He was but seventeen years old when he spun the following yarn to his brethren: “Hear, I pray you, this dream which I have dreamed. For behold, we were binding sheaves in the field, and lo, my sheaf arose, and also stood upright, and behold, your sheaves stood round about, and made obeisance to my sheaf” (Genesis xxxvii. 6, 7).

Now this proceeding did not show much wisdom on the part of Joseph, because he knew his brothers were envious of him, owing to the fact that his and their father loved him more than he did them. The natural result of his vain statement was that “his brethren said to him: ‘Shalt thou indeed reign over us? or shalt thou indeed have dominion over us?’ And they hated him yet the more for his dreams, and for his words” (Genesis xxxvii. 8).

Bishop Wilson, the celebrated commentator, thinks it was “unreasonable for them to hate him, because,” says he, “if God give the dream, and if it be his will that the younger should have the principality and dominion, is it his fault? Is he to blame for it?” Certainly not! But, in making that statement, the Bishop evidently forgot himself; for his argument proves much more than appears on the face of it—much more, I think, than he intended to admit. His argument, carried to its logical conclusion, proves that whatever of fault and blame there might be in the matter rested with God and not with Joseph; and, that being so, God, being the Creator of all things, becomes the originator and perpetrator of all the crime and misery there are in the wide world.

Afterwards, Joseph spun another and a tougher yarn, and this he told to his father as well as to his brothers. Said he: “I have dreamed a dream more; and behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me” (Genesis xxxvii. 9). This vain-glorious boast disturbed not only his brethren, but his father. It was more than the old man could stand, and so he rebuked the dreamer—that is, he told him to hold his tongue, and keep his

idle boasts to himself. "What," said he, "is this dream that thou hast dreamed? Shall I, and thy mother, and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?" (Genesis xxxvii. 10). Jacob evidently did not believe Joseph; though why he should doubt him, when he himself was a dreamer, and knew, therefore, the exact value of dreams, no reason is given.

Commentators are at their wits' end respecting this absurd dream, and therefore they say it was figurative—that the sun, moon, and stars were simply emblems of persons of superior rank and station. But how does that apply to Joseph's father and brothers, for they were on an equality one with the other? Further, these "sky pilots" ignore altogether the moon, representing Joseph's mother; and they are equally silent as to the eleven stars, representing Joseph's brethren; for the text speaks specifically of "the eleven stars." Which stars were they? Was anyone ever able to point them out? In good sooth Joseph's astronomical knowledge was as small as his vanity was great. "But," say the commentators, "the dream came true. It was wonderfully fulfilled when his brethren came to him in Egypt for corn, to avoid the horrors of famine; for then we read they 'bowed themselves before him with their faces to the earth'" (Genesis xlii. 6). The dream was not fulfilled; it could not possibly be, for Joseph's mother was dead before he dreamed the dream; and Jacob certainly never bowed down before Joseph, even when he went to his son in Egypt. And, as for his brethren making obeisance to him when they went to buy corn of him, we must take the statement, uncorroborated as it is, for just what it is worth. When persons are doing business together they treat one another with civility and courtesy, which is a widely different thing to paying homage as to a sovereign prince.

Next we come to the dreams that were the making of Joseph's fortune. When in prison he took to fortune-telling, and this, until quite recently, has always been a paying game. According to the Bible, he interpreted the dreams of two fellow-prisoners with perfect accuracy, and this, in due course, led to his being introduced to Pharaoh, King of Egypt. It seems that the king suffered from nightmare, and had two bad dreams, which troubled his spirit and interfered with his digestion. And, as the magicians and wise men of Egypt could not tell him what the dreams betokened, he sent for Joseph to interpret them. Joseph did so, to the satisfaction of the king; and, as the king was satisfied, none of his courtiers doubted Joseph's interpretation. I need not relate these dreams, for the yarn which Joseph spun concerning them is, I am sure, well known to all of you. But I desire to direct your attention to one large rift in the lute, to one big insect—a regular death's-head *scarabeus* it is—in this pot of ointment prepared so daintily by Master Joseph.

We are told that Pharaoh's dreams were fulfilled according to Joseph's interpretation of them, and that in due time "the dearth was in all lands," that "the famine was over all the face of the earth" (Genesis xli. 54-56). If this were so, what about the promise which the Lord made to Noah? Said the Lord to him: "I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake,.....neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done. While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease" (Genesis viii. 21, 22). Here, then, is a contradiction which cannot be reconciled. The Bible, however, is full of contradictions, notwithstanding that, according to St. Paul, it is "impossible for God to lie" (Hebrews vi. 18). It follows, then, that the statements that "the dearth was in all lands," and that "the famine was over all the face of the earth," are not true; and if the story be untrue in its main particular, what reason is there for believing it to be true in any respect?

J. W. DE CAUX.

(To be continued.)

Christianity and Western Progress.

ONE of the arguments very dear to the heart of the Christian apologist is that which is drawn from the vaunted superiority of our modern civilisation,—the social activities, the national organisations, and the commercial enterprise of European nations, generally summed up in the phrase "Western progress," and which is assumed to be the outcome or result of some inspiring influence of Christianity. We will state the argument in the words of the Frenchman, St. Hilaire, as it is very probable that later apologists either borrowed it from him or from some source that was indebted to him. St. Hilaire's book, *The Buddha and his Religion*, was written some sixty years ago, and the argument is there used in an attempt to exhibit the superiority of Christianity over Buddhism. Speaking of the order and social peace to which Buddhist virtues tend, St. Hilaire says:—

"If we add to this the hatred of falsehood, the respect for truth, the sanctity of the bond that unites intelligences; add the reprobation of slandering or even idle speech; add also the respect for family ties, the veneration of parents, consideration and esteem for women,—and we must feel astonished that, with so many social virtues, Buddhism was not able to found, even in Asia, a tolerable social state or government."

"The worth of religions," he says, "can in some degree be valued by the social institutions which they have inspired or tolerated"; and praising the national organisations of European countries, which he places to the credit of Christianity, he continues: "Nothing of the kind is to be seen in Buddhist societies, and as regards politics and legislation the religion of the Buddha has remained inferior to that of Brahminism." And, he adds, "as regards nations, it has hardly done anything to organise them or govern them equitably."

This argument in various forms is constantly being repeated, not only by the pulpit and the religious press, but also by the hireling scribes of the daily newspaper. The *Hull Daily Mail* of April 5, for example, as quoted in the *Freethinker* of the 17th, triumphantly exclaims: "Look at Great Britain, Germany, the United States—all speeding forward with splendid strides, and all aggressively Christian! Analyse the progress of Japan, and we find it due to the new Christian influence." And while this claim mostly depends for its plausibility upon the fallacy that because two things occur simultaneously, or exist side by side, therefore one is the necessary cause of the other, yet its acceptance is facilitated by the fact that Christianity as a religion has always been of an aggressive nature. The long history of its acquisition of power, its intolerance of tenets that were not in accord with its own, the strife of its internal factions, and the persecution and victimisation of heretics who refused to be mentally bound by its stagnant dogmatism, all tend to justify, as applied to its own methods, its title to the term "aggressive." And naturally its official sympathies condone the growth of militarism and national aggression on the part of those Western nations who own the Christian name. Military church parades, the State support of religion, the ceremonial blessing by the bishops of soldiers told off for active service in the field of war, all tend to exhibit the intimate relation of religion and warfare,—an intimacy indicated in popular phraseology when we speak of "the Army and the Church."

But this connection with the State and its military organisations is of a purely accidental nature. It is not a relation of cause and effect, as the argument assumes; the association of religion with national institutions is rather of a parasitical character than of the nature of an inspiring cause. National organisations and immense empires have certainly existed in the world that owed nothing whatever to Christianity. And if military organisation be a mark of national superiority, and a credit to the religion

a nation may happen to profess, then evidently no Christian country can claim the palm for supremacy; for probably no nation has ever existed that for organising ability and administrative skill could creditably compare with Pagan Rome. And to claim the progress of Japan as being due to "Christian" influence, in face of the fact that she nationally repudiated the religious system of Christianity, is one of those absurdities in which the Christian apologist delights to indulge. Organisation in some form or another for purposes of self-protection or defence is an almost universal phenomenon, the necessity for which is not created by religion, but by social and national exigencies. And while claiming credit for the aggressive power of Western nations, we make no doubt that if the armies of Europe were to be disbanded to-morrow, such a happy consummation would also be claimed by the obliging Christian apologist as being due to the "new" Christian influence.

That such an argument should be used as evidence of the merits of a religion is indeed a significant fact, and exhibits the difference between the ethical and social influence of Christianity and Buddhism in a very striking manner. The author of *The Churches and Modern Thought* relates an incident of a Christian missionary who boasted to a learned Buddhist monk that the power of Western nations was due to Christianity. To this the monk made reply that such was not the case; that they had become powerful to the extent in which they had substituted for the Christian maxim, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," that other Maxim that shoots at the rate of 300 bullets a minute. The definition of religion according to Buddhism is: A knowledge of the laws of life that lead to happiness; and the association of religion with military aggression and the annexation of other people's territory is a thought that would never suggest itself to a Buddhist. His religious ideas are cast in a different mould. The moral difference between the power of brute force and the deeper and more lasting results of human sympathy and consideration of human rights is one that the Christian missionary and his fellow-apologists utterly fail to comprehend. If evidence were wanted of the failure of Christianity to influence the social life of nations in the direction of peace and unity and human solidarity, it would be found not only in the claim we are considering, but also in that arrogant attitude which Christian nations assume towards those whom they are pleased to call the "inferior" races. Even if the claim were true that Christianity had inspired the aggressive spirit of Western nations, it would only succeed in establishing a contradiction between much of the ethical teaching of the New Testament and the beliefs and practices of those who profess to accept it as a moral guide. And it is noteworthy that the very sphere of social life where Christianity might have exhibited its boasted powers of organisation to some advantage both to itself and to the community—the organisation of industry—is one that it completely ignored. It left the formation of a social science to Atheists like Karl Marx, and the propagation of social truths and attempts to apply them to industrial life to Freethinkers like Owen and Holyoake. The modern Labor movement has grown up independent of, and almost wholly antagonistic to, religion and the Church. The later attempts of some of the Christian clergy to capture the movement and "Christianise" it may be taken as an acknowledgment of their failure in the past to sympathise with and aid any popular aspiration towards better conditions of social and industrial life. They are already seeking to establish the same plea with regard to national progress, of being the "inspiring cause." But both pleas are merely an afterthought, and exhibit the parasitical nature of Christian pretensions.

Interference in politics and legislation, and with the machinery of national government, is contrary to the very spirit and genius of Buddhism; and the charge, therefore, that it did not found any social

system or particular form of government, is as unjust as it is irrelevant. And the naïve insinuation that Christianity did itself "found" any form or system of government, or inaugurate any ideal social state, has no foundation in historic fact. Its representatives simply accepted whatever form of government they found existing, and were satisfied if they could divert some of the revenues of the State or community into the channels of the Church. Christianity's connection with legislation, if we take the history of the Christian bishops in the House of Lords, and the attitude they have always assumed towards progressive and beneficial measures, as an example, has not only not shown any desire for the establishment of a just social state, but it has been decidedly antagonistic to reforms of a remedial nature. In seeking to influence and control legislation it has never had anything in view but the preservation of its own status and privileges. The religious spectacles through which it has viewed human life and social relationships have always distorted its conceptions of the most elementary demands of human freedom and social justice. And if Christianity's connection with politics and legislation had been of a really creditable nature, it would yet remain to be shown that governments, as we understand them, are an unmixed blessing. Indeed, some persons regard them as a positive evil, and are able to support their views with a fair show of reason. As a phase of national life and centralised control they will probably, in the course of social evolution, give place to some form of executive management that is less cumbersome as regards its machinery, more effective in its methods, and less inimical to international peace and goodwill. The sublime conceptions of the Buddha rose superior to the ephemeral nature of national institutions, his system being only concerned with the discovery and application of abiding and eternal truth. The Buddhist monk to-day is so completely cosmopolitan in his ideas that he knows no country, and recognises all men as "brothers" in a sense Christianity has never recognised, nor even, indeed, comprehended. And as it is alien to the functions of a national government to interest itself in the petty questions of particular forms of church government which divide the Christian sects, so the universal aspirations and teaching of the Buddhist faith take no cognisance of the transitory sentiments and national prejudices that stand as a barrier to the unity and fellowship of the human race. It aims, in fact, at nothing less than "the brotherhood of man."

But this argument from Western progress becomes altogether farcical in the light of the historic conflict between Christian theology and Western science, and is really less excusable to-day than when it was first formulated by St. Hilaire some sixty years ago. The Christian Church resisted the innovation of every new idea, and the promulgation of every important discovery, before the advent of the theory of Evolution; but it has fought with the courage of despair a doctrine that challenged and imperilled the very basis of its existence. The Christian apologist is fond of prating about the stagnation of Chinese civilisation, conveniently ignoring the fact that a similar phenomenon is observable in the history of Christian Europe during the long and weary ages, when all intellectual thought was throttled or suppressed. And there is this redeeming feature about the arrested progress of the social evolution of the Chinese, that it was not accompanied by the intellectual degradation and religious persecution that disfigure the pages of European history. The scientific advancement of Europe, and the rapid spread of the modern social movement during the nineteenth century, so far from being due to any inspirational incentive of Christianity, have been accomplished in spite of it, and in face of the most strenuous opposition and the use of all the hereditary influence and prestige which the Church possessed.

But there is still another consideration which largely discounts the alleged originality specially claimed for our Western progress, and which ex-

hibits the claim of Christianity to have been its inspirer in anything but a favorable light. Readers of the *Freethinker* are, of course, aware of the fact that, at the time mediæval Europe was steeped in the grossest ignorance and superstition, the Mahomedan Moors of Spain had attained a high degree of civilisation and culture, and made remarkable progress in many of the sciences. And it seems beyond dispute that the channels through which the revival of learning came were all non-Christian. One of the great historic events which was the means of enlarging the ideas of Christian Europe, and supplying that impetus to the intellectual effort which has been such a distinguishing feature of Western civilisation, was the intercourse established with the nations of the East as the result of the conquest of China by the famous Tartar conqueror, and the relations he sought to encourage with European countries. According to Father Huc, in his famous *Travels*, nearly all our Western progress is due to the development of ideas or suggestions that were imported into Europe through various channels from the Chinese Empire. Any curious reader who wishes to see the evidence of this indebtedness of the West to those Eastern nations whom it now affects to despise, will find Father Huc both interesting and instructive. It is at least significant that, while Christianity was dominant in Europe for fully a thousand years without any signs of intellectual or social development ever appearing, no sooner did the West come into touch with this ancient civilisation of the East than the seeds of progress began to sprout forth in a marvellous manner. Doubtless many other circumstances, such as the Crusades, played at least an indirect part in breaking down the ignorance and superstition of mediæval Europe, but the impetus given to modern progress and activity from contact with the empire of the Grand Khan appears to have been by far the greatest in importance.

The Christian apologist must have strangely misinterpreted the angelic message of peace and goodwill to men when he can claim the power of nations, based upon the force of arms, in favor of the superiority of his religion. The Buddhist would probably make him a welcome present of his argument. He would say, Welcome, Mr. Christian, to your Dreadnoughts and Turbines, your war and bloodshed, and all the appurtenances of national aggression! Our religion is one of love, charity, and compassion, and regards the arts of war as belonging to the barbaric stages of man's existence. No other weapon was ever used in the propagation of our faith than moral suasion, and the name of our Great Teacher has never been associated with anything but peace and gentleness and goodwill.

JOSEPH BRYCE.

Correspondence.

"THE OFFENCE OF THE CROSS."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—The interesting article by Mr. Lloyd on "The Offence of the Cross" leads me to write you on the subject. The doctrine of the atonement was the breaking-point for me with orthodox Christianity, and careful reading over a variety of literature brought me to see that the Cross, with all its tragic and dramatic elements, linked with the ideas of "sin," "forgiveness," "punishment," "sacrifice," etc., has acted like a spell of hypnotism on the minds of millions. Just as the monks of old sought illumination by concentration on the point of yellow light within, so multitudes have kept gazing at one little event—thus losing the true lines of the perspective of the Universe—through the distorting glass of mythological theology. And they have lulled themselves into a fearful state of mental stupefaction, believing that their faith brought them comfort now and gave them the hope of immortality. But the mind bent on seeking Truth, through all the interpretations and glosses, finds at the end of the quest a mere handful of ideas—the elements from which the superstructure of dogma has been erected.

I wish to point out that, taking the Synoptics as a basis, we find that Jesus never referred to his death as a "vicarious sacrifice" for sins, and never linked his death with the idea of "forgiveness." The first Gospel, alone, introduces the

words "for the forgiveness of sins," in the Passion-night supper (xxvi. 28)—very clearly the gloss of an interpreter. This passage and the one quoted by Mr. Lloyd (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45) are the only words of Jesus on which the theologian can seize and apply in the orthodox way. But these words simply stand in line with the continually expressed thought of Jesus that death lay in front of him. He felt, in that strange mood of presentiment—common to certain temperaments—that his mission must inevitably end in death, but that it would bear fruit in the emancipation of his followers from Rabbinitism. Was this not the experience of Jeremiah (xi. 19, xxvi., xxxviii.)—"But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter"? Did not the latter Isaiah see in the suffering Prophet the sin-bearer of the nation? (Isa. liii.) And does not the thought of the "Son of Man" ministering show us that life always comes out of death, and that a Socrates, a Michael Servetus, a Mazzini, an Abraham Lincoln are all necessary as "a ransom for the many"?

But the word "ransom" is not a sacrificial word; it is connected with the Hebrew idea of kinship. And the *lutron* is used in the LXX in Lev. xxv. 34, 51, 52; Num. xxxv. 31, 33; Ex. xxx. 12. Dr. S. T. Green says "*lutron* is the price paid for releasing anyone from captivity, punishment, or death" (*Grammar of Gr. Test.*). Robinson says "*loosing-money*.....i.e., fine paid for letting loose" (*Gr. Lex.*). But gradually the words of the Oriental have become frozen into the cold, lifeless language of Western dogmatism, and we have evidences of the tendency to gloss in such passages as Matt. xxvi. 28, where "for the forgiveness of sins" has crept in after the simple words recorded by Mark.

So the words of the Epistles, "Jesus died for our sins," give us the interpretation which the disciples put upon that death which cut from them so tragically that pure-souled Nazarene, leaving an indelible impress on their minds. These words, in their turn, have been juggled with by successive generations of expositors, and from the "ransom" theory of the fathers to the modern theories of McLeod Campbell, Bushnell, Dale, and others, we have had innumerable attempts to connect, in a reasonable way, Jesus's death with the idea of forgiveness. But all have overlooked the fact that the old prophets preached a far grander gospel of forgiveness than this niggardly "scheme" (Isaiah lv. 6-9; Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34; Hosea xiv.). They have failed to see that Jesus taught ideas in direct contradiction to Paul's idea of justification (Matthew vi. 12; Luke xv. 11-24). And all have failed to show why a God of love should require the death of His Son ere He could forgive them. "Righteousness," "sympathy," "substitution," "a spectacular parable of salvation," such have been some of the suggested solutions. And all in their turn have been riddled by the theologians of the opposing faction. And yet the moral grandeur, pathetic and touching, of Golgotha, affects us, and will ever find a place in men's hearts. I might, in conclusion, quote Mrs. Humphry Ward:—

"Why is it.....that this divine figure is enshrined, if not in all our affections, at least in all our imaginations? Why is it that at the heart of this modern world, with all its love of gold, its thirst for knowledge, its desire for pleasure, there still lives and burns.....this strange madness of sacrifice, this foolishness of the Cross?.....How has our world of heat and iron produced such a thing? How, except as the clue to the world's secret, is man to explain it to himself?" (*Eleanor*, p. 388).

"FELIX PONDERING."

CHRISTIANITY AND MEDICAL SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I have read Mr. Cohen's articles on the above with very great pleasure; but regret that he has—I feel sure unconsciously—done an injustice to perhaps the most noble member of the most altruistic profession in failing to mention Mr. Gardiner Hill, formerly Medical Officer for the Lincoln Hospital for the mentally afflicted.

As early as the year 1827, Mr. Hill recognised that in the treatment of the insane, as in every other walk of life, that—

"Out of evil, evil comes;
Out of tyranny, tyranny buds;"

and was the first—in this country, at all events—to do away with all punishment and mechanical restraints. It is needless to say that he accomplished this in the teeth of the most strenuous opposition. He was ably followed by Connolly, Tuke, and others in England, and Pinel in France. Probably Connolly, with his facile pen, contributed more to the reform in the treatment of those of our fellow-creatures who most merit our pity, than anyone else, his literary ability endowing him with great power.

But the fact remains that Gardner Hill was, like Uriah the Hittite, in the forefront of the battle, and the other noble men were merely soldiers who followed, and ably seconded, an enlightened and gallant general.

New Zealand,

FRED. DE LISLE, L.R.C.P., D.P.H.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

Notices of Lectures, etc., must reach us by first post on Tuesday, and be marked "Lecture Notice" if not sent on postcard.

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 3.15 and 6.15, C. Cohen, Lectures.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, A. B. Moss, a Lecture; 6, Miss K. Kough, a Lecture.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Highbury Corner): 12 noon, J. Darby and Sidney Cook. Newington Green: 12 noon, Walter Bradford. Clerkenwell Green: 12 noon, H. King and T. Dobson. Finsbury Park: 3.30, R. H. Rosetti, "Jesus Christ, the Unknown Jew Boy." Highbury Corner: Saturday, at 8, H. King and T. Dobson.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (Ridley-road, Kingsland): 11.30, W. J. Ramsey, "The Curse of the Cross."

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES (Market Square): 7.30, Joseph A. E. Bates, "The dead know not anything; neither have they any more a reward."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill Fields): 3.30, F. A. Davies, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford): 7, R. H. Rosetti, "God, Faith, and Morality."

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers' Hill, opposite Public Library): 11.30, Debate between Mr. Rowney and Mr. Legge, "Can a Christian be a Good Man?" The Green, Enfield: 7, Mr. Evans, "Miracles."

WOOLWICH BRANCH N. S. S. (Beresford-square): 11.30, a Lecture.

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

Huddersfield BRANCH N. S. S. (Market Cross): 8, G. T. Whitehead, a Lecture. Saturday, at 8, G. T. Whitehead, a Lecture.

BUSINESS CARDS.

Short advertisements are inserted under this heading at the rate of 2s. per half inch and 3s. 6d. per inch. No advertisement under this heading can be less than 2s. or extend beyond one inch. Special terms for several continuous insertions.

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. *Hunting Skunks*, G. W. Foote; 2. *Bible and Teetotalism*, J. M. Wheeler; 3. *Principles of Secularism*, C. Watts; 4. *Where Are Your Hospitals?* R. Ingersoll. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 6d. per hundred, post free 7d. Special rates for larger quantities. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

FREETHOUGHT BADGES.—The new N. S. S. Badge Design is the French Freethinkers' emblem—a single Pansy flower. Button shape, with strong pin. Has been the means of many pleasant introductions. Price, single, 2d., postage 1d.; three or more post free. Reduction to Branches.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

NOTICE NEW ADDRESS.—W. STEWART & Co., 19 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C. Bargains, Freethought Literature; "Saladin's," etc. 8s. worth for 1s.; cheap.

HARRY BOULTER, the Freethinker's Tailor, Leysian Offices, 108 City-road (opposite Old-street Tube Station). Suits from 37/6. Ladies' Costumes from 45/-. Boycotted by Christians, appeals to all Freethinkers for support.

T. J. THURLOW is open to lecture for Branches of N. S. S., or projected Branches, open-air or indoors. Terms to London Branches, as usual; out of London, out-of-pocket expenses. Anti-theological subjects only.—Address: 40 Churston-avenue, Upton-park, E.

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT

By G. W. FOOTE.

Contains scores of entertaining and informing Essays and Articles on a great variety of Freethought topics.

First Series, cloth 2s. 6d.
Second Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

A LIBERAL OFFER NOTHING LIKE IT.

Greatest Popular Family Reference Book and Sexology—Almost Given Away. A Million sold at 3 and 4 dollars—Now Try it Yourself.

Insure Your Life—You Die to Win; Buy this Book, You Learn to Live.



Ignorance kills—knowledge saves—be wise in time. Men weaken, sicken, die—no knowing how to live. "Habits that enslave" wreck thousands—young and old Fathers fail, mothers are "bed-ridden," babies die. Family feuds, marital miseries, divorces—even murders—All can be avoided by self-knowledge, self-control.

You can discount heaven—dodge hell—here and now, by reading and applying the wisdom of this one book of 1,200 pages, 400 illustrations, 80 lithographs on 18 anatomical color plates, and over 250 prescriptions.

OF COURSE YOU WANT TO KNOW WHAT EVERYONE OUGHT TO KNOW.

THE YOUNG—How to choose the best to marry.
THE MARRIED—How to be happy in marriage.
THE FOND PARENT—How to have prize babies.
THE MOTHER—How to have them without pain.
THE CHILDLESS—How to be fruitful and multiply.
THE CURIOUS—How they "grewed" from germ-cell.
THE HEALTHY—How to enjoy life and keep well.
THE INVALID—How to brace up and keep well.

Whatever you'd ask a doctor you find herein, or (if not, Dr. F. will answer your inquiry FREE, any time)

Dr. Foote's books have been the popular instructors of the masses in America for fifty years (often re-written, enlarged, and always kept up-to-date). For twenty years they have sold largely (from London) to all countries where English is spoken, and everywhere highly praised. Last editions are best, largest, and most for the price. You may save the price by not buying, and you may lose your life (or your wife or child) by not knowing some of the vitally important truths it tells.

Most Grateful Testimonials From Everywhere.

Gudivoda, India: "It is a store of medical knowledge in plainest language, and every reader of English would be benefited by it."—W. L. N.

Triplicane, India: "I have gone through the book many times, and not only benefited myself but many friends also."—G. W. T.

Panderma, Turkey: "I can avow frankly there is rarely to be found such an interesting book as yours."—K. H. (Chemist).
Calgary, Can.: "The information therein has changed my whole idea of life—to be nobler and happier."—D. N. M.
Laverton, W. Aust.: "I consider it worth ten times the price. I have benefited much by it."—R. M.

Somewhat Abridged Editions (800 pp. each) can be had in German, Swedish, Finnish, or Spanish.

Price EIGHT SHILLINGS by Mail to any Address.

ORDER OF THE PIONEER PRESS,
2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary: MISS E. M. VANCE, 2 Newcastle-st., London, E.C.

Principles and Objects.

SECULARISM teaches that conduct should be based on reason and knowledge. It knows nothing of divine guidance or interference; it excludes supernatural hopes and fears; it regards happiness as man's proper aim, and utility as his moral guide.

Secularism affirms that Progress is only possible through Liberty, which is at once a right and a duty; and therefore seeks to remove every barrier to the fullest equal freedom of thought, action, and speech.

Secularism declares that theology is condemned by reason as superstitious, and by experience as mischievous, and assails it as the historic enemy of Progress.

Secularism accordingly seeks to dispel superstition; to spread education; to disestablish religion; to rationalise morality; to promote peace; to dignify labor; to extend material well-being; and to realise the self-government of the people.

Membership.

Any person is eligible as a member on signing the following declaration:—

"I desire to join the National Secular Society, and I pledge myself, if admitted as a member, to co-operate in promoting its objects."

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

Dated this..... day of..... 190.....

This Declaration should be transmitted to the Secretary with a subscription.

P.S.—Beyond a minimum of Two Shillings per year, every member is left to fix his own subscription according to his means and interest in the cause.

Immediate Practical Objects.

The Legitimation of Bequests to Secular or other Free-thought Societies, for the maintenance and propagation of heterodox opinions on matters of religion, on the same conditions as apply to Christian or Theistic churches or organisations.

The Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws, in order that Religion may be canvassed as freely as other subjects, without fear of fine or imprisonment.

The Disestablishment and Disendowment of the State Churches in England, Scotland, and Wales.

The Abolition of all Religious Teaching and Bible Reading in Schools, or other educational establishments supported by the State.

The Opening of all endowed educational institutions to the children and youth of all classes alike.

The Abrogation of all laws interfering with the free use of Sunday for the purpose of culture and recreation; and the Sunday opening of State and Municipal Museums, Libraries, and Art Galleries.

A Reform of the Marriage Laws, especially to secure equal justice for husband and wife, and a reasonable liberty and facility of divorce.

The Equalisation of the legal status of men and women, so that all rights may be independent of sexual distinctions.

The Protection of children from all forms of violence, and from the greed of those who would make a profit out of their premature labor.

The Abolition of all hereditary distinctions and privileges, fostering a spirit antagonistic to justice and human brotherhood.

The Improvement by all just and wise means of the conditions of daily life for the masses of the people, especially in towns and cities, where insanitary and incommensurable dwellings, and the want of open spaces, cause physical weakness and disease, and the deterioration of family life.

The Promotion of the right and duty of Labor to organise itself for its moral and economical advancement, and of its claim to legal protection in such combinations.

The Substitution of the idea of Reform for that of Punishment in the treatment of criminals, so that gaols may no longer be places of brutalisation, or even of more detention, but places of physical, intellectual, and moral elevation for those who are afflicted with anti-social tendencies.

An Extension of the moral law to animals, so as to secure them humane treatment and legal protection against cruelty.

The Promotion of Peace between nations, and the substitution of Arbitration for War in the settlement of international disputes

America's Freethought Newspaper.

THE TRUTH SEEKER.

FOUNDED BY D. M. BENNETT, 1873.
CONTINUED BY E. M. MACDONALD, 1883-1909.

G. E. MACDONALD EDITOR.
L. K. WASHBURN EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTOR.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Single subscription in advance	\$3.00
Two new subscribers	5.00
One subscription two years in advance	5.00

To all foreign countries, except Mexico, 50 cents per annum extra
Subscriptions for any length of time under a year, at the rate of 25 cents per month, may be begun at any time.

Freethinkers everywhere are invited to send for specimen copies, which are free.

THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
Publishers, Dealers in Freethought Books,
62 VESSEY STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

TRUE MORALITY:

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism

IS, I BELIEVE,

THE BEST BOOK

ON THIS SUBJECT.

Superfine Large-paper Edition, 176 pages, with Portrait and Autograph, bound in cloth, gilt-lettered, post free 1s. a copy.

In order that it may have a large circulation, and to bring it within the reach of the poor, I have issued

A POPULAR EDITION IN PAPER COVERS.

A copy of this edition post free for 2d. A dozen copies, for distribution, post free for one shilling.

The National Reformer of September 4, 1892, says: "Mr. Holmes's pamphlet.....is an almost unexceptional statement of the Neo-Malthusianism theory and practice.....and throughout appeals to moral feeling.....The special value of Mr. Holmes's service to the Neo-Malthusian cause and to human well-being generally is just his combination in his pamphlet of a plain statement of the physical and moral need for family limitation, with a plain account of the means by which it can be secured, and an offer to all concerned of the requisites at the lowest possible prices."

The Council of the Malthusian League, Dr. Drysdale, Dr. Albutt, and others, have also spoken of it in very high terms.

Orders should be sent to the author,

J. R. HOLMES, EAST HANNEY, WANTAGE.

PAMPHLETS by C. COHEN.

Foreign Missions, their Dangers and Delusions 3d.
Full of facts and figures.

An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics ... 6d.
Principles of ethics, based on the doctrine of Evolution.

Socialism, Atheism, and Christianity.. 1d.

Christianity and Social Ethics ... 1d.

Pain and Providence 1d.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon street, E.C.

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

Being a Three Hours' Address to the Jury before the Lord Chief Justice of England, in answer to an Indictment for Blasphemy, on April 24, 1883.

With Special Preface and many Footnotes.

Price FOURPENCE. Post free FIVEPENCE.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office—2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON. E.C.

Chairman of Board of Directors—MR. G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary—MISS E. M. VANCE.

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

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

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up and the assets were insufficient to cover liabilities—a most unlikely contingency.

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

The Society has a considerable number of members, but a much larger number is desirable, and it is hoped that some will be gained amongst those who read this announcement. All who join it participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest, or in any way whatever.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, consisting of not less than five and not more than twelve members, one-third of whom retire (by ballot) each year,

but are capable of re-election. An Annual General Meeting of members must be held in London, to receive the Report, elect new Directors, and transact any other business that may arise.

Being a duly registered body, the Secular Society, Limited, can receive donations and bequests with absolute security. Those who are in a position to do so are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favor in their wills. On this point there need not be the slightest apprehension. It is quite impossible to set aside such bequests. The executors have no option but to pay them over in the ordinary course of administration. No objection of any kind has been raised in connection with any of the wills by which the Society has already been benefited.

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Battcock, 23 Rood-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

A Form of Bequest.—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—"I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £— free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy."

Friends of the Society who have remembered it in their wills, or who intend to do so, should formally notify the Secretary of the fact, or send a private intimation to the Chairman, who will (if desired) treat it as strictly confidential. This is not necessary, but it is advisable, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid, and their contents have to be established by competent testimony.

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

"BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

With a Portrait of the Author

Reynolds's Newspaper says:—"Mr. G. W. Foote, chairman of the Secular Society, is well known as a man of exceptional ability. His *Bible Romances* have had a large sale in the original edition. A popular, revised, and enlarged edition, at the price of 6d., has now been published by the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, for the Secular Society. Thus, within the reach of almost everyone, the ripest thought of the leaders of modern opinion are being placed from day to day."

144 Large Double-Column Pages, Good Print, Good Paper

SIXPENCE—NET

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Reminiscences of Charles Bradlaugh

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

The most intimate thing ever written about Bradlaugh. Mr. Foote's personal recollections of the great "Iconoclast" during many exciting years, with a page on his attitude in the presence of death, and an account of his last appearance as President of the National Secular Society.

PUBLISHED AT SIXPENCE REDUCED TO TWOPENCE.

(Postage Halfpenny.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.