

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXX.—No. 38

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1910

PRICE TWOPENCE

An honest God's the noblest work of man.—INGERSOLL.

Sir Oliver Lodge as a Decoy.

HAVING dealt last week with the Archbishop of York's sermon in connection with the British Association's Congress at Sheffield, we have now, according to promise, to deal with Sir Oliver Lodge's address in the Victoria Hall, on the interpretation of the Old Testament.

"Long before the time of meeting," the local *Telegraph* says, "the building was packed, whilst thousands were unable to obtain admission." This was due to "the personality of Sir Oliver Lodge," which "has evidently made a big impression in Sheffield," and also to the fact that his address was interesting as "coming from a scientist of such note, of his attitude towards theological problems." We do not wish to minimise the importance of Sir Oliver Lodge's personality, but we fancy that the second cause had more to do with the size of the meeting. People know beforehand what theologians will say, and must say, on "theological problems," but there is a fresh attraction in "a scientist of such note" treating them non-professionally. People expect to hear something new, and religious people think the noted scientist should be encouraged. It enhances so greatly the credentials of Christianity that such a man as the Principal of Birmingham University is willing to appear with it in public. There was a time when leading men of science were not so condescending. It is natural that the Church should make the most of his patronage. He is used as a sort of decoy duck or rogue elephant, and it must be allowed that he plays the part with skill and satisfaction.

When we say that he plays the part with skill, we do not mean that he exhibits great intellectual power in these performances. They do not add to his reputation as a thinker. They never convert unbelievers. But they do just what is required. They tickle the ears of believers, allay their apprehensions, and assure them that Christianity is, after all, not so false and absurd as critical persons are apt to think it.

Had the simple believers, who are so easily reassured, but listened to the Archbishop of York's sermon as well as Sir Oliver Lodge's address, they might easily have gone away with considerable trepidation. On a vital point the two were in flat disagreement,—we might say open hostility. The Archbishop declared that modern science taught what "was only expressed in the language of religion in the great words, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'" Sir Oliver Lodge, however, repudiated the idea of creation altogether:—

"Modern science knows nothing of ultimate origins. It never asked the question. It started with matter in motion; it traced its past, and to some extent its future. It might look backward and forwards for millions of years, but to every past, however remote, there was an antecedent past. Nothing pointed to a beginning or to an end. At every point we could ask, 'And what before?' or 'What after?'"

Being a scientific man, with a reputation to lose,
1,521

Sir Oliver Lodge could hardly go wrong on a point like that. But on many other points he was just as likely to go wrong as the Archbishop. It is a popular delusion that a great man is great at everything, and that a scientific authority is an authority on everything. A strong corrective to this mistaken view lies in the fact that scientific men differ just as much as other people do on matters that lie outside their special provinces. A good head, of course, is likely to think better than a poor one on any subject to which it gives its attention. But good heads are not confined to the pursuit of physical science. They are to be found in all the walks of life. You might as well put up a famous lawyer, a famous physician, a famous inventor, a famous engineer, a famous industrial organiser, a famous writer, a famous musical composer, or a famous actor, as put up a famous electrician to talk about the Old Testament. The only use of a scientist in this connection is purely negative. He may correct the Bible, or Christian teaching generally, where it conflicts with his scientific knowledge. That was the function which Huxley performed with such *éclat*. But when it came to positive beliefs on questions as to which his scientific knowledge was no guide, Huxley's authority was no greater than that of any other capable and well-informed man. And he had the sense to see it. Sir Oliver Lodge does not appear to get a glimpse of this obvious truth. He talks as though his scientific position gave a special value to his personal opinions on other subjects. We beg to tell him, quite frankly, he may even think roughly, that it does nothing of the kind. He has no more mandate to speak of religion in the name of science than he has to speak of art, literature, or politics in the name of science. It is absurd for him to pose as if he had. It is not absurd, but astute, on the part of the Churches to exploit his amiable weakness.

We will now deal briefly with what Sir Oliver Lodge had to say "on his own." He made the singular observation that "the early parts of the Bible were better adapted to children than to adults." The reason he assigned for this was more singular still. "Whatever," he said, "was suited to the childhood of the world might be appropriate to the individual child at a certain stage of development." Children are to be taught falsehoods and mistakes that their elders have outgrown! For that is what Sir Oliver Lodge's suggestion comes to. It is idle to reply that children are regaled with fairy-tales. They are. But they are not told that fairy-tales are profound religious truths. Fairy-tales are not imposed upon them as the Bible is. Or does Sir Oliver Lodge mean that the myths and legends of the Bible are to be presented to children as other romances are? If he does not, he is only helping the priests' game; if he does, we venture to suggest to him that "the early parts of the Bible" would stand very little chance with children in a competition with the more delightful romances of the Arabian Nights, to say nothing of the folk-lore stories to which they are never tired of listening.

Another observation of Sir Oliver Lodge's was this. "You have not," he said, "to argue a child into a belief in God. The belief is naturally there." How on earth did the study of electricity enable him to make that statement? Is he really any

better authority on the point than a village carpenter? We challenge his assertion. Our own children have grown up without a belief in God. We know of other children who have grown up in the same way. To say that the belief in God is in a child's mind by nature is to talk nonsense. It is there because it is put there. The priests of religion may affect to agree with Sir Oliver Lodge, but we judge them by their actions rather than their words. Why are they so anxious to control the education of the children? Why do they denounce a "godless education"? Why are they afraid to trust what is "naturally" in the child's mind? Because they know it is *not* naturally in the child's mind. They dare not give the child the slightest chance of trusting to nature. They make him a Godite so soon that he cannot recollect being otherwise, and he is thus finessed (cheated would be a better word) into regarding religion as a part of his natural outfit.

We need not trouble with Sir Oliver Lodge the rhapsodist. When he says that "beauty represents an ideal in the mind of the Creator. Beauty is how things are in the heart of God" he is passing off his own subjective fancies for objective facts,—and paying the artists of beautiful things a very poor compliment. One might ask him to explain how it is, if beauty is how things are in the heart of God, that God has allowed so much ugliness to exist in this world. Does the Deity suffer from feeble action of the heart? Or what *is* the matter? Victor Hugo said to the priests, when you tell me that God made man in his own image, and I look at some of you, I am obliged to reply that he is very ugly. How many human beings are a credit to such a God as Sir Oliver Lodge depicts? Does he himself claim to be one of them?

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be concluded.)

The Logic of Atheism.

WHEN Swift wrote his famous astrological prediction of the death of Partridge, the almanack maker, and followed it with an account of that gentleman's demise, the alleged corpse thought to put the great Dean to the right-about by pointing out that he was still alive. Swift's reply was that there was no need whatever to get annoyed over the matter; it was really a difference of opinion between two gentlemen, and it should be discussed with perfect fairness and good humor. The difficulty was to get Partridge to do this. He, poor man, imagined that his being alive was quite enough to disprove Swift's elaborate, but bufflesque, prediction. The latter, with portentous gravity, insisted that Partridge *saying* he was alive merely offered matter for discussion—nothing more. And, clearly, once the fact of Partridge being alive was ruled out as not pertinent to the point at issue, there was no reason why the dispute should not go on interminably. Swift, for purposes of his own, insisted on merely balancing reasons to decide whether Partridge was alive or dead. Partridge held that all the reasoning in the world could not prove a man to be dead if that person was still alive.

The position of those who, in dealing with the belief in God, persist in balancing reasons for and against the existence of Deity remind me of this famous literary squib. They object, as Swift did—and also for purposes of their own—to face certain facts, and insist on treating the subject as though it were entirely a question of balancing arguments *pro* and *con*. For considerably over half a century anthropologists of eminence have been collecting facts showing how the idea of God actually originated, and in addition tracing the stages of the development through which this idea has passed. If they are right, if only in a general way, in the account they give of the manner in which the God-idea began, controversy is at an end. If people began to believe in

gods because in their ignorance they misunderstood events which we now interpret in an altogether different way, then the balancing of reasons for and against this belief is sheer waste of energy. You may dispute the anthropological data if you like, but you cannot honestly ignore it; still less can you admit it, and then proceed with argumentation as though it did not exist.

I have said "cannot" when I should have said, ought not. For, as a matter of fact, some people do ignore it. Hundreds of books are issued every year discussing, from the religious point of view, the belief in God. Of these, scarcely any trouble to consider the anthropological aspect of the question. It is not that they openly reject it; that would be intelligible, even though its rejection would place them upon a level with the champions of a flat earth. They simply ignore it; and this gives their conduct a much more sinister aspect. Yet the question of origin is all-important. If we assume that the origin of the God-idea is known, to go on discussing the weight of the argument from causation, from intuition, from design, etc., is waste of time. There is really nothing to discuss. All these arguments become so many ingenious speculations created for the purpose of supporting a belief that is admittedly without foundation. No amount of reasoning, however subtle, can bring something out of nothing. You cannot extract a fact from a delusion. All that may be done is to so mingle fact and fancy that the new-comer to the subject will not be able to tell one from the other. And, doubtless, many of those writings that do this serve well the purpose for which they were penned.

Still more curious is the attitude of a second class. These profess to accept without serious qualification the general results of anthropological research. They do not champion religious belief, but they profess a considerable respect for it, and they decline to express a definite opinion for or against the God-idea. Their attitude is suspensory, they say. They are Agnostics, and do not know. But what is it they do not know? On what is it they suspend judgment? If the origin of the idea of God amongst savages is admitted, there is no cause to plead ignorance, and there is no room for suspension of judgment. We only suspend judgment when there is not enough evidence on which to arrive at a decision. We only confess ignorance when there is an absence of knowledge. But in this instance the knowledge is within our grasp. It is admitted that the gods owe their creation to uninstructed primitive intelligence; and that had the primitive mind been better instructed the gods would never have been born. Primitive man simply exaggerated himself, and gave his creation an objective, an independent existence. Well, we know this was an error; we know that the welter of gods that darken the life of primitive man was sheer delusion. We know, too, that all later gods—without a single exception—are derived from these primitive ones, and it is repeating a mere truism to say that they cannot transcend their origin. Concerning what, then, is judgment suspended? Do we not, in accepting the anthropological origin of the idea of God, decisively pass judgment on it as pure myth?

It may be argued that while all the actual presentations of deity may be properly dismissed as myth, judgment must still be suspended concerning the existence of a God—the abstract question still remains. But what is God in the abstract? We have man, animal, tree, etc., as abstract terms. But no one pretends that these words connote a real existence—or a possibly real existence—apart from the particular things from which they are compounded. Destroy every particular man, and what becomes of man in the abstract? Our abstraction loses all meaning with the annihilation of the group of particular things it covers. Now, with all who have any pretensions to cultured thinking, the world's actual gods are denied all existence, save in the minds of their worshipers. The process has become so complete that even the Biblical deity is

dismissed as a myth, although by the religious a saving clause is added that this represented man's attempt to figure deity to himself. But, if one after another, the gods are denied existence, on what ground is it assumed that a god may still exist? By what rule of logic is an existence claimed for an universal after all particulars have been destroyed? If none of the gods exist, if none of them have existed, how can God, in the abstract, stand for a possibly actual existence? Those who deny the existence of the world's gods, do actually deny the existence of God—so long as they use the word intelligibly—although they have not always the courage or consistency to admit it.

All that is left is the word "God." And what is the value of this? Once all particular gods have been negated it is without either meaning or value. The word is only intelligible so long as it connotes some actual deity. Deny its applicability to any and you destroy, at the same time, all its meaning. Man began to believe in gods because he fancied he saw in certain phenomena proofs of the existence and operations of an intelligence similar in kind to his own. We know that in this he was in absolute error. We take exactly the same facts and show that they admit of an altogether different explanation. Yet while doing this, we pretend to believe that the idea of God itself was a sound one. We have a precisely similar belief in the case of witchcraft. Certain things proved to our ancestors the existence of witches. Pathology, psychology, and a study of social evolution, makes plain the real nature of those facts that were thought to prove the existence of witches. Yet none assert that while the witches were either impostors or as witches did not exist, yet there does exist, or there may exist, a witch—people merely having cast their belief in witches in a wrong form. Now, if a reinterpretation of the facts upon which the belief in witches rested, warrants us in denying the existence of witches, why will not a reinterpretation of the facts, with which the belief in God really began, warrant us in serving gods in the same fashion?

It will be said that this is trying to prove a negative. It is really nothing of the kind. One can only attempt to prove a negative when the terms of a proposition—negative or positive—admit of being brought together in consciousness. Mark Twain said that he believed Adam was buried in the place pointed out to him because no one had ever been able to prove that he wasn't. But if anyone had tried to do so, the terms of the proposition—a dead man, a grave, the act of burial—were all realisable in thought. The difficulty in negative evidence is that we may have overlooked something, or something may have occurred without our knowledge. For this reason we have to be satisfied with a negative inference from positive evidence. But in the case of the existence of God we are on different ground. Historically, "God" means the gods believed in at different times by different peoples. Dispute or deny their existence, and there remains nothing concerning which a proposition, negative or affirmative, may be made. Accept the possibility of the existence of the gods worshiped by different people, and "God does exist," or "God does not exist," are both intelligible propositions. Reject their existence as an impossibility, and there is nothing about which we may plead suspension of judgment or a condition of ignorance. We have passed judgment in denying the existence of gods in the only sense in which "god" has any historical or intelligible meaning.

Or, if it be said that the idea of God contained from the earliest time a perception of some existence greater than man, and criticism has been merely stripping away the excrescences, the reply is that this is a sheer travesty of the facts. Early man pictures the gods as like himself in all respects, but demanding the attention that a stronger human being commands. Subsequent knowledge refines this primitive conception only in the sense that it compels man to drop from his deity one human attribute after

another, until we are left with the absurd spectacle of an overruling intelligence devoid of all the conditions under which intelligence exists. But these refinements were not in the original idea; they are something which the ingenious philosophical speculations of later ages suggest as substitutes for the primitive idea. And these suggestions arise because in each generation the vast majority are under the thralldom of the past, and the problem becomes one of how best to accommodate old ideas to new knowledge rather than that of fearlessly criticising old ideas in the light of later mental acquisitions.

The present is a curious state of affairs. On the one side is the crowd of theologians, whose minds are naturally in the pre-evolutionary stage, and who continue, actually or pretendedly, oblivious to the positive results of the new knowledge. From them one would hardly expect a recognition of the truth that the gods have now been explained out of existence, as witches and warlocks were several generations back. But stranger still is it to see on the other side those who avowedly accept the natural origin and evolution of the God-idea, and yet, when they come to deal with current religion, talk as though their lack of faith was due to the inconclusive nature of religious arguments. Really, it should be nothing of the kind. If their acceptance of the results of modern research is a real, an intelligent acceptance, they know that, no matter how plausible modern religious arguments may be, they are quite beside the real point at issue. A belief that began in error, and that has no other basis than error, can by no possible argument be converted into a truth. The old question was, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" The modern answer is an emphatic affirmative. We have by searching found out God. We know the substantial origin and history of one of the greatest delusions that ever obsessed the human mind. Analytically and synthetically we understand the god-idea as previous generations could not understand it. It has been explained. And the logical result of that explanation is—Atheism.

C. COHEN.

Celestine.

No sooner had the poet Dante stepped within the gate of Hell (as he fables in his *Divine Comedy*) than he felt the sweep of a whirlwind like to a desert blast carrying sand. It was the rush of lost souls. Out of the darkness emerged a mystic flag which fluttered rapidly round the circle of Hell, followed by a long train of spirits. To Dante all their faces were strange, except one.

This one was Pope Celestine.

Why Celestine was placed by God (that is to say, by the poet) in the Inferno need not here detain us. I cite this passage from the grand mediæval epic in order to mark what was, in some practical respects, the beginning of modern Freethought. Dante's poem was composed in the early years of the fourteenth century. The fact that Dante was a Catholic must not obscure his merit as a pioneer of modern intellectual courage. When he made so bold as to condemn Popes and Cardinals who failed in (as he conceived) their Christian duty, and when he set down the judgment in a poem for Italy to read, he was doing a work which was, in various modes, to continue for five hundred years, and is still in operation to-day: I mean the work of criticising the would-be spiritual leaders of humanity.

The other Sunday, riding in the Tube towards Piccadilly, in order to attend Mr. G. W. Foote's opening lecture of the season at Queen's Hall, I was reading in Carey's "Dante" the very canto in which Celestine—poor soul—flies round Hell after the terrible flag, wasps and hornets buzzing about his Papal ears. I listened to the spirited and eloquent address of Mr. Foote on the work and influence of Ferrer, the Martyr of Montjuich, and joined in the applause accorded by the crowded hall. When I

reached home, I turned up an old diary, and, under the date March 10, 1881, I found that I then visited the Hall of Science, Old-street, and there saw and heard Mr. Foote for the first time. Mr. Harris Cowper, a Christian Evidence advocate, lectured on "The Origin of Christianity," and the chief lead in the ensuing discussion was taken by the Editor of this paper; though I forget if the *Freethinker* had yet come into being. Mr. Cowper piously enjoyed himself by making a pun on his opponent's name, but my diary records a note that Mr. Foote replied with "coolness and decision." I may add in passing that, four days later, on my venturing upon some critical remarks at the close of a lecture at Morley Hall, Hackney, by this same Mr. Harris Cowper, the courteous gentleman again enjoyed himself by punning—this time on *my* name.

Well, some thirty years have since passed, and here is Mr. Foote still engaged in the business of assailing churches and creeds; and with the same ring in the voice—for I can perfectly recall the tones in which he spoke in March, 1881. But is the assault justified? Is there any call to attack Rome after the manner of the Queen's Hall attack?

I think yes. Not that I coincide with Mr. Foote's view of the history of Christianity, but such a question is, for present purposes, neither here nor there. Rome either approved or disapproved of Ferrer's execution. The disturbances that occurred in many European cities in token of the indignation of the working-classes were well known to signify hostility to the Spanish government and the Roman Church. A great church which concerns itself with moral issues would, of course, know that the execution of Ferrer raised such an issue. And, just as an honorable gentleman would not willingly let a suspicion rest on his good name if, by a word, he could prevent it, so the Church of Rome should have been ready, and more than ready, to clear itself of complicity in this dark case. It was the duty of the Pope to say, in plain Latin and plain Italian, whether his Church regretted or assented to Ferrer's punishment. It would not suffice to say that Ferrer was an Anarchist, and, therefore, the opinion of Rome on his deserts as a Rationalist was not required. It is very much required. For a vast number of people believe Rome guilty. The least that Rome can do is to say that it disapproves of any penalty for heretical speech and teaching, and, therefore, that it would have looked upon Ferrer's execution for Freethought propaganda as immoral. Rome has not said this.

For myself, I believe not merely in toleration, but in the most generous interpretation of religious liberty (and I may add, in parenthesis, of political liberty also). I understood Mr. Foote to intimate, at Queen's Hall, that while he would freely allow religious processions in the public highways, he was not prepared to recognise the right to perform the religious function implied in an open-air worship of the Host. But I am; always providing that traffic and convenience are not unreasonably interfered with; and I should take that attitude even if the Church which thus did its worship in the street was a very pattern of bigotry and uncharitableness. Nevertheless, we must be allowed to reap the fruits of the labors of our fathers during the last five hundred years. There are some things which honest folk do not argue. We do not argue against indecency: we suppress it. We do not argue against dirt: we go on with our sanitation. And the Twentieth Century is not inclined to argue much about Free Speech. It expects it, and will have it. When I say the Twentieth Century, I mean the living, heroic, confident spirit which knows itself to be the heir of the ages and the coming king. It is absolutely sure that Free Speech is vital to order and progress. It will give that liberty to Rome, to Canterbury, to Dissent, to Faddism; but it will utter its mind in unmistakable terms if an institution or a Church seeks to put down its critics by force. A Church which loses its temper, and fetches down the rifle from the rack, will receive a smart lesson.

Brawling of this sort was quite the fashion before the age of rifles, and there is an occasional recrudescence of such scenes. But the soul of our honest old Earth has very nearly had enough of the degenerate methods of persecution. The Parisians threw up barricades when the telegraph announced the death of Ferrer. Kings used to see the barricades in Paris; but there are no kings there now. Killing pioneers of thought and education is not now a purely local luxury. It is seen from considerable distances. The flash of the rifles at Montjuich was answered by menacing beacons of proletarian wrath in a hundred cities far and near. This responsiveness of the world's people is a new fact in history. It is even a new law; and Churches are not above this law. One man, writing a poem at Ravenna, could effectively rebuke Popes, and the hornets he evoked round the head of Celestine still buzz. And what a single poet could do, not without success, can be yet more forcibly done by the world's democracy.

F. J. GOULD.

Harriet Martineau.

1802-1876.

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

—MATTHEW ARNOLD (*Lines on Harriet Martineau*).

THE death of Florence Nightingale has recalled to the public recollection her friendship with Harriet Martineau, who was not only one of the most remarkable Englishwomen, but who has a special claim on the attention of all Freethinkers.

The life of Harriet Martineau is the simple record of a quiet and pre-eminently useful existence devoted to the service of her fellows. It will be of interest to those who never read the literary works of this great and noble woman. So far back as 1832 Lucy Alkin wrote to Dr. Channing, "You must know that a great, new light has risen among Englishwomen." Lord Brougham, a still better authority, remarked to a friend about the same time: "There is at Norwich a deaf girl, who is doing more good than any man in the country."

Harriet Martineau was born at Norwich in 1802. She has given us a picture of life in this cathedral city. She tells us of the clerical exclusiveness and intellectual stagnation, only slightly modified by the social gatherings of a few cultured families, and by an infusion of French blood, the result of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Martineaus themselves were among the "aliens" whom that intolerant measure drove to our hospitable shores. At Norwich they had flourished for about a century, part of the family devoting itself to silk-weaving, while others were in the medical profession. Harriet's father died young, leaving a family of eight children, of whom Harriet and her brother James, the distinguished theologian, are both famous.

Harriet was barely of age when she published her first book, *Devotional Exercises for Young Persons*. It was a religious publication of the Unitarian school, in which she had been brought up. It is a work of little consequence, but it was the harbinger of a splendid series of productions which were destined to raise her to the pinnacle of fame and influence.

Her mind ripened rapidly, and there was soon a marked improvement in her choice of subjects. Works of fiction, travel, folk-lore, biography, and sociology followed in rapid succession. Her fertile and versatile pen even attempted a series of stories illustrating the working of the principles of Political Economy, which had been laid down in an abstract manner by Adam Smith, Bentham, and Romilly.

These stories were translated into various Continental languages. She found time for travel, visiting the United States, and meeting with a most cordial reception. On her return she associated herself with Charles Knight, the famous publisher, and contributed a number of useful books to the popular series which earned for him a well-deserved and enduring reputation. With the object of lightening her literary labors by variety, she next employed her pen on a series of tales for children, of which *The Settlers at Home* and *Feats on the Fiord* are still read. At the same time she produced two novels of a very marked and distinguished character, called *Deerbrook* and *The Hour and the Man*, the latter dealing with Toussant L'Ouverture and the Haytian Rebellion. This latter work has passed through many editions, and remains, perhaps, her most popular work. About this time her health failed, and Lord Melbourne pressed upon her acceptance a Government pension. But she was too high-minded and conscientious to accept it. In declining this pension she said she could not share in the proceeds of a system of taxation which she had criticised adversely. Her illness lasted several years; but she characteristically turned misfortune to account by writing *Life in a Sick Room*, a work which alike proves this noble woman's rare courage and serenity under the iron hand of affliction. Soon after her restoration to health she varied the monotony of a laborious life by a visit to the Orient, and recorded her impressions in *Eastern Life*, a work which is still full of interest. During all these years her mind had been irresistibly growing, and the result of her mature thought was embodied in *Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development*, written conjointly with Henry George Atkinson. This revealed to all the world that Harriet Martineau was an Atheist. Three years later she introduced to the English public a version of Comte's epoch-making *Positive Philosophy*, a work destined to have an enormous effect on contemporary thought. While thus employed, she yet found time to write her *History of England During the Thirty Years' Peace*, which is characterised by its clarity and impartiality, and is, perhaps, the finest historical work written by a woman.

From this time it was mainly as a leader writer to the *Daily News* and as a contributor to *Once a Week* that her literary ability manifested itself. To the last, in spite of bad health, she took the greatest interest in every movement for the bettering of humanity. She lived through a long, happy, useful, irreproachable life, and sank, calmly, full of years, into the grave, regretted and esteemed by all.

Because Harriet Martineau taught the vital truths of Liberty and Fraternity, of good deeds to others, of kindly tolerance, she is worthy of warm and genuine approval. Popularity, applause, and friends were rightly hers. Who knows, when the final result is weighed, who will have done the most good in the world, the artist who adds masterpieces to our literature or the woman who does her best to alleviate "the weariness, the fever, and the fret" of life? If Freethinkers, still true to the long line of their illustrious dead, keep her memory green, holding her as she was, the embodiment of true womanhood, then better than in effigy or epitaph will her life be written and her tomb be built in the hearts of her fellow-soldiers in the Army of Human Liberation.

MIMNERMUS.

The Existence of God.

UNQUESTIONABLY the supreme point at issue between Atheism and every shade of Theistic thought is the existence or non-existence of God. Diversity of opinion upon the date, authorship, and authority of documents, upon the origin and validity of dogmas, or upon the ethics of the various religious systems, are all side issues that become negligible before the all-important question of Deity. When one takes up a

definitely negative position with regard to this central question, all minor issues cease to excite interest. But this, apparently, is not the prevailing attitude assumed by Freethinkers; at least, so I gather from a recent article from the pen of Mr. J. T. Lloyd. "No sensible man," he avers, "goes about the country asseverating that there is no God, for no sensible man pretends to be in possession of any knowledge whatever on the subject." Now, as a reader of the *Freethinker* for a considerable number of years, I yield to none in my admiration of Mr. Lloyd's ability as a clear thinker and a cogent writer. But I am disappointed that he should have penned such a statement. It is a trifle too dogmatic, in the first place. Just because Mr. Lloyd is in favor of the Spencerian attitude towards the existence of God it does not necessarily follow that "no sensible man" will take a more definite view of the question. I should like to see the question debated at length; and although it is, perhaps, a gratuitous labor to demonstrate a negative, I do not think that in this case it is an impossibility. After all, is the position of the Atheist who denies the existence of God so untenable, or so difficult to defend? I think not. Added to the fact that there is not an atom of real evidence in proof of a Deity that has always declined to demonstrate its existence, there are many unanswerable arguments against the possibility. Surely by accepting the mechanical theory of the universe we, by implication, deny the existence of God. By disposing of the functions of Godhead we have argued God out of being. The real origin of God was the presence of natural phenomena which, to the undeveloped and uninformed mind of man, admitted of no other explanation than the supernatural one of an all-powerful God controlling and ordering the universe. *Mais nous avons changé tout cela*,—to use Molière's phrase. With the aid of modern science we now know that the universe does not need a supreme controller. The laws that govern it are not regulations ordained by a divine law-giver; they are inherent in the universe itself. The sun does not require a command from God to absorb moisture into the clouds. It does so because it simply could not do otherwise. A stone thrown into the air does not need a divine injunction to return to earth when the energy imparted to it is spent; it falls in response to the attraction of a greater body. The same logic accounts for all natural phenomena. Obviously, therefore, there is no need for God's existence at the present stage. Thomas Carlyle, with all his ingrained belief in God, realised this difficulty. Once he almost alighted upon the truth that a God that does nothing does not exist. Froude tells us that Carlyle was perplexed by the indifference with which the Supreme Power was allowing his existence to be obscured. "I [Froude] once said to him, not long before his death, that I could only believe in a God which *did* something. With a cry of pain, which I shall never forget, he said, 'He does nothing.'" That was Carlyle's one weakness as a thinker. He could not live down the theological bias which he owed to his dotting mother, and bring his theories into consonance with truths that he plainly realised. With the advent of an enlightened era, God has relapsed into inactivity; and, to say the truth, there is now nothing for him to do. But, the Theist may protest, does not the very existence of the laws inherent in matter demonstrate the necessity of an original law-giver, even though they render his intervention superfluous now? The very existence of the universe and its laws implies a Maker, a Designer, a First Cause. Let us consider the question on purely logical grounds. In the first place the simple, obvious retort is that the existence of a Maker demands a prior Maker, and so on *ad infinitum*. An uncaused Maker is, at least, quite as much a logical absurdity as an uncaused universe. But, as we hope to demonstrate, an uncaused universe is the only logical possibility conceivable. The universe could never have been created, using that word in its only justifiable sense, viz., to bring into being or form out of nothing.

In some form it must always have existed. If, in an era unthinkably remote, there had been for one single instant no universe in existence, it is logically obvious that it could never have come into being, since *ex nihilo nihil fit*. The dictum of Lucretius is unanswerable by anyone who claims to argue along the lines of human reason. How the world assumed its present form—whether as Lucretius, in his *De Rerum Natura*, opines, it was caused by the fortuitous union of atoms falling from space, or as the advocates of the nebular theory maintain—it is doubtful whether we shall ever be able to do more than hazard a guess. The creation story, with its implication of a supernatural Creator, is certainly untenable. Again, then, God is rendered unnecessary, and consequently non-existent. If we are honest with ourselves, how can we continue to affect doubt upon the subject? To demonstrate the non-morality of the laws that govern Nature; to prove the incompatibility of a beneficent deity with the bloody trail of evolution through the ages; to illustrate the complete non-intervention of deity in human affairs, and its impossibility were God more than an idea; all this seems so archaic as to savor of the pre-glacial epoch. It has been done so well for us by the greatest writers and thinkers that culture has produced. Why, then, should we hesitate to declare our denial of God's existence? Enlightened human thought has killed the Devil; it must now destroy God. The one is as illogical as the other. An All-powerful Agent of Good is become even more incompatible with the known facts of life now that the supreme Agent of Evil is out of existence. Let God die a natural death. We have destroyed the substance; shall we retain the shadow?

ALFRED GERMANY.

Acid Drops.

The Eucharistic Congress came to an end at Montreal on Sunday. "In the midst of a gorgeous procession of Cardinals, Archbishops, and clergy," the *Daily Chronicle* says, "the Host was solemnly borne through the streets of Montreal between the kneeling ranks of over half a million people." The Host was borne by Cardinal Vannutelli, the Pope's Legate. The number of Bishops and clergy who took part in the procession is reported to have been five thousand. But the divine power resident in them was not deemed sufficient for the protection of the Catholic "God":—

"The Host was guarded by the 65th Regiment, Montreal's crack Carabiniers Mont-Royal, who, under the command of their colonel, Lieut.-Colonel Labelle, hedged in the Papal Legate and his sacred charge with a ring of steel. The presence of the Militia with fixed bayonets and drawn swords was not, however, intended as an official participation in the ceremony, the men being there with the Government's permission in their capacity as Roman Catholic Volunteers."

There you are. There you have the insolence of Rome. There was no need whatever to carry the Host through the public streets. It could only have been meant as a direct challenge to the Protestant one-fourth of the population, and the presence of Militia with fixed bayonets and drawn swords is a proof of it. That the Government should permit a regiment, in uniform and armed, to take a share in this partisan game, is simply scandalous.

It will be pretended, of course, that the Host was carried through the streets of Montreal in order that solemn Mass might be conducted by Cardinal Vannutelli at a temporary altar erected at Fletcher's Field outside the town. But that is only the Jesuitism for which the Romish Church is so famous. No such necessity could be pleaded when it was intended to carry the Host through the streets of Westminster—an intention which was only frustrated by the Prime Minister's interference.

Mr. F. J. Gould raises a very interesting problem in the delightful article which we print from his pen in this week's *Freethinker*. It is a problem in the principle and practice of toleration. The view that Mr. Foote expressed at Queen's Hall on the worship of the Mass in the public thoroughfares is the same view that he expressed in a leading article at the time of the Eucharistic Congress at Westminster. It is a reasoned, deliberate view, and he is prepared to defend it.

He proposes to do so next week; which is better than diverting attention this week from the general contents of Mr. Gould's article.

Cardinal Vannutelli, the Pope's Legate at the Eucharistic Congress, rose early one day and celebrated mass for the Roman Catholic prisoners in the chapel of Montreal prison. No doubt they were too many to be overlooked. Roman Catholic criminals are generally much more numerous than they should be considering the Roman Catholic proportion of the population.

The Quebec Premier, Sir Louis Gouin, and his ministerial colleagues, entertained Cardinal Vannutelli at luncheon. According to a Reuter telegram, the Cardinal "referred in appreciative terms to the religious liberty enjoyed in Canada." Of course he did. Religious liberty is a grand thing when Catholics want it badly. It is an invention of the Devil when they are in a majority and don't want it, either for themselves or for others. Religious liberty is a grand thing in Great Britain and Canada; it is a diabolical thing in Spain.

The Pope has committed a fresh act of folly in his crusade against Modernism. He solemnly warns all bishops and superiors to keep a careful watch on students for the priesthood, to prepare them for the struggle against modern errors, and to prohibit their reading newspapers and reviews. They are to be kept in ignorance of the very "errors" against which they are to "struggle." Such a policy is worthy of a lunatic asylum. Fancy medical students being kept from a knowledge of the diseases they will afterwards be expected to cure! It is really too silly for words. Yet the Pope, who is guilty of this almost incredible folly, is God's infallible vicegerent on earth. What a funny world it is—especially the religious world.

Mr. "Willie" Redmond, M.P., is called "a genial Irishman." We do not know enough of him to dispute it. All we know of him is that in February, 1882, he rose on his legs in the House of Commons and asked the Home Secretary "whether the Government had power to seize and summarily suppress newspapers which they considered pernicious to public morals; and, if so, why that power was not exercised in the case of the *Freethinker* and other papers now published and circulated in England." The gentleman who put that question had "cheek" enough for a dozen ordinary men of any other nationality. He represented a handful of voters at New Ross, a little Irish town of less than seven thousand inhabitants—men, women, and children. We believe that the whole of his (voting) constituents could have taken an excursion in a couple of waggons. The *Freethinker*, on the other hand, had thousands of readers. "Cheek" indeed!

That delightful apostle of compromise—with a sufficiently fashionable backing—Professor Michael E. Sadler, contributes an article to the *Contemporary Review* on "High Churchmen and the Crisis in Religious Education." His article is an appeal to the fears and interests of High Churchmen to support the proposals of the Educational Settlement Committee, in order to prevent the schools coming under the control of the advocates of Secular Education. He appeals to advocates of religious instruction in State schools to fight together and avoid division "before the face of the secularist enemy," and adds: "The religious future of England depends in great measure" upon the response to this appeal. Now we do not gather that Professor Sadler stands before the world as a champion of religion—in fact, we have always understood that his religious opinions are of an extremely nebulous character. His position is that of an educational expert, and we should much like to know what such a person has to do with the "religious future of England." That is the business of the Churches, not of those who desire to see the schools of the country conducted on wise and right lines. And Professor Sadler's appeal to the sectarian interests of Churchmen, inviting them to co-operate in perpetuating an injustice lest Secular Education be established, is—no matter how it be disguised—discreditable both to those who offer advice and to those who accept it.

Professor Sadler argues that Secular Education will not mean religious neutrality. Eliminate Christian teaching, he argues, and "Naturalism or Humanitarianism offers itself as a substitute." By "Naturalism or Humanitarianism" we may assume Professor Sadler means a teaching devoid of explicit supernaturalism, and directed to the development of human faculty and the satisfaction of legitimate human needs. At least, this is what we understand by the expression. And, to be quite frank, we are inclined to agree that the absence of religious instruction in

public schools will react to the disadvantage of religious beliefs. But this is only saying that the normal and healthful development of a child's faculties, backed up by a sanely scientific teaching, lends no support to religion, but tends to prevent its acceptance. This is, of course, a satisfactory reason why clergymen should oppose Secular Education; but for a professed educationalist to appeal to them upon this ground, and take it as a sufficient reason for his own support of religious instruction, is surprising—that is, it would be were it not that the hypocrisy and time-serving nature of English public men is so pronounced that we are prepared for almost anything in that direction.

A *Methodist Times* writer, describing his holiday in Italy, speaks of the country as reminiscent "of the greatest man the strange nineteenth century produced—the wonderful Giuseppe Garibaldi." We add, and one that did not scruple to call himself an Atheist.

Holman Hunt's "Shadow of Death" was, after all, a clap-trap picture—in spite of its fine painting. The shadow of the carpenter Jesus stretching himself looked as though he were extended on the Cross. But how could that suggest the crucifixion to his mother, if she had only a woman's knowledge and foresight? And what could it matter to her if she were supernaturally acquainted with what was to happen? And precisely the same questions apply to Jesus also.

Carlyle gave Holman Hunt a bit of sound advice: "Take my word for it," he said "and use your cunning hand for something that ye see about ye, and, above all, do not confuse your understanding with mysteries."

The Berlin Correspondent of the *Christian World* writes that the anti-Christian movement in Germany "is unquestionably growing in strength, almost in violence." The Socialist press "seems as eager in combating Christianity as in tilting against the alleged abuses of the secular State." The Monist League, with Haeckel at its head, and other Freethought associations, are, he says, developing an activity beyond anything of the kind in England. For millions of Germans the Church is an obsolete and antiquated institution. The Church is face to face with a tremendous problem, and it seems unable to find any satisfactory solution. We are not surprised at the news. The decay of Christianity is not local, but universal. Man is finding himself; and the universal revolt against Christianity is the condemnation by civilised humanity of one of the most colossal impostures that has ever oppressed the race.

We are always happy to make acknowledgments when and where they are deserved. Writing in the *Christian World* for September 8, "J. B." says:—

"The English religious world still thinks of Thomas Paine simply as a denier, an 'Infidel.' He lies under mountains of orthodox denunciation. What does our average religionist know about him? He knows nothing of the fact that this Quaker soul was one of the bravest affirmers of his time; that this man, the friend of Washington, the friend of Lafayette and Franklin, spent his life without fee or reward in battles for all that is sacred in humanity—battles in the cause of universal peace, in the cause of negro emancipation, in the cause of the child, in the cause of the poor. Whether in America fighting the cause of independence, or in the French Convention upholding the rights of the people, he ever founds himself on principles which we now recognise as the alphabet of ethics."

From such a source the tribute is doubly welcome. We hope that those who most need such reminders—"J. B.'s" fellow clergyman—will bear it well in mind when they next have occasion to refer to the great Freethinkers of the past.

The pity is that such a rebuke should be necessary. But being necessary, it carries with it a wholesale condemnation of the moral influence of Christian belief. For nothing but Christian malignancy and falsehood could have given continued currency to the mountain of calumny that gathered around the name of Paine. Had Paine been a Christian, and done but a tenth of the good work he did, his name would have been constantly on the lips of Christians in praise of his greatness and well-doing. Not being a Christian he was painted as a drunken, dissolute, cowardly swashbuckler—a figure that still ranks as the real Thomas Paine with the vast majority of Christians in this country. And when the infamous Torrey was repeating these vile stories, the English, lacking the courage to voice the lies themselves, were contemptible enough to stand quietly by and reap whatever advantage might come to them from the Yankee adventurer's falsehoods.

Paine, it must be remembered, is after all only a type—a standing example of the way in which history, trickling through the polluted and polluting channels of Christianity, treats those who have had the courage to speak the truth about the great lying creed. Those whose reputations it does not or cannot befoul, it buries. What does ordinary history know of the many Freethinking men and women, preceding and succeeding Paine, who spent their lives in working for the same objects as Paine, even though in a less conspicuous manner? How much does the ordinary reader gather concerning those who fought and suffered for freedom of speech and the press? How much even of so great a figure as that of Robert Owen—the Atheist? Ignored altogether he could not be; but one may pick up book after book dealing with the history of social questions with merely a passing mention of his name—and sometimes not even that. While any nonentity, so long as he did a little, provided he was a zealous member of this or that Christian sect, is elevated to the rank of a social savior. The unwritten law, although observed more exactly than any written law, is that the unbeliever's good works shall be buried. His faults or his follies, be they ever so microscopic, are painted in monumental letters for the edification of future generations. Christian malignancy is sleepless in its vindictiveness, its falsehood inexhaustible in its fertility.

Rev. E. S. Waterhouse asks, "Why cannot ecclesiastical history be made as interesting as fiction?" Presumably Mr. Waterhouse means as interesting as *other* fiction, for most of it belongs to the same class. And we suspect the true answer is that the writers of Church history are not sufficiently humorous. There are infinite possibilities before a really humorous writer who turns his attention in this direction.

How history is written! Mr. Charles Frohman is trying to arrange for a series of Sunday plays, and he is evidently under the impression that, provided the plays selected are sufficiently solemn, he will secure his end. To an interviewer he remarked that Mr. John Galsworthy's *Justice* would be quite suitable for Sunday presentation. He added, "It was produced at my Repertory Theatre in London, and its immediate effect was so to stir the sympathies of the British public as to bring about widespread prison reforms." Oh, shade of Beccaria! For a good century and a half reformers—mostly Freethinkers, be it noted—have been urging the scientific—which is the humanitarian—treatment of prison inmates, and now the credit is to be piled in one lump on the shoulders of Mr. Galsworthy. We have every respect for the drama, but some of the folk connected with it seem to take themselves just a trifle too seriously.

What is the matter with the editor of the *Methodist Times*? He suggests, in a leading article in his paper for September 8, that the alternative before the French is Rome or—Methodism. Now we can picture a great many things happening in France, and we can conceive the French people adopting anyone of a number of curious opinions. But for the life of us we cannot conceive the French people as a nation of Methodists. We could sooner think of them as joining the Salvation Army. There would at least be the big drum and the red jersey—to say nothing of the possibilities in the way of developing a kind of sanctified can-can among the female portion of the converts.

"God" made men and animals, and God made men to dine on animals, and animals to dine sometimes on men. Snakes diminished the population of India in 1908 by 19,738. Tigers accounted for 909, leopards for 302, wolves for 269, and other wild animals for 21,904. It all shows how accurate the late Mr. Gladstone was in remarking how wonderfully "Providence" had fitted up the earth for man's habitation.

At one of Roosevelt's meetings in Fargo, North Dakota, a man called him a liar. The ex-President, and would-be next President, caught hold of the man, who was quickly passed out of the building. Roosevelt has frequently called his critics liars, but he doesn't like to hear the word himself. Yet he is a liar. For many years he has declined to correct his published statement that Thomas Paine was a "dirty little Atheist." Here are three lies in three words,—which fairly takes the cake.

Senator Lorimer, the man that Roosevelt won't dine with, as guilty of the worst corruption, was certified by Charles T. Yeakes as "genuinely religious." The man who is reported to have bribed him, Lee Browne, professes to "believe the Bible from cover to cover."

The erection of new places of worship is always trumpeted abroad; but very little is said of the closing of these places. Leigh-road Congregational Church, Westcliff-on-Sea, has been closed in order to swell the congregation of the new Crowstone-road Church. The same thing happened when Moorfield's Catholic Church, London, was sold up to help the building fund of Westminster Cathedral.

Canon Bickersteth Ottley, speaking at St. John's Church, Southend, said that the Christian had a bank holiday every Sunday, but the ordinary man had only four bank holidays a year. That is so, and the ordinary man realises this when a Salvation Army band brays outside his house for hours on a Sunday.

During the month of August most of the distinguished ecclesiastics were scattered over Europe holiday making. Christ died on the Cross and these gentlemen live on it. That's a distinction with a difference.

The meetings of the British Association attract very little attention nowadays. It was far different in "the seventies," when men cared for Truth instead of Mrs. Grundy.

It is the late Professor William James's own fault. He chose to attach importance while he was living to some of the "phenomena" of Spiritism, and now that he is dead the Spiritists are trading upon the fact. American mediums, male and female, are conveying messages from him in "the beyond" to his friends on the "earth plane." Here is one that has reached Mr. Ayer, a Boston business man, and head of the "Ayer's Tabernacle Bond of Spirits":—

"I am at peace (here several words were lost) with myself and all mankind. I have awakened to a life far beyond my highest conception while a denizen of the earth. Tell my brothers that I will transmit a message through this instrument that will prove my individuality when I can manifest myself more clearly than at this time. I did not realise how difficult it would be to manifest from this place of life to the mortal place. There is much for me to learn, and many conditions to overcome."

Those who are acquainted with William James's writings will see that he has lost his fine, vivid, and powerful style already. We may add that there never was a message from any important writer who has emigrated to "the beyond" which was worthy of his reputation. They all degenerate miserably. They write just like the mediums. And it doesn't require genius to see what that means.

Yvette Guilbert has written the story of her life, and it is just published in English under the title of *Struggles and Victories*. She is a very clever woman—a genius in her way—but she belongs to a profession which is notorious for its superstition. We are not surprised, therefore, at the following pious outburst at the very beginning of her narrative:—

"I feel it my first duty, a duty I owe to my faith and to my conscience to express my thanks to Almighty God for all His mercies. His hands have shaped my destiny—the struggles I have endured have but served to make me the better appreciate my victories.....I have loved work, and You have given me courage; I have loved art, and You have given me the means to enjoy it. My poor efforts, first as a seamstress, then as an artist, have often met with rebuffs and disappointments, but I was always confident, thanks to Your Mercy, of arriving at my goal at last."

It will be observed that the great Yvette, like meaner pietists, considers herself as one of heaven's favorites. She has been taken especial care of by the Deity who has let so many others fall into failure and misery. And with the selfishness of religion, which masquerades as renunciation and humility, she is duly grateful for her own advantages.

Mr. Harold Begbie, a mere slap dash journalist, is taken by the newspapers as a philosophic authority. He even pats Mr. Edward Clodd on the back as not quite such a wicked unbeliever as is generally imagined. "Mr. Clodd," he says, "does well to insist, that he [Huxley] was neither Atheist nor Materialist." Huxley, indeed, did not call himself an Atheist; he called himself an Agnostic; but it puzzles candid people to find any real difference between the two designations. He was certainly "without God in the world"—as the Bible puts it. Huxley also repudiated the term Materialist. But he *was* a Materialist in the sense in which Mr. Begbie and his orthodox friends use the word.

He did not accept the theory of a "soul" separate from, and independent of, the human organism.

"Correspondence between the Rev. John Wesley Hill president of the Individual and Social Justice League of America (anti-Socialist), and Allen Cook, a Socialist of Canton, Ohio, is published as a leaflet, after appearing in the *New York Call*. The religious question is involved in the discussion. The Rev. Hill declares Socialism to be "un-Christian." Mr. Cook replies that "Socialism is not opposed to religion," and asserts that the clergy, in their support of capitalism, forget the teachings of Christ, while Socialism is right in line with the work of the Nazarene. It will hardly pay the Socialists to adopt this style of argument—blasting the ministers and the Church while asserting their friendliness to religion. Christianity, or religion, is the form in which it is manifested in this day and generation. When the representatives of religion, the leading Protestant clergymen, the Roman Catholic archbishops, the most prominent Jewish rabbis, join in a Socialist-smashing crusade, it is proper to say that religion opposes Socialism; and when Socialists declare that the priesthood of the Jews, the Catholics, and the Protestants 'unite as one man in defending the infamous system that feeds them,' they are attacking religion as we have it."—*Truthseeker* (New York).

The *Daily News* refers to "the riddles that have to be solved before the Bible can be translated into remote and barbaric tongues," and it gives several illustrations, but it does not include what is perhaps the best of all. A missionary in a certain part of China tried to translate the word "God" into the local dialect. They had no word of their own for the Deity, so the missionary had to cast about for the nearest word that would serve his turn, and he lighted on one that seemed to him admirable. He used the word regularly with great confidence, but he found eventually that he had been calling God "stinking fish." The Chinese were too polite to laugh at his blunder.

Rev. Dr. Clifford, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, and Rev. J. W. Ewing were to have represented the Baptist World's Alliance at the first Congress of Russian Baptists at St. Petersburg on September 13. But their faith in Providence was not sufficient to overcome their fear of the cholera. So they acted on discretion as the better part of valor and stayed at home.

France having taken practical possession of Madagascar, the Protestant missionaries are naturally not allowed any special privileges. This terribly annoys them. They are therefore spreading, through the London Missionary Society and otherwise, wonderful stories about the immorality which is allowed, and even encouraged, by the French government. These stories are too absurd for belief. Missionaries should romance with a little plausibility.

Rev. Dr. Alexander McLaren, the famous Nonconformist divine, who died lately, left £28,505 4s. 5d. net. They all do—if they can. Anybody can have a Christian apostle's share of the blessings of poverty.

The Pilgrim Fathers again! The Mayor of Southampton has just been presiding over a meeting of the committee formed to erect a memorial over the spot whence the *Mayflower* sailed for America in 1620. It is piously believed that the gentlemen who went over in the *Mayflower* were fugitives from tyranny and friends of freedom. Fugitives from tyranny they were, but not friends of freedom. They were not wedded to freedom. They had hardly been introduced to her. They set up in America a more detestable, and less excusable, tyranny than the one they had left behind them in England. They whipped, branded, tortured, and burnt heretics with the greatest cheerfulness. It was this fact that prompted a Yankee humorist to say that the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, but it might have been better if Plymouth Rock had landed on the Pilgrim Fathers.

A *Daily News* reviewer on Monday morning referred to Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* as "an indictment of God." An excellent description. Truth, like murder, will out—even in the organ of the Nonconformist Conscience.

An airship circling round St. Paul's! How absurd it makes the doctrines look that are taught in that splendid abode of superstition! Had there been airships two thousand years ago there would have been no Christianity.

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, September 18, Queen's (Minor) Hall, Langham-place, W. : at 7.30, "The True Heaven and Hell."

September 25, Queen's Hall, London.

October 2, Glasgow; 9, Manchester; 16, Queen's Hall; 23, Leicester; 30, Birmingham.

November 6, Shoreditch Town Hall; 13, Liverpool; 27, Shoreditch Town Hall.

To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—October 2, Queen's Hall, London; 9, Glasgow; 30, Queen's Hall, London. November 13, West Ham; 20, Shoreditch Town Hall. December 4, Manchester.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—October 2, Liverpool; 9, Queen's Hall, London; 16, Glasgow; 23, Queen's Hall, London. November 6, Fulham; 13, Shoreditch Town Hall; 20, Manchester; 27, Leicester. December 4, Holloway; 18, West Ham.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND: 1910.—Previously acknowledged, £248 2s. 7d. Received since:—T. M. Mosley, 2s.

ELIZABETH LECHMERE.—Those dignitaries of the Church, and some of Science, must be lacking in sympathy, as you say, or they would not chatter so about their "good God" while so much suffering and misery surrounded them.

E. B.—See paragraph. Thanks.

INQUIRER.—(1) Such expressions as "the most perfect specimen," "a high state of perfection," are really incorrect, although they have crept into common use, even by good writers. Perfect is perfect, and there is an end of it. There cannot be degrees in perfection. The fact is that these incorrect expressions result from a want of clearness of thought, or from a want of skill or patience in the choice of words to express the exact meaning intended. (2) Glad you were so pleased with the article you mention.

HAROLD ELLIOT.—(1) What has Socialism to do with it? To mention it is to raise a false scent. If our criticism can be answered, let it be so. Everything else is beside the point. (2) Thanks for the enclosures.

PRETORIA SUBSCRIBER.—We will deal with it all right.

W. P. BALL.—Many thanks for cuttings.

A. E. WILLIAMS.—We have renewed the instruction. There must be a mistake somewhere.

T. M. MOSLEY.—You are mistaken. Mr. Foote waited some time after his last lecture at Leicester, chatting and shaking hands with "saints." He will be glad to see you on October 23. The enclosure shall be referred to next week.

W. STEWART, secretary of the Wood Green Branch, 78 Carlingford-road, West-green, will be glad to hear from local Freethinkers who would co-operate in forming a Branch of the N. S. S. for Edmonton and Enfield.

W. H. H.—Your suggestion *re* Manchester lectures shall be borne in mind.

L. H. HEWETT.—You make the same suggestion as W. H. H. Mr. Foote will be happy to give the new Bradlaugh lecture at Manchester if it is generally desired.

J. CARRUTHERS.—Glad you continue to have good open-air meetings at Blackburn, and that your members are going over to hear Mr. Foote at Manchester on October 9.

F. G. KEENEY.—It is quite right to refuse burial to Freethinkers in Westminster Abbey—which is a Christian temple. The representatives of notable dead Freethinkers ought to know better than to crave for such an indignity. Pleased to hear from you as a recent reader who became acquainted with our journal "through the kind offices of a fellow Atheist."

W. BLETCHEB.—Perfectly spurious. Whiston had credulity enough for anything.

W. OWEN.—Glasgow subjects were posted on Monday.

CLARA GUNNING.—The trick is in the word "laws." A "law" of nature and a "law" of the state have absolutely no resemblance to each other. People are "controlled" by a law of the state, but nothing is "controlled" by a law of nature. "Control" must come from outside. A "law" of nature simply means the way in which nature operates through inherent forces. A "law" of the state can be broken; a "law" of nature cannot be broken. People talk about "breaking nature's laws," but the expression is scientifically absurd.

ROBERT GREEN (Sheringham).—Glad you take it so humorously, but it was certainly annoying to be unable to see the lecturer at Queen's Hall on Sunday evening in consequence of a lady's banyan hat. We hope the wearer, if she sees this, will take the hint; but she was very likely a stranger.

H. REID.—We will look through it.

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.

There was another fine audience at Queen's (Minor) Hall on Sunday evening, including a very gratifying proportion of the fair sex, who were by no means the least interested hearers. Mr. Cohen, who of course was most heartily welcomed, occupied the chair, and told the audience that he was looking forward, as he was sure they were, to the lecture which bore such a striking and suggestive title. Prior to the lecture Madame Saunders (pianist) and Miss Clarke (vocalist) rendered a much appreciated musical program; and Mr. Foote recited Hamlet's soliloquy after the players have left him—"O what a rogue and peasant slave am I." The lecture itself, "Man's Discovery of Himself," was listened to with extraordinary attention and enthusiastically applauded at the finish; one of the most attentive listeners being Mr. Lloyd, who occupied a front seat. A good many questions were asked and afterwards answered.

One must not forget, in relation to these lectures, the valuable services rendered, chiefly behind the scenes, by three ladies; Miss Vance, as secretary, and Miss Kough and Miss Stanley, her active co-operators. We say this with all the more pleasure as it may encourage other ladies to work for Freethought.

It is delightful to Mr. Foote to see so many ladies at his lectures nowadays. There could be no surer sign that Freethought is winning. One very intelligent looking lady, in going out, thanked Mr. Foote warmly. She said that she did not usually care much for lectures, but she never enjoyed any in her life as she had enjoyed his. And she had brought with her "a thoughtful young daughter," who had enjoyed the lecture too. More than most other tributes this gratified the lecturer. "A thoughtful young daughter" is a happy assemblage of words. When thoughtful daughters about the world will be far on the road to salvation. Men may smile at this, but thoughtful women will join us in smiling at them.

Mr. Foote's third lecture at Queen's Hall to-night (Sept. 18) will be on "The True Heaven and Hell." Prior to the lecture he will read Tennyson's "Rizpah"—a poem that Swinburne used to rave over, and it is indeed written in heart's blood and immortal tears. Through the mouth of a poor old woman, whose boy had long years ago been hung, the great poet—for Tennyson was a great poet when he wrote "Rizpah"—shatters to dust the detestable doctrine of hell. Mr. Davies will be the chairman on this occasion. There will be a musical program before the lecture.

Charles Bradlaugh's birthday was September 26, and September 25 is, of course, the nearest Sunday to that date. It will be seen by the Queen's Hall advertisement that Mr. Foote's subject for that evening is "Charles Bradlaugh: After Twenty Years." We are happy to announce that the chair at this lecture will be taken by Mrs. Bradlaugh-Bonner, his only surviving daughter, whose biography of her father is known to everybody—that is to say, everybody who is anybody. Mrs. Bonner will also write a special article on her father for the *Freethinker* dated September 25, and the article will be accompanied by a very fine portrait of the great "Iconoclast."

Saturday, September 10, being the 113th anniversary of the death of Mary Woolstonecraft, the author of the *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, deputations from various Women's Societies visited her grave in St. Peter's Churchyard, Bournemouth, and laid flowers upon it. Southey used to call Mary Woolstonecraft "that divine woman." She was very beautiful, very gifted—and a Freethinker. She was the wife of Godwin and the mother of Mary Shelley.

Mr. Lloyd's article is not in its usual place this week. His copy never arrived at the printing office, and he had to write it all over again—too late to go anywhere but where it is. The Post Office may deliver the original copy ten years hence. You never can tell.

The Prophecies Concerning Jesus Christ.—III.

(Continued from p. 589.)

NOW the burden of all the prophecies of these deceived and deceiving prophets was that some ruler in Israel would arise who would turn the Jews from their evil ways and exalt the Jewish nation above all surrounding nations. This ruler was to be a powerful earthly potentate, not a mere spiritual myth—a barbarian conqueror and deliverer like to Joshua and David, not a feeble god-man who abjured earth and all its pleasures, and spoke only of a kingdom of heaven and all its airy delights. Thus Isaiah says that Cyrus, the Lord's anointed, "shall perform all his [the Lord's] pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isaiah xlv. 28). "The Lord will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in his people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying" (Isaiah lxxv. 19). Hosea says that God himself shall deliver them; for, saith the Lord, "There is no savior beside me" (Hosea xiii. 4). Micah supposed that this deliverer would come out of Bethlehem Ephrathah, and that he would deliver the Jews from the Assyrian; he was also to be a ruler in Israel, and to waste the land of Assyria and the land of Nimrod with the sword (Micah v. 1-6). What similarity is there between this man and Jesus? None whatever! Jesus was never a ruler in Israel, nor did he deliver the Jews from the Assyrian yoke; in his days, and long afterwards, both Assyria and Judah were subject to the Roman power. Jesus, therefore, was not the man to whom Micah refers; and so far as Jesus is concerned the prophecy is void.

Matthew informs us that, on a certain occasion, Jesus, when he "drew nigh unto Jerusalem," said to two of his disciples:—

"Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; loose them and bring them unto me. And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them. All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them, and brought the ass and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon. And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees and strewed them in the way. And the multitude that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest" (Matt. xxi. 1-9).

Mark (xi. 1-7) and Luke (xix. 29-38) being evidently of opinion that both the ass and the colt were not required for Jesus to ride upon, leave out the story of the ass, and say that it was only the colt that was brought to him. John (xii. 12-15), on the contrary, leaves out the colt, and says it was an ass that Jesus rode; he is careful, too, to say that it was a "young ass," and that the animal had been found straying, and so had not been taken possession of surreptitiously.

The passage to which Matthew alludes is the ninth verse of the ninth chapter of Zechariah, which reads thus: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." These words were spoken by the prophet in order to encourage and stimulate the people who were then employed in building the house of the Lord. But how can they be made to apply to Jesus? No reference is made to him, and not even to Shiloh. The passage undoubtedly refers to Joshua, the son of Josedech, for in chapter vi. we read that the prophet was directed by the Lord "to take silver and gold, and make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest; and

speaking unto him, saying, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and shall build the temple of the Lord" (11, 12). This Joshua the son of Josedech was, therefore, the King of whom Jeremiah prophesied when he said, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch; and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jer. xxiii. 5).

Riding upon an ass was no exceptional circumstance even in ancient times. Balaam rode upon an ass. And if the ass upon which Jesus is said to have ridden had opened its mouth, as the ass of Baalam is said to have done, and had assured the multitude that the personage then bestriding it was the man of whom Zechariah had spoken, what human donkey would have gainsaid the statement? But the story itself bears the impress of improbability because at this very time, according to John, Jesus—so far from being the idol of the multitude—"walked no longer openly among the Jews because the priests and scribes had taken steps to put him to death" (xi. 53, 54).

In the eighth chapter of Matthew we read that, on a certain day, "when the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word and healed all that were sick. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (16, 17). But the words in Isaiah (liii. 4) are widely different, and refer not to the future but to the past. The words are: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows," and could not possibly refer to Jesus. Nothing, moreover, is said in these words about curing diseases or casting out devils. So far from this being a prophecy respecting Jesus, they are in no wise applicable to him. Christ never took upon himself the infirmities and sicknesses of mankind. We are told that he was without sin; therefore he was not subject to the "ills which flesh is heir to," and could not have been tempted as human beings are. We never hear of his having had even a headache, and most certainly he was not "possessed with devils." If Matthew be the apostle of Truth, Jesus was the possessor of devils; and exercised jurisdiction over them as a slaveowner does over his human chattels, as was evidenced by his ordering a legion of them to enter into the herd of swine. The Gospel of Matthew is the first book in which a devil is mentioned; but Matthew never gave a description of a devil, and never even pretended to have seen one. No one ever heard of, much more ever saw, a devil until Jesus came upon earth; and, strange to say, when Jesus disappeared behind the cloud (Acts i. 9), the devil vanished too; for no devil has been seen since.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, from which Matthew has taken his quotation, is a favorite one with sky-pilots, because they assert that from beginning to end it relates to Christ. But it does nothing of the kind. Like Milton's poem of Lycidas, it is simply a monody—that is, a mournful utterance on the death of a friend. But nothing is known of this friend. He may have been, and probably was, a creation of the prophet's brain. And it is this silence, which is evidence of nothing, that Matthew has broken by uttering the name of Christ, and associating it with the monody. Where is his authority for doing so? To treat a monody as if it were a prophecy is absurd. The characters and environments of men, even in different ages of the world, are so much alike that what is said of one man may, with propriety, be said of many; but this fitness does not raise a few called words to the dignity of a prophecy. Isaiah, in deploring the hard fate and loss of his friend, mentions nothing of him but what all human beings have been subject to. All that he states of him—his persecutions, his imprisonment, his patience in suffering, and his perseverance in principle—are within the line of nature; they belong to no one man, but may with justice be claimed by many. If Jesus had been the being which Christians represent

him to have been, that which would exclusively apply to him must be something that could not apply to any mortal man; it must be something beyond nature, beyond humankind; and there are no such expressions in this chapter nor in any other chapter of the Old Testament to warrant such a conclusion.

Isaiah laments his friend in these words: "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth" (Isaiah liii. 7). But this may be truly said of thousands of persons—of Gentiles as well as Jews, of Pagans as well as Christians, of Freethinkers as well as Fanatics—who have borne all the horrors of persecution, and have suffered martyrdom rather than be traitors to their consciences. Christ himself did not meet persecution and death more bravely—with more perfect composure and serene resignation—than did Giordano Bruno, the Freethinker.

Matthew, speaking of the crucifixion of Jesus, says: "And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet—They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (Matt. xxvii. 35). In this case, the writer referred to is the writer of Psalm xxii., whoever he may be, and the verse reads: "They parted"—not parted—"my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture" (Psalm xxii., 18). This Psalm, like the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, is a great favorite with psalm-smiters, and for the self-same reason. But in what way can it be said to be prophetic of Jesus? In what respect is the writer—who speaks of himself, and not of another person as Isaiah does—a counterpart of Christ? The writer exclaims, amongst other ejaculations, "I am a worm, and no man" (Psalm xxii., v. 6). "Thou"—that is, God—"hast brought me into the dust of death!" (v. 15). "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture" (v. 18). But the writer does not say that he is being done to death. On the contrary, he exclaims: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee" (v. 22). How does this tally with the crucifixion of Christ? In nowise whatever. In good sooth, the statement that it is prophetic of Christ is as misleading as is the statement that the words "he was numbered with the transgressors" (Isaiah liii. 12) was a prophecy that Christ would be crucified between two thieves. Had Isaiah foreknown that Christ would be crucified between two thieves, we may be sure that he would have said so plainly and distinctly. As a matter of fact, he knew no more of Christ than did the writer of this Psalm; and when he wrote the words "he was numbered with the transgressors"—referring to something that had happened in the past, and not to something that would happen in the future—he was thinking only of the friend whom he mourned.

Matthew, in the second chapter, tells how Joseph, in consequence of a dream he had had, took Mary and Jesus into Egypt, "and was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son'" (Matt. ii. 5-15). Now this statement is flatly denied by Luke, who, in his second chapter, says that Joseph and Mary, from the birth of Christ, lived in their own city, Nazareth (v. 39); and that "every year they went to Jerusalem with Jesus to attend the feast of the Passover" (v. 41). The prophet referred to was Hosea, whose words are: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called him out of Egypt" (Hosea xi. 1). These words referred to a past event, not to a future one. Hosea proves this to be so in his twelfth chapter, where he says: "And Jacob fled into the country of Syria; and Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep. And by a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved" (Hosea xii. 13).

Matthew, in the same chapter, says: "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the pro-

phet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning; Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they were not" (Matt. ii. 17, 18). One has, however, only to read on from Jeremiah xxxi. 15 to discover either the ignorance or the credulity of the evangelist, for in the two following verses we are told that the Lord said to Rachel: "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy children shall come again from the land of the enemy to their own border." Now how could the children whom Herod is said to have slain return to their homes and kindred?

Matthew tells us (iii. 1-3) that "in those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make his paths straight." Now, firstly, as to the kingdom of heaven. I will not stop to inquire where heaven is, because, although sky-pilots assert that it is the "duty of the clergy to pilot those who come under their influence to heaven," not one of them has ever attempted even to indicate the direction in which it must be looked for. But the statement of the Baptist that it was "at hand" was utterly untrue; for he has been dead nearly 1,900 years, and there is no indication of its approach yet. The Baptist, however, made a mistake in good company, for did not Jesus, on a certain occasion, say: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28). Since then nearly 1,900 years have rolled away, and the Son of Man has not come yet.

In the thirteenth chapter of Matthew we read that, when Jesus had spoken some parables, his disciples came and said unto him, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given (Matt. v. 10, 11). Therefore speak I to them in parables; because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not; neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive; for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed, lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them" (Matt. xiii. 15). Now this prophecy is most important, because Matthew makes Jesus himself to quote it. The prophecy is this:—The Lord said to Isaiah—so that it is the Lord who speaks—"Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert and be healed" (Isaiah vi. 10). In what sense can this speaking in parables be said to be a fulfilment of the prophecy? What is a parable? A parable is a fable, an allegory—a mode of speech which, from the most remote ages, has been made the vehicle for the conveyance of the most homely, as well as the most startling, truths. A parable, then, is a poetic or symbolic statement of a truth. And what is a truth but a fact! Symbols are word-paintings in the true intellectual idiom. It matters not, therefore, whether such statements be taken literally or allegorically, because they picture the truth as minutely and as faithfully as the sun photographs a landscape. Christ's speaking in parables, therefore, could not, either literally or metaphorically, have made "this people's heart gross, nor dulled their hearing, nor closed their eyes." The language employed was that of mysticism bordering on deception, like that which Jesus employed when he drove out of the temple at Jerusalem those who did business therein. Being asked, "What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest thou these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy

this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 18, 19). Naturally enough, the Jews understood him to mean the building in which they then were; and so also did the disciples, for it was not until after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus that they understood that "he spake of the temple of his body"; as is proved by the statement that "when, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them" (John ii. 21, 22).

Matthew, in the last verse of the second chapter, is made to speak thus: "He [Joseph] came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet—He [Jesus] shall be called a Nazarene." Now, if this be not an interpolation, Matthew, so far from being inspired or a man of truth, was not versed in Jewish writings, for they contain no such prophecy as that to which allusion is made.

J. W. DE CAUX.

(To be continued.)

Liberty of Conscience.

IT is an undeniable fact that the Catholic Church is at present wide-awake, and fiercely determined to do its utmost to resist and suppress all modern ideas and tendencies. The story of its stubborn fight for the retention of its supremacy in France is still fresh in our memory; and its defeat there was in no sense due to any lack of zeal and energy on its part. It is now engaged in a similar warfare in Spain and, to some extent, in Italy. Indeed, that great Church is now adopting a decidedly aggressive policy in all countries. We were told at the recent Brussels Congress that, in Belgium, it has become richer and more powerful than anywhere else; that it monopolises all material interests, even high finance; that it holds the world by the power of money; that its economic strength is enormous; that the people can get nothing except at the cost of compromises with it; and that it corrupts poverty as well as riches. M. George Lorand went the length of saying that—

"Agricultural Associations, on a mutual basis, instituted for the production of milk, for the purchase of seeds, manure, machines, are under the management of the priests—and thus subsidised by the clerical State. The convents and monasteries do business at our homes, and in all professions and industries, to the detriment of free workers."

How eminently appropriate it was, therefore, that the sole subject of discussion at the Congress should have been Liberty of Conscience. This liberty is claimed as a natural and inalienable right of every human being. But what are we to understand by liberty of conscience? Professor Hector Denis, in his opening speech, answered that question most satisfactorily; and it is with his answer that this article purposes to deal. The address was given chiefly in honor of Ernst Haeckel and Anatole France, two stalwart defenders of human liberty. Anatole France, in particular, is a son of the eighteenth century, "and entirely penetrated by the spirit of the positive philosophy of the nineteenth, one of the heroic soldiers of the Right of Humanity in this terrible crisis by which the France of the Revolution is again seized." The Revolution was a movement the object of which was to declare and establish the rights of man. Professor Denis referred to the recent controversy between Professor Jellineck, of Heidelberg, and Boutmy, as to the origin of the Declaration of these rights. Professor Jellineck, like Taine, regards it as only the radiation in Europe of the anterior Declarations of the Republican States of New England. This is called the purely historical view. Boutmy, on the contrary, is wedded to an exclusively philosophical interpretation. It is well known that the American declarations did not exceed the limits of Unitarianism, or natural religion; but "Boutmy invokes a philosophy that is elevated above religious beliefs, widening that

way the conception of Right, stretching the guarantees of the law so as to embrace the negation of theological conceptions, even Atheism itself." After all, however, article 10 of the Declaration of 1789 only provides for toleration, not for liberty of conscience. The article is as follows: "No man ought to be molested on account of his opinions, not even on account of his *religious* opinions, provided his avowal of them does not disturb the public order established by the law." If Mirabeau's protestations had been listened to, that article would have contained the philosophical conception of liberty, the conception so well expressed by Voltaire when he declared that he was not a preacher of toleration. "I come not," he said,—

"I come not to preach Toleration: the most illimitable liberty of religion is, in my eyes, a Right so sacred that the word 'tolerance,' which would express it, seems to me to be itself in some way tyrannical; seeing that the existence of authority, which has the power to tolerate, is an attack upon liberty of thought by that even which it tolerates, and which thus it cannot tolerate."

But what *is* this liberty of Conscience which the Declaration of Rights of 1789 failed to express, but which philosophy soon succeeded in working into the idea of Right? Professor Denis says that the thinkers of the eighteenth century searched for it, as regards the human person, in the principle of equality of rights, of equality of consciences, of reasons, but that "the philosophy of the nineteenth century, with its incomparable power of analysis, the critical, positive, and evolutionary philosophy, supplied the right of conscience, for the most peremptory objective reasons, with an immovable intellectual basis." To understand the true nature of this foundation is to know what liberty of conscience is. The point of emphasis is the relativity of knowledge as taught by Kant and Hamilton. Dr. Denis says:—

"Human knowledge is relative; it does not go beyond the domain of observable facts and their constant relations, or their laws. Our affirmations never arrive at the truth, they are never more than approximations to the truth; we should in the same way recognise a limit to our power over the thought and the will of others. The bounds of our demonstrable power determine those of our personal right, and extend to our duties. 'Do not behave towards other men,' says Alfred Fouillée, 'as if you knew the inner heart of things, and the inner heart of man. Do not raise yourself into the absolute, that is to say, into God.'"

Absolutism is the only refuge of religious thinkers, the only thing on which, when driven into a corner, they can fall back. It is the claim that they possess absolute knowledge which makes theologians so intolerant and cruel. Intolerance is as essential to such people as the air they breathe, or the food they eat. An infallible Church could not avoid persecution even if it would. It would be a howling inconsistency on its part to allow liberty of conscience. It is only on the assumption that knowledge is relative that freedom is seen to be even thinkable. It is indeed possible for a man like Pasteur to "associate in himself the most rigid scientific method, at least in certain domains, and a passionate worship of the religious absolute"; but the fact remains that "the collective reason" does not permit the association, and cannot logically admit its possibility. If all knowledge is relative, absolutism stands for ever condemned as an intolerable absurdity, although such great men as Plato, Plotinus, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Fichte, and Hegel were firm believers in it. If all knowledge is relative, it follows that all men are fallible, not excluding even the Pope. Now, it is in the relativity of knowledge and the fallibility of mankind that liberty of conscience roots itself. No man living has a moral right to dictate to another on the subject of right and wrong, good and evil. Everything is relative to something else, and must be carefully investigated before it can be thoroughly understood. This is how Professor Denis puts it:—

"Thus when we place ourselves at the social point of view, and when we embrace the past, the present, and the future of human knowledges, free examination

delivers the work of the spirit to criticism, to eternal ventilation. Thus, from the sum of accumulated relative knowledges, there is being constituted a collective patrimony. It is being formed every moment from all that has survived criticism, from what has triumphed over all scepticisms, from all that imposes itself without constraint upon individual reasons by virtue of laws peculiar to them. Such is the pledge, always growing and always revised, of the intellectual and moral unity of generations, of their power on nature, and upon their own proper destinies. To this life, eternally animated by the spirit, is alone adapted the juridical structure of liberty of conscience."

Another foundation, henceforth indestructible, of the right of conscience, according to Dr. Denis, is "the autonomous morality of man." He tells us that "in every century the conflict with the trustees of the absolute has shown itself under some predominating aspect." From the seventeenth century the dispute ranged over the conception of the world, the origin and evolution of life and of conscience. Some fifty years ago that controversy practically came to an end, and to-day Sociology and Ethics are the great subjects under consideration. The Church makes its supreme appeal to authority, which it declares to be vested in God-appointed prelates, who "proclaim the necessity of supernatural succor to sustain natural ideas, without which there is no social order; and against the formidable enterprise of human emancipation it does not hesitate to pronounce implacable and haughty verdicts, such as this: 'Duty, descended from the altar,' say the prelates, 'debased to be but the work of man, becomes exhausted and falls to dust.' And Christian sociology, which gravitates round about the Divine, applies itself to display the phases of the decadence of apostate nations which have abjured the Church." What the Church aims at, and what it desiderates more and more, is "the spiritual direction" in every country, which would carry with it the fortification of the authority of dogma, and the reversion of humanity to its original infirmity by the outrageous prohibition of all instruction in the regulation of morality.

Now, Freethought is a legitimate revolt against the extravagant and groundless pretensions of the Church. Its fundamental contention is that morality is a development from below, not a revelation from above; a possession slowly acquired in the school of experience, not a gift of Divine grace bestowed upon a chosen few. It was in the service of this truth that Voltaire, Mirabeau, Paine, Bayle, d'Lambert, Condorcet, Volney, and a host of other heroes, so valiantly fought; and it is for this all-important truth that many present-day Freethinkers are laying themselves down as willing sacrifices on the altar of progress. What they maintain is that, while religion is, in the words of Condorcet, a private matter, morality is a social affair. In relation to religion, then, there should be absolute liberty. Freethought has no right to persecute Religion, nor Religion Freethought. Freedom, without any penalty attached, is a natural and inalienable right of every human being. Persecution is the most odious and damnable thing under heaven by whomsoever practised. As long as any "ism" does not become a public nuisance it is entitled to protection. This is the only demand that Freethought makes on its own behalf; and this is all that is meant by Liberty of Conscience.

J. T. LLOYD.

QUOTATION MARKS.

Senator Beveridge, in an after-dinner speech in Cleveland, said of a corrupt politician:—
 "The man's excuse is as absurd as the excuse that a certain minister offered on being convicted of plagiarism. 'Brethren,' said this minister, 'it is true that I occasionally borrow for my sermons, but I always acknowledge the fact in the pulpit by raising two fingers at the beginning and two at the end of the borrowed matter, thus indicating that it is quoted.'"

Correspondence.

A PIECE FROM MALTA.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—No doubt you have heard before about the strong religious superstition which prevails in Malta.

On Tuesday and Wednesday 29 and 30 proximo, they held the feast of St. Domenic. Tuesday was the day of preliminary proceedings, and Wednesday was the actual day of the Feast. I was on duty on Wednesday, so that I missed the performance on that day. On Tuesday, in the forenoon, there was a procession of priests, gorgeous flags, and two of Malta's best bands, i.e., La Vallette and the King's Own Civic. The people were at Mass nearly every half hour during the day, and in the evening the church was on view to the general public. I went inside and was amazed at the display of wealth therein, the floor was strewn with leaves and flowers, and there was a pleasant aroma about the place. There were several pictures on the wall, some of the different Saints, one of the Madonna and Child, and one in bas relief of Jesus Christ hanging from the cross, supported by tin-tacks. The chandeliers were resplendent in cut glass and silver, and all round the wall were some of the finest pieces of silver and gold embroidery. Some of the people were sitting in the few pews that were there, others were kneeling down with their heads and eyes roving about the place, their mouths open as if to catch some poor unwary fly, and some were crossing themselves at the various bowls of water about the place.

Now, the churches in Malta are noted for their richness in gold, silver, etc., yet the great majority of people are walking about hungry and destitute on account of their priests, who extort their money from them with that dear old tale of the hereafter. It is pitiful to see these poor children of Christ coming to the barracks and asking for food which, on receiving, they devour it as if they had had no food for months.

Blessed be ye poor! Woe unto ye rich! When Freethinkers look about and see these demoralising facts of nearly 2,000 years of Christianity, how they must say, thank goodness I am not a Christian.

The amount of money spent upon festivals in Malta must reach anything from four figures, what with illuminations and decorations. There are about eighty of these festivals during the year in this little island of about sixty miles in circumference. The three biggest are the festivals of St. Peter and St. Paul, Stella Maris, and St. John. They all last for about two days, and the poor fools lose what symptoms of sanity they have for the time being. At night time they have firework displays on the top of the churches trying to drive the Devil away. The Battery Commander places himself in a prominent position and gives the word of command: target! His Satanic Majesty, floating about here, you will have to find him yourselves, and you will use your own discretion as to range. Salvo, fire at three seconds interval, changing to independent fire—group, action, No. 1, fire! And so they start driving the poor old chap away. It has never been stated that they have ever hit the target, so we must come to the conclusion that he went with his suite to some other roof and watched the proceedings and smiled, and so do we who watch them playing their silly game.

Hoping to hear of success at the coming Queen's Hall Lectures.

A. G. STAMFORD.

Fort St. Elmo, Malta.

SOUTH LONDON FREETHOUGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Owing to the Camberwell Branch N. S. S. giving up its headquarters in New Church-road, and for other reasons as well, the Branch has become somewhat disorganised, and I desire to appeal through your paper to all old members of the Branch to attend a meeting which will be held at the Lambeth Baths (Committee Room) on Tuesday, Sept. 27, at 8 p.m. The principal object of the meeting is to reorganise the Branch with a view to more effective propagandist work. Freethinkers who are not members are also invited to attend and become members.

Communications can be addressed to me.

114 Kennington-road, S.E.

VICTOR ROGER.

Our youth was happy: why repine
 That, like the Year's, Life's days decline?
 'Tis well to mingle with the mould
 When we ourselves alike are cold,
 And when the only tears we shed
 Are of the dying or the dead.

—Landor.

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.

INDOOR.

QUEEN'S (Minor) HALL (Langham-place, W.): Mr. G. W. Foote: 7.30, "The True Heaven and Hell."

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 3.15, A. B. Moss, a Lecture.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, E. C. Saphin, a Lecture.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Highbury Corner): 12 noon, Walter Bradford and S. J. Cook. Newington Green: 12 noon, Debate, J. J. Darby and T. Douglas-Mugford, "The Existence of God." Clerkenwell Green: 12 noon, H. King and T. Dobson. Finsbury Park: 3.30, F. A. Davies, "An Hour with the Devil." Highbury Corner: Saturday, at 8, H. King, J. Rowney, and T. Dobson.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill Fields): 3.30, Debate, S. Fry and C. E. Ratcliffe, "Is the Bible the Word of God?"

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford): 7, E. C. Saphin, "Christianity Sun-Worship."

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers' Hill, opposite Public Library): 11.30, Mr. Allison, "Jesus Christ and Socialism." The Green, Enfield: 7, a Lecture.

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

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

LAINDON, ESSEX (opposite Luff's Hairdressing Saloon): 7, R. H. Rosetti, "If Jesus Christ Came To-Day."

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.

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. 5. *Because the Bible Tells Me So*, W. P. Ball. 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.

The *Freethinker*, complete, from January, 1891, including Special Summer Number for 1893; clean and in good condition. What offers? Proceeds to be given to President's Honorary Fund.—Apply to MISS VANCE, 2 Newcastle-st.

COLENSO'S *Pentateuch Critically Examined*, for which the Bishop was expelled and condemned by the Church. Every Freethinker should possess this rare masterpiece; long out of print. Fine cloth copies, complete and very cheap at 4s. 6d., post free.—W. STEWART & Co., 19 Newcastle-st., London, E.C.

THE

MARTYRDOM OF HYPATIA.

An Address delivered at Chicago by

M. M. MANGASARIAN.

Will be forwarded, post free, for

THREE HALFPENCE.

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 Battock, 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.

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 19.....

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 mere 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. Allbutt, 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.

SUNDAY EVENING FREETHOUGHT LECTURES

AT

Queen's (Minor) Hall,

LANGHAM PLACE, LONDON, W.

DURING SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER.

SEPTEMBER 18.—Mr. G. W. FOOTE:

“THE TRUE HEAVEN AND HELL.”

SEPTEMBER 25.—Mr. G. W. FOOTE:

“CHARLES BRADLAUGH—AFTER TWENTY YEARS.”

OCTOBER 2, 9, 16, 23, 30,—

Mr. C. COHEN, Mr. J. T. LLOYD, and Mr. G. W. FOOTE.

Music at 7 p.m. Chair taken at 7.30. p.m. Reserved Seats, 1s. and 6d. A few Seats Free.

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.