

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—NO. 14

SUNDAY, APRIL 2, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

O eternal sleep, death of the passions, the burial of failures, follies, bitter recollections, the end of fears, welcome sleep!—R. H. WHITE (Mark Rutherford).

The Bible and the King.

JUNE is the month of roses. It is the month of months. Everything is at the height of its freshness and beauty. The weather is not too hot and the days are still lengthening. Nature is yet crescent. No whisper of mortality and desolation creeps amongst the vivid green leaves of the loaded trees. With a fine June day, and health, and freedom, a man might well exclaim "Now are we at the top of happy hours," and laugh at time and fate, and mock at death itself.

June also—to compare small things with great—is this year the month of the King's Coronation. Crowds, bustle, and ostentation will be the order of the day. Monarchy will put on all its finery, and the mob will be dazzled,—although all the display of human vanity will be as nothing to the "miracle" of the summer flowers. What are the costliest of the King's robes to the flash of the underwing of the commonest bird overhead? What is the dome of the proudest building to the glorious sunlit sky? What indeed are all the pompous doings of the "great ones" of the earth to the smile of a beloved woman or the laughter and the clinging fingers of a dear and happy child?

But the Coronation will have its way. King George will go to Westminster Abbey and be anointed with holy oil by the Archbishop of Canterbury. After that performance he will be every inch a king. Until then he is only a half-and-half affair. He has a legal right to the throne, and the public favor, but he lacks the grace of God. Archbishop Davidson will supply him with that in June.

It was only a few years ago that King Edward was to be crowned in June. Everything was ready, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his holy oil, and his grace of God; everything was ready—but the King. Without informing the Archbishop, the Lord had decided to postpone the Coronation until October. King Edward was prostrated with appendicitis, and had to take his place on the operating table instead of his place in Westminster Abbey. That was one disappointment. And there was another. A Coronation Bible was got ready for the King. He was to lay his hand upon it and kiss it at the Westminster Abbey performance. It was, of course, a Bible fit for a king; printed in beautiful new type on the finest paper, and bound by the best artists in that kind of work, utterly regardless of expense. The present was prepared by the British and Foreign Bible Society, who, in an evil hour, wanted the Archbishop of Canterbury to call at their office and inspect it. His Grace admired the print, the paper, and the binding; but he damned the volume when he found it did not contain the Old Testament "apocryphal" books. He said it wasn't a Bible at all; it was only half a Bible—and the King shouldn't accept such a miserable apology for the Word of God. The King *did* accept it, but it was almost smuggled into Buckingham Palace, and was not used at the Coronation.

The Archbishop saw to that. King George's Coronation Bible is all right in this respect. It contains the delightful tale of Bel and the Dragon, and the delectable story of Susanna and the Elders, and the midnight adventures of Mistress Judith and General Holofernes. And the worthy Archbishop is filled with sweet satisfaction.

We understand that this Coronation Bible was the one recently presented to King George by a deputation from the Christian Churches headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury—in celebration of the tercentenary of the Authorised Version. God is no respecter of persons, they say—indeed the Bible says; but God's professional representatives do not share his sublime impartiality. Instead of presenting the King with a shilling copy, neatly but strongly bound for daily use, they had a copy specially printed and sumptuously bound, according to the following description in an evening newspaper:—

"The Bible presented to his Majesty is a large octavo volume, measuring 11in. by 7½in., printed in small pica type. The binding is purple velvet, with silver mounts. The silver corner pieces bear various crests and badges. On the upper cover, beginning with the upper dexter corner, they show (1) a Tudor rose, surmounted by a Royal crown; (2) the crowned harp of Ireland; (3) a crowned cross pattée fitchée; this crest without the crown is the coat-of-arms of Cadwallador, the last king of the Britons, and shows on his banner on the Great Seal of James I.; and (4) the crowned thistle of Scotland. On the lower cover the corner pieces, taken in the same order, show (1) a crowned fleur-de-lys; (2) a crowned lion, the ancient crest of Scotland; (3) the crowned harp, as on the upper cover, and (4) the crowned lion crest of England."

There you are. That's the style. Even the Word of God must be rare and costly that goes into the hands of a King.

With the Bible was presented an Address, also "got up regardless," printed in Old English type on hand-made paper, bound in crimson morocco, and ornamented with the Royal Arms in gold.

The *Westminster Gazette* was good enough to say that "the deputation, like the movement, was strictly non-sectarian," and that "the address was signed by representatives of every branch of the Christian Church." Indeed! Then the Catholic Church is no part of the Christian Church,—which, as our old friend Euclid says, is absurd. The deputation was purely Protestant. The Catholic Church bans the Authorised Version. It has an English version of its own, the Douai, which is not so fine from a literary point of view, but is often more accurate, and sometimes throws a curious modern light on the ancient text. Many people fancy that the Douai version is a comparatively recent Catholic concession to the demand created by the Protestant Churches. As a matter of fact, the Douai version was published before the Authorised Version.

King George may not have noticed it, but he was really receiving a Protestant deputation who presented him with a copy of the Protestant fetish. When the Archbishop, reading the Address, called the Bible "the most valuable thing that this world affords," he was speaking as a Protestant. No Catholic could ever talk in that fashion.

The Protestant Churches, it will be noted, stick to the Authorised Version. The Revised Version was prepared for the sake of greater accuracy, at a vast

expense, by the most eminent scholars. Yet the Authorised Version holds the field, and will continue to do so. Why? Because the clergy don't want accuracy. They want more profitable things. They want the artificial sanctity of the book which has come down through many generations, the glamor of its archaic and musical language, and its designed and deliberate consecration of Protestant doctrines. Moreover, there is always a peril in disturbance in matters of religion. Orthodoxy depends upon peaceful continuity of fat-headed acquiescence.

The Bible, it used to be said, is the secret of England's greatness. Fraudulent pictures of Queen Victoria announcing that great truth used to be in general circulation. England's coal and iron, and her geographical position, had, of course, nothing to do with her greatness. It was all owing to the Bible—that is to say, to Christianity—that is to say, to the Church—that is to say, to the Protestant Church; for the people who declare that the Bible is the secret of England's greatness are equally ready to assure you that the Catholic Church has been her principal curse. But the Address to the King sang a little smaller. Listen:—

"The growth and strength of the Empire owes much to the English Bible. It has sweetened life; it has set a standard of pure speech; it has permeated literature and art; it has helped to remove social wrongs and to ameliorate conditions of labor; it has modified the laws of the realm and shaped the national character, and it has fostered international comity and goodwill among men."

Words, words, words! We are glad that the King did not follow the Archbishop in that foolish line. He had to go through his share of the business, and he went through it in a florid little speech, probably written by the competent scribe who is retained for such occasions. G. W. FOOTE.

On Cause and Effect.

THE fallacies and misunderstandings connected with the question of causation was one of the subjects I had intended to deal with in the course of my article on "How Not to Do It." For various reasons I did not do so: and indeed the importance of a right understanding of causation is great enough, and misunderstandings of it numerous enough, to justify separate treatment. There are very few books—even by scientific writers—that one can pick up in which one can find the principle of causation stated as it ought to be stated. Often the way in which it is stated is of no material consequence to the main purpose of the work, but often it vitiates the author's view of things and leads to a partly erroneous conclusion. Science being a search for the conditions under which phenomena occur, a right conception of causation is above all things important.

Between the religious and the non-religious world, a great deal of controversy turns upon this question. As has been shown in my preceding articles, much of the discussion on Materialism, and the relation of thought to nerve structure, turns upon what we mean, or what we ought to mean, by cause and effect. When the Spiritualist argues against Materialism because he cannot see how nervous action produces thought, he has in mind nervous action as one thing, thought as another, and the latter produced by the former in such a way that it is as distinct as a plucked apple is from the parent tree. And, of course, so long as this conception is allowed to dominate his mind, a right solution of the problem is impossible. Curiously enough, it is always the Spiritualist who demands the most materialistic evidence before yielding assent. And confusion on this head is not confined to the thoughtless or the untrained. Even giants like Hume and John Stuart Mill are not impeccable when dealing with causation; and where such men stumble lesser men may well be excused complete loss of equilibrium.

As an illustration of what has been said, we will take an example from Mill. It will be found in the

sixth chapter of the second book of his *System of Logic*. Dealing with what is known as the Composition of Causes, he explains that in some cases "the joint effect of causes is the sum of their separate effects." As an instance of this he cites the *weight* of a chemical compound which is equal to the sum of the weights of the elements composing it. The illustration is accurate enough as a mere statement of fact; but by not keeping in mind the truth that a cause is always a compound of at least two factors, Mill has cited as an illustration of the Composition of Causes something which is not an illustration of cause and effect at all. He takes the weight of a chemical compound as the *effect* of which the separate components form the cause. But this is not true. Weight is an expression of gravitation, and gravitation does not act upon the mass as mass, but upon the particles composing the mass. The law of gravitation is that every particle of matter attracts every other particle in direct proportion to the mass, and inversely to the square of the distance. Thus the size or mass or combined weight of a body adds nothing whatever to the phenomena of gravitation. The atomic weight of a chemical compound is not a matter of a composition of causes; its weight is a simple sum in addition, because there is here the simple phenomenon of gravitation, and because this acts on every atom, irrespective of what the number may be. Gravitation, indeed, is not a "cause" of the stone falling to the ground; gravitation is the falling.

To constitute a cause, in the scientific sense of the word, there must be a combination of different factors. Mill saw this clearly enough in other connections, and the way he dealt with it made an admirable reply to a common form of Theistic argument with which I will next deal. There must be, we are told, an adequate cause for every effect. This statement is not only a first principle of scientific reasoning, it may be taken as an indispensable datum of all thinking. The dispute between the Theist and the Atheist is really whether certain alleged causes are adequate to certain effects. What the Theist really means is, that the properties manifested by a compound must be discernible in its factors or they could never emerge. Thus, life cannot be a product of material forces, because these do not manifest life. Nervous action cannot produce consciousness, because there is no trace of consciousness in the constituents of nerve structure. When they say "an effect cannot be greater than its cause," what they mean is, that it cannot be *different* to its cause. They ask, How can that which does not possess life give life? as though it were on all fours with the necessity of a man possessing twenty shillings before he can present anyone with a sovereign.

Now, the simple reply to this is, that the factors which combined produce an effect, *always* "give" something which separately they do not possess. There is no trace of sweetness in the constituents of sugar of lead, of blueness in the constituents of blue vitriol. In not a single case, if we are to reason as the Theist reasons concerning life and mind, is there a single cause adequate to its effect; in each case we should have to assume some occult power as responsible for the existence of the effect. As a matter of fact, we know that two volumes of hydrogen and one of oxygen produces water. But no knowledge of the qualities of H and O, separately, could tell us that in combination they would form water. In strict scientific truth it is of the very essence of causation that there shall be present in the effect some quality or qualities not present in the factors of which it is the expression. In studying an effect, it is the qualities of a combination with which we are concerned, and had this been always borne in mind, a great deal of ink might have been saved and much labor more profitably employed.

Sir Oliver Lodge, in his little work on *Life and Matter*, properly corrects the fallacy with which I have been dealing, and points out that "properties can be possessed by an aggregate or an assemblage of particles which, in the particles themselves, did

not in the slightest degree exist." But in his desire to find a basis for his Theism, he falls into an error in the opposite direction. We are on safe ground, he says, in asserting that "whatever is in a part must be in the whole." This is true if it is meant that as the whole contains the part, the part is in the whole. But, in that sense, the statement is hardly worth making. What he really means, for his special purpose, is that as man manifests mind, and as man is part of the whole of nature, therefore, nature, as a whole, manifests mind. And this is not true. Mind may be, the Materialist believes is, a special manifestation of a peculiar collection of forces, and only occurring under special conditions. What Sir Oliver says is, that the properties of a part are included in the whole because the part is a part of the whole. What he implies—and without this his whole argument is meaningless—is that the properties of a part belong to *all parts* of the whole. And that is a statement so grotesquely untrue that I expect Sir Oliver would be the first to disown the plain implication of his own argument.

And here is Sir Oliver's illustration of his proposition:—

"The fact that an apple has pips legitimises the assertion that an apple tree has pips.....but it would be a childish misunderstanding to expect to find actual pips in the trunk of a tree."

Such language, from a scientific man, shows almost inexcusable confusion. Why should the fact that an apple has pips legitimise the statement that an apple tree has pips, any more than it legitimises the statement that the soil from which it springs has pips? And if the tree has not actual pips, in what sense does it possess them? If Sir Oliver replies that it possesses pips potentially, one may meet that with the rejoinder that potentially, pips, and everything else, including Sir Oliver Lodge, was contained in the primitive nebula—but this only in the sense that all that has resulted is due to the interactions and growing complexities of cosmic forces. As a matter of fact, the apple tree does not contain pips either actually or potentially. In his championship of Theism our scientist forgets his science. What the apple tree has is the capacity for building up a fruit with pips *with the aid of material extracted from the air around it and the soil beneath it*. The pips are no more in the tree than they are in the air or the soil—not even as a figure of speech. One might, from any point of view, as reasonably look for the color and shape or smell of an apple in the tree as to look for its pips. The properties of the tree is really one of the factors in the production of a result. Sir Oliver Lodge treats the tree as the only factor in the problem. Of course, Sir Oliver is as well aware of the fact that the co-operation of tree, atmosphere, and soil are necessary, as I am—better, I should say. But if his argument does not mean what I have said it means it is reduced to a meaningless string of words, and its only value is to illustrate the demoralising influence of religious beliefs on intelligent men.

We are still only on the fringe of the misunderstandings of the nature of cause and effect, although I am of opinion that the best way to gain a true and active conception of causation is to understand something of the various misconceptions that have obtained, and which still obtain. Here, if anywhere, Locke's language is truly applicable.

"Vague and insignificant forms of speech and abuse of language have for so long passed for mysteries of science; and hard and misapplied words, with little or no meaning, have, by prescription, such a right to be mistaken for deep learning that.....to break in upon this sanctuary of ignorance and vanity will be, I suppose, some service to the human understanding."

A very early conception of the nature of causation is that of some power or occult quality passing from a cause to effect, and so compelling its production. "Early" has here almost exclusive reference to origin as it is still with us. The late Dr. Martineau, for example, said distinctly: "We cannot get out of believing that there is power passing out of one phenomenon into the other.....To the full idea of cause

it is essential that there be permanent power passing through phenomena." In some form or other this conception is at the base of most Theistic reasonings. The Theist uses it as an argument for Deity, the metaphysician for a "principle" or "power," which is really deity in a state of decomposition—more or less advanced. Amongst those wonderful thinkers, the Greeks, this idea was challenged by Sextus Empiricus, who clearly pointed out that the relation existing between cause and effect had no existence save in the human mind. Amongst the moderns the controversy assumes a prominent form with Locke, Malebranche, Hobbes, and Hume; Malebranche and Hobbes plainly stating the position that is generally identified with the last named. Locke, however, had used the conception of causation to lead up to a belief in Deity. Hume very acutely utilising Locke's principle that the mind is originally a blank page on which experience inscribes its characters, denied the possibility of our tracing any connection between the events, and thus challenged the validity of the attempt to rise by causal connection from phenomena to God. It was almost solely in consequence of the anti-theological results of Hume's reasoning that the hostility to him was so pronounced. And in correcting the notion of some indwelling power in the cause producing the effect, Hume did an enormous service to philosophic thinking. Only, however, to give rise to another confusion or misunderstanding.

C COHEN.

(To be concluded.)

"The Land o' the Leal."

MANY labor under the strange delusion that by "the Land o' the Leal" we are to understand the country called Scotland. Such was Gladstone's impression till late in his life. In 1879, the great politician was conducting what was called "the Midlothian campaign," and in a speech at Dalkeith he described Scotland as being not only the

"Land of brown heath and shaggy wood,
Land of the mountain and the flood,"

but as being also "the Land o' the Leal." Journalists have again and again fallen into the same error. Now "leal" means faithful, loyal, true; and with that meaning in our minds we perceive how unutterably silly it is to think of Scotland as "the Land o' the Leal." Lady Nairne (1766-1845), the authoress of the exquisitely pathetic lyric, was a devout Christian; and there can be no doubt but that to her "the Land o' the Leal" was heaven. She pictures a dying wife addressing her husband whom she loves so well:—

"I'm wearin' awa', Jean,
Like snaw-wreaths in thaw, Jean,
I'm wearin' awa'
To the land o' the leal.
There's nae sorrow there, Jean,
There's neither cauld nor care, Jean;
The day is aye fair
In the land o' the leal."

The poor woman was torn asunder by two contrary emotions. On the one hand, she had a strong desire to see her darling girl again who had preceded her to "the land o' the leal," but, on the other, she was loath to leave her beloved companion behind in this world of dreams and shadows. One comforting thought presented itself to her, however, to which she clung with all her might:—

"Ye were aye leal and true, Jean,
Your task's ended noo, Jean,
And I'll welcome you
To the land o' the leal."

Then comes the final burst of affection:—

"Now, fare-ye-weel, my ain Jean,
This world's cares are vain, Jean;
We'll meet, and aye be fain,
In the land o' the leal."

Taken as pure poetry the pathos of that lovely lyric is inimitable, and, interpreted mythologically, it

is intensely interesting. The hope of heaven, either here or hereafter, has been cherished in all ages and by all sorts of people. The significance of this is that we are not able to believe that the existing conditions of life are final, and that we naturally look forward to a definite improvement somewhere and somehow. And this is as it should be. The present state of things is anything but ideal, and it would be criminal to be contented with it. Every political and social "ism" that arises is a distinct protest against it, and a would-be way out of it. Ostensibly the State exists for the express purpose of seriously dealing with it with a view to putting an end to it. Supernatural religion, however, looks at the whole problem from an entirely different point of view. Christianity completely ignores men's natural relations to one another as members of society. Its teaching is that the sufferings and sorrows of the world are due to the fact that we are a fallen race. That is, it is because we are on bad terms with God that we are afflicted with such grievous social disabilities and inequities; and until we get into right relations with God through faith in his Son we are socially helpless. Indeed, even after the reconciliation with heaven is supposed to have been effected, human society is acknowledged to be so hopelessly depraved and corrupt that it is susceptible of but slight improvement in this world. For eight hundred years after Christianity came to power social life sank lower and lower until in the tenth and eleventh centuries it touched the lowest possible depth of degradation. And yet during the whole of that period practically all the people believed that they were right with God, though they were as wrong as they could be in their treatment of one another. Only those who were in authority and had the command of wealth found any enjoyment in this world. The masses of the people, who groaned under unjust burdens, had to be satisfied with the hope of bliss in another life. All they got here was charity. Their only happiness here consisted in the hope of happiness hereafter. Dropping a few alms into their laps, those set over them condescendingly said to them: "The stations in life which you occupy are of Divine appointment; therewith learn to be content, and you shall have an inconceivable reward when you die."

It is a remarkable fact that the bare idea of economic justice never entered the head of the Christian Church. Until within less than a hundred years ago it concerned itself almost exclusively about men's relations with God as individuals. To be saved meant not to be made a good neighbor, but to receive a title to enter heaven at death. All crimes against society were either winked at or easily pardoned. Indulgences afforded ease to the guilty recipients and ample profit to the equally guilty dispensers. All who suffered as well as all who caused the suffering looked forward to bliss unending beyond the tomb. The sense of justice was wholly absent. Access to heaven was not possible by merit, but only as an act of Divine grace. If mankind got their deserts they would all go down into "the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." It was not character, not merit, that counted, but faith; not faith in one's own inherent goodness, but in the worthiness of another, not by nature a member of our race. Such a doctrine of salvation is not only essentially immoral, but positively demoralising as well. The New Testament glories in the statement that entrance into heaven was purchased for all time "with the precious blood of Christ." Paul expected to get in not because he was a righteous man, but because he wore the righteousness of Christ as a cloak to hide his own foulness.

When we bear this in mind there is nothing surprising in the fact that, when Christianity came to power, instead of adopting and carrying to completion the various social reforms long preached and initiated by the Pagan philosophers and emperors, it ignored them almost entirely, and allowed the evils so powerfully denounced by the Pagan moralists to grow worse. The explanation is that the supreme business of the Church was not to fill the empire

with just, noble, and benevolent citizens, but to people heaven with whitewashed sinners who would spend eternity in singing the praises of him who made it possible for them to enter without possessing any personal merit, and in spite of possessing considerable demerit. A stockbroker was known to be one of the most tricky, dishonest, and unscrupulous manipulators on the Exchange. An acquaintance saw him at worship one Sunday, and his countenance literally beamed with signs of the heavenly rapture that filled his heart. "You seemed to be exceptionally happy at Church yesterday," said the acquaintance who knew him only too well. "True," answered the swindling stockbroker; "I was supremely happy because I had such a vivid realisation of the glorious truth that 'the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'" It is by such characters that the Christian heaven is inhabited, while men like Gotama, Socrates, Aristotle, Epictetus, and Seneca are confined within the various circles of the Inferno.

Such a heaven is not "the land o' the leal." That land is as yet only very sparsely occupied. The leal members of the human family are still few and far between. The reforms that are essential to perfect social welfare are yet to come, and the responsibility for their absence lies largely at the door of orthodox Christianity. What is needed above all else to-day is a genuine humanist revival which, without a doubt, will teach and inspire men to help one another to earn heaven by living lives of social righteousness, or by serving one another from love. An unearned heaven is an illusion. It never did, and never can, exist. Without self-respect there can be no ideal state, either for the individual or for society; and self-respect is beyond the reach of those who hide their nakedness with borrowed garments. There must be something seriously wrong with the man or woman who can sincerely sing a hymn in which such a verse as this occurs:—

"O joy all joys beyond,
To see the Lamb who died,
And count each sacred Wound,
In Hands, and Feet, and Side;
To give to him the praise
Of every triumph won,
And sing through endless days
The great things He hath done."

If such a heaven really existed sensible people could not tolerate it, and one would think it would be equally unendurable to the Lamb. No self-respecting Lamb would enjoy hearing his marvellous exploits sung "through endless days." As compared with such a heaven the Secularist heaven would be a Paradise indeed. What Secularists advocate is the substitution of justice for charity, of self-sacrifice for self-indulgence, of self-respect for toadyism, of benevolence for tyranny and oppression, and of sympathy and love for cruelty and arrogant selfishness; and it is a moral certainty that when the substitution has been completed there will be heaven on earth, an ideal state of society. Under Christianity, disinterested social ministries are quite impracticable, because it recommends that we should do good from selfish motives. Tennyson's hospital nurse could not do her work were it not for her belief in immortality.

"O how could I serve in the wards if the hope of the world were a lie?
How could I bear with the sights and loathsome smells of disease,
But that he said, 'Ye do it to me when ye do it to these?'"

Such service is tainted because it is not spontaneous, and because its real object is self. In effect, what is said is this: "I hate the work I am engaged in, and I could not do it were it not that doing it pleases my Lord and insures my experiencing the bliss of heaven to all eternity." The true servants of humanity are they whose kind deeds are prompted by their instinctive love of their fellow beings, and who would be miserable if they did not do them; and they are the people who will be "fain in the land o' the leal."

J. T. LLOYD

The Apocalypse.—III.

(Continued from p. 198.)

In order to see the undoubted Jewish character of the "Book of Revelation," it will be necessary, before going further, to notice all the later Christian interpolations—and to set them aside as forming no part of the book. These, in the original Jewish Apocalypse (excluding two, already dealt with) are the following:—

Rev. vi. 16.—"hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne: [and from the wrath of the Lamb] for the great day of [their] wrath is come."

Rev. xi. 15.—"and they said, the kingdom of the world is becoming the kingdom of our Lord, [and of his Christ] and he shall reign for ever and ever."

Rev. xiv. 4.—The 144,000 Jews "were purchased from among men to be the first-fruits unto God [and unto the Lamb]."

Rev. xviii. 20.—"Rejoice.....ye saints, [and ye apostles] and ye prophets."

Rev. xxii. 1.—"a river of water of life.....proceeding out of the throne of God [and of the Lamb]."

Rev. xxii. 3.—"and the throne of God [and of the Lamb] shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service."

The interpolations are, of course, the words placed within brackets. In the foregoing passages most, if not all, of the added words are glosses: that is, let us say, a second century Christian wrote in the margin of Rev. xi. 15, in his copy, the words "and of his Christ," and in the margin of Rev. xviii. 20 "and ye apostles." Later on, a professional copyist, when making new copies from this MS., took the words in the margin to be an integral part of the text which had been inadvertently omitted, and inserted them.

Now, in the second and last of these passages it will be seen that the pronouns following the interpolations still remain in the singular; in the first passage the pronoun has been changed into the plural. In the fourth passage the words "and ye apostles" can be seen to be an addition by comparison with the following similar passages:—

Rev. xi. 18.—"to give their reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name."

Rev. xvi. 6.—"they poured out the blood of saints and prophets."

Rev. xviii. 24.—"the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth."

The word "saint" is employed in the same sense as in the book of Daniel; that is, to denote a patriotic and zealous Jew believer: the saints and prophets were the "servants of God."

The Christian interpolations in the other portions of the Apocalypse are, with three exceptions, limited to a number of short phrases, the exceptions being the following: Rev. v. 9—14, which describes the opening of the door of salvation to "men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation," and which glorifies "the Lamb," whom the writer identifies with a slain Jesus; Rev. vii. 9—10, 13—17, which is of the same character as the last; and Rev. xxii. 16—21, which forms a Christian conclusion in the name of Jesus.

Of the shorter interpolations, I commence with those having to do with "the testimony of Jesus." These are the following:—

Rev. xii. 17.—Those "which keep the commandments of God [and hold the testimony of Jesus]."

Rev. xiv. 12.—"the saints, they that keep the commandments of God [and the faith of Jesus]."

Rev. xx. 4.—"the souls of them that had been beheaded for [the testimony of Jesus, and for] the word of God."

Rev. xix. 10.—"And he saith unto one, See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren [that hold the testimony of Jesus]: worship God [for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy]."

All the foregoing appear rather to be glosses than

deliberate interpolations. The original reading may be gathered from the following passages:—

Rev. vi. 9.—The souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held."

Rev. xxii. 9.—"And he saith unto one, See thou do it not: for I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God."

The last passage, it will be seen, is a repetition of the same incident recorded in Rev. xix. 10, and shows how the latter passage has been interpolated.

Next, in Rev. xix. 11—16, we are told, there appeared "a white horse" upon which sat one "called Faithful and True." Of this rider it is further said, "he hath a name written, which no one knoweth but he himself." Then comes the following interpolation:—

Rev. xix. 13.—["And he is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood: and his name is called the Word of God."]

The first half of the latter passage is a genuine interpolation; the second half is a gloss, written after the appearance of the Fourth Gospel. The writer of the second half, after reading John i. 1 and 14, believed he had learnt the name of the rider, and so wrote in the margin of his copy of the Apocalypse: "His name is called the Word of God." No name, of course, had been given in the text, for the simple reason that no one save the rider himself was supposed to be acquainted with it.

Again, in verse 16 of the same paragraph we find another gloss, if not another interpolation also, due doubtless to another second century reader. This reads:—

"And he hath on his garment and on his thigh a name written [King of kings, and Lord of lords]."

Thus, the illustrious Rider on the white horse, whose name was known to no one save himself, has by means of interpolations three names—"Faithful and True"—"Word of God"—"King of kings and Lord of lords." The first of these may mean that the rider was known to be "faithful and true," but not actually so named. In the third case the alleged fact that he bore a name which no one knew but himself, shows that the statement to the effect that this name was written on his garment is a later addition; for if the latter were the case everyone would know the name. As to the title "King of kings and Lord of lords," we find in Rev. xvii. 14 this appellation (inverted) also given to "the Lamb"—"The Lamb shall overcome them [for he is Lord of lords and King of kings]." From these two passages it would seem that the Rider on the white horse and the Lamb were one and the same person, and certainly both are exalted into the rank of God Almighty. Christian interpolators appear to have neither sense nor judgment. The writer of the "First Epistle to Timothy" is another instance; for the latter individual has fatuously applied this absurd title to Jesus Christ, who was never more than a poor peasant—except in the imagination of the most ignorant and credulous of the early Christians. One of the second century Christian readers of the Apocalypse has been so stupid as to say (Rev. xiii. 8): "the Lamb [that hath been slain from the foundation of the world]"—a statement which could not apply to any living being, except perhaps to one of "the firstlings" of Abel's flock (Gen. iv. 4), or to Abel himself.

According to the narrative in the Apocalypse, the Rider on the white horse was the leader of the "armies in heaven" which "followed him upon white horses" (Rev. xix. 14), and was probably intended for the archangel Michael (Rev. xii. 7; Dan. x. 21; xii. 1). The Lamb was the "Lion of the tribe of Judah," a righteous king descended from David, and the leader of the 144,000 Jew believers. The two were therefore not the same person.

Upon the same subject we also find the following passages:—

Rev. xii. 11.—"And they overcame him because of [the blood of the Lamb, and because of] the word of their testimony."

Rev. xvii. 6.—“the woman drunken with the blood of the saints [and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus].”

These two interpolations come under the headings “testimony” and “saints” which I have already noticed. The following passages also appear to be merely glosses:—

Rev. xx. 4.—“and they lived and reigned [with Christ] a thousand years.”

Rev. xx. 6.—“they shall be priests of God, [and of Christ] and shall reign with *him* a thousand years.”

Rev. xii. 10.—“the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God [and the authority of his Christ].”

Rev. xi. 8.—“the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt [where also their Lord was crucified].”

In the second of the foregoing passages the pronoun “him” refers, not to the interpolated “Christ,” but to God, as in Rev. xxii. 3–5, which reads: “And the throne of God shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face..... and they shall reign for ever and ever.”

In the last passage the second century Christian responsible for the gloss had learnt from Jer. xxiii. 14 and other Old Testament statements that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were in the sight of God more immoral than the people of Sodom or Egypt. Then, in order to show off his knowledge of the name of the “great city,” he wrote in the margin of his copy “where also their Lord was crucified.”

The other interpolations remaining to be noticed are the following:—

Rev. xvi. 15.—“Behold I come as a thief,” etc. (whole verse).

Rev. xxi. 14.—“And the wall of the city had twelve foundations [and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb].”

Rev. xxi. 23.—“And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it [and the lamp thereof is the Lamb].”

With regard to the second of these passages, I need only remark that nowhere in the book is it stated that “the Lamb” had twelve apostles: he was simply the leader of the 144,000 Jews who were to be saved. As regards the last passage, the words within brackets are shown to be an interpolation by Rev. xxii. 5, which is part of the original Apocalypse. In this verse it is plainly stated:—

“And there shall be night no more; and they need no light of lamp, neither light of sun; for the Lord God shall give them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.”

Thus, it was the Lord God, not the Lamb, who was to be “the lamp thereof.” It will no doubt be seen that the Christian interpolations connected with “the Lamb” are of a twofold character: (1) Those which glorify that domestic quadruped, and exalt him into a position approaching equality with the Lord God; (2) those which identify that harmless creature with a divine savior, who had suffered death for his ignorant and silly followers—a fiction ascribed by the credulous primitive Christians to one whom they named “Jesus Christ.”

If the glosses and short interpolations in the “Book of Revelation” be marked neatly in the text (say, underlined in red ink or placed between brackets), and the longer passages or paragraphs indicated by a line in the margin, it will then be easy to read the Jewish Apocalypse as originally written.

ABRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

Avoid extremes; and shun the fault of such
Who still are pleased too little, or too much.
At every trifle scorn to take offence,
That always shows great pride, or little sense.

—Pope.

France is one torrent of splendid scepticism from Abelard to Anatole France.—G. K. Chesterton.

Acid Drops.

A large part of the elementary education of England is carried on directly in the interest of the Church of England. The Lord Mayor of London boasted of this in his recent chairman's address at the celebration of the centenary of the National Society for Promoting Education in the Principles of the Church of England. “There were,” he said, “11,000 schools and 32 training colleges maintained in a condition of efficiency at the expense of the Society, or subject to large grants from its funds.” But the “efficiency” referred to does not apply to the working expenses of the schools and colleges, but only to the buildings, for the working expenses are met by grants from the State. Practically those 11,000 schools are a public swindle. The nation pays the cost of educating the children in them, and the Church of England controls their education in its own ecclesiastical interests. A very pretty bargain for the Church! A ridiculously bad bargain for the Nation!

Mr. Balfour was the principal speaker at the centenary celebration over which the Lord Mayor presided. He told the assembly—of course amidst loud cheers—that education without religion was “a most dangerous” thing. Being the clever man he is, Mr. Balfour was obliged to admit the difficulties of religious education undertaken by the State itself. But the State could call in the aid of bodies like the National Education Society to carry out the wishes of the children's parents in the matter of religious instruction—for that is Mr. Balfour's ideal. “I have always looked forward,” he said, “to the time when it would be found possible to give in our public elementary schools that teaching to every child or to the great majority of children—for no system can be quite perfect—the religious teaching which the parents of that child desire.” We agree with Mr. Balfour that if anybody has a right to decide what religion a child shall be taught it is the child's parents. What we deny is that the parents possess any right to have their child taught the religion they prefer in public buildings at the public expense. That point is the parting of the ways. On one side is dogmatic religious teaching—for all religious teaching is dogmatic; and on the other side is the policy of Secular Education. And the latter is going to win, because the former is an utter impossibility, for the simple reason that it would never work.

Note the way in which Mr. Balfour dismisses the awkward right of minorities, who are, of course, always more or less heretics. It would be difficult to provide special religious (or irreligious) teaching for *their* children. It would only be the big religious denominations that would share out the privilege provided by the State.

The Bishop of London was in his anecdote at the National Society's meeting. Because he was Bishop of Stepney before he climbed up to the Bishopric of London, he is supposed to be a great authority on the East End and its working-classes; and he always represents them, of course, as being desperately in love with the good old Church of England. His anecdote on this occasion was of a 'bus driver and himself. The jarvey told him that he believed in the Church schools for two reasons: “First of all it means less dirt for the missus,”—and, in the next place, “it keeps them out of the languago.” This is the Bishop of London's cowardly way of saying that the Council schools promote dirt and foul speech.

Our amazing Bishop of London is always uttering some ineptitude. “I would throw up my orders and leave the Church to-morrow,” he told a recent meeting, “if I thought that God cared for one set of the community and not for the other.” His lordship is fond of indulging in this sort of bravado. He knows how cheap it is. It is the episcopal counterpart of the man in the street who says “S'welp me God” and “I'll bet my bottom dollar on it.”

Why does God send riches to some people and poverty to others? Bishop Ingram has his answer pat. He says that “God has given the minority riches in trust, in order that they might pass them on to others.” We guess the “others” would sooner have them direct. The “passing on” is so slow—and uncertain.

What a tragi-comedy were the late Christian riots at Paris over the new play by Henri Bernstein, who is a Jew. That fact stuck in the throats of the gentlemen who swallow sausages. The very word “Jew” incenses them to the point of madness. Yet they owe their religion to Jews. The twelve apostles were Jews, Paul was a Jew, Joseph was

a Jew, Mary was a Jewess, Jesus was a Jew, and old Jehovah himself (the Christian's God the Father) was a Jew, and the Holy Bible has well been called the Jew Book.

What is the age of the earth? Professor T. C. Chamberlain, head of the department of Geology at the University of Chicago, gives it as 400,000,000 years. What price Moses now? And old Jahveh behind him? Fancy a God, who made the world, believing he made it six thousand instead of four hundred million years ago! What he must have suffered!

We, of course, recognise with the greatest pleasure the prospect of a furtherance of the cause of the world's peace by the suggested arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States. Freethinkers will be the first to applaud the wisdom of the step, as they have always been the first in opposing militarism and cultivating feelings of international amity. But as so much is being said by Christians as to the *Christian* character of the peace crusade, we may as well point out that it is not the moral and intellectual iniquity of militarism that has roused the bulk of the Christians of this country, but the *cost*. It is the financial burden that has induced them to consider the question from a new point of view. Cash, not conscience, was the motive power. Had militarism continued cheap, the Christian protest would have remained weak.

Rev. Charles Brown says that "Literary criticism can avail nothing against spiritual experience." The deliverance is a fair sample of the stupidity that passes for wisdom in the pulpit. "Personal experience" has nothing whatever to do with the Biblical textual criticism—to which Mr. Brown was referring. How on earth can the personal experience of anyone in the Metropolitan Tabernacle to-day tell them anything as to when or where or by whom the books of the Bible were written? Such foolishness would be surprising were it not so common. But criticism of another kind does explain the "personal experience" of Mr. Brown. And, as is the case with so much connected with religion, it reduces the testimony of experience to the truth of Christianity, to an ignorant misreading of facts that are properly susceptible to a quite different explanation.

A batch of these personal experiences is given in the April number of the *Sunday at Home*, all by well-known clergymen. Among them the Rev. Prebendary Webb-Peploe explains how "the light" came to him. A friend took him on the roof of a house, and "there, under the stars, he pointed me to Christ"—a somewhat unusual astronomical lesson, one would imagine. Then, when he was going to the Derby—wicked man!—a young man came and gave him a tract with the cheerful question, "Reader, if you died to-night, would your soul be in hell?" Sheer terror seized him, and he ran straight away home, nearly six miles. So "God's good providence" followed, and eventually captured him. Another writer, Sir John Kirk, explains how, when he was a hardened sinner of eight years' old, a girl cousin got him to go on his knees and to give himself to Christ. And from that time "some influence" for good entered into his life. And so on, with the other contributors, to this symposium. We presume that the editor of the magazine knows his readers, but it is enough to give one a fit of the blues to find such twaddle written and printed by men who pose as guides and teachers to the people. It also makes one realise that Freethought has only scratched the surface of our civilisation, and a very great deal yet remains to be done.

The *Sunday At Home* also gives a character sketch of the editor of the *Spectator*, Mr. St. Loe Strachey, whom it eulogises for his unimpeachable Christianity. By way of praising him, it says that "no reviewer of the *Spectator* is allowed, while handling some important work of philosophy or history, to deal secret stabs at the body of truths which are dear to all Christian hearts." We presume they are at perfect liberty to deal stabs at truths that are dear to non-Christian hearts. Good Christians are the last to exercise care where other people are concerned. What the compliment really means is that no matter what a reviewer thinks of Christian "truths," he must keep his opinions outside the *Spectator*. The editor is careful to see that no attacks on Christianity are printed. Criticism must praise only; it must not disparage. Well, after all, this is the rule in other papers beside the *Spectator*; so that Mr. St. Loe Strachey can lay no claim to originality in this respect. For our part we believe the *Spectator* would be better worth perusing if it provided its readers with the views of the best thinkers on both sides of the question. That would be treating its readers like intelligent and responsible men and women, and if it did not make them sounder Christians it would at least make them better individuals.

The ravages of the plague in China are dreadful enough, in all conscience, but the position is not bad enough to suit the active imagination of missionaries on the look-out for funds. In a recent issue of the *Times* there was published an appeal for funds, to fight the plague, from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. In order to stir up sympathisers, it prints an excerpt from one of its agents at Kharlin to the effect that in three days "over 4,000 unburied bodies" were burned. It adds, "Not a single case has recovered. Russian, Chinese, and foreign doctors have succumbed, to say nothing of assistants, sanitary men, and coolies, whose numbers have got out of reckoning." The impression is, that with thousands being buried or burnt every few days, and with not a single case recovering, the whole population of Manchuria will be blotted out unless the English people hurry up with their subscriptions.

Now in the *Times* for March 23 a special article appears from its correspondent on the spot. It forms an effective reply to the missionary appeal, and offers an apt commentary upon the reliability of missionary yarns. To commence with, the plague reached its height on January 28, with a record of 173 cases in Kharlin, and has since been on the decline. No death was recorded on February 28. Out of a European population, in the infected area, of 60,000, only 50 have died, and "nearly every case of death among the Europeans was preventible." The statement that not a case recovered is absurdly false. Numbers have been discharged from the hospitals, and the Chinese doctors have worked well. Of 700 police in the plague-stricken town, only 20 died. In the whole of Manchuria, since last November, it is estimated—probably over-estimated—that 41,000 have died. A terrible figure, but it effectually disposes of the 4,000 in three days, for the plague raged with severity for over three months. The example of the greatest morality was furnished by a Christian compound, where, out of 300 Christians, 263 died. Finally, the finishing comment upon the Society's appeal for funds is given by a telegram from our own Consul-General that since his last report no deaths have occurred.

In ten years the Mohammedan population of India has increased by about six millions. This is partly by increase of births over deaths, and partly by conversions. The number of Christians in India is returned at less than three millions. That is, in ten years, the Mohammedans have gained twice the number of the entire Christian population. And Christian missions avowedly make no headway amongst Mohammedans, who are beating them in India as in Africa. Indeed, in Africa the position of the Christian missionary in relation to the advance of Mohammedanism is perfectly hopeless. Neither India nor Africa discourages the missionary—so long as the people at home keep the exchequer full.

"Church House, Westminster," is a sinister address for a Committee whose object is to put down "impure literature." Their first attack is upon "certain novels," but it is easy to see that they will not stop there. "Many of these books," they say, "are not indecent in the ordinary sense of the word, but their whole tone and tendency is debasing and demoralising." Then the books are *not* indecent. They only run counter to the ideas of the pious and aristocratic ladies and gentlemen who sign the Committee's appeal. When we read later on that "the law requires strengthening" we understand what these press censors would be at. They would suppress the *Freethinker* if they could, not because it is indecent in the ordinary sense of the word, but because it is indecent in *their* sense of the word. This Committee will have to be watched.

The report of the Theatres and Music Halls Committee will be before the London County Council after this week's *Freethinker* goes to press. Judging from a *Daily News* interview with Mr. J. Stanley Holmes, a member of the Committee, there is likely to be more liberality shown towards Sunday entertainments, especially the cinematograph shows. Mr. Holmes admits that "abundant evidence has been forthcoming to show that in the poorer districts of London the Sunday cinematograph has resulted in a great improvement in order and decency. City missionaries and the police alike testify to this." "I have heard women thank God for those entertainments," he adds, "as they say their husbands, who used to spend their evenings in the public-houses, now take the wife and children for two hours or two hours and a half to the picture exhibitions." These are the things against which the Sabbatarian bigots are fighting.

The Sabbatarian bigots pretend to dread that the employees of cinematograph shows open on Sunday will be

obliged to work seven days a week. But it is easy enough to guard against that by providing, under the license, that every employee shall have one day's rest in seven.

"New York police have notified all the theatres that they must not permit persons to stand at performances. It has not yet been found necessary to take this action regarding the churches."—*Pittsburg Gazette-Times*.

Mr. G. K. Chesterton was turned on in the *Daily News* to write some windy nonsense about the Authorised Version of the Bible. He appears to think that the "translators" of that version really translated it from Hebrew and Greek direct into English. What they did, according to their instructions as a commission, was to collate all the older translations and prepare a new one, truer to the originals, but with as few alterations as possible. Mr. Chesterton's object was to show that those "nobodies" (which they were not, by the way) were inspired by their holy task into out-doing themselves and leaving behind them in the world an immortal masterpiece of English composition. He has, however, simply misread the facts. The Authorised Version was the climax of generations of Bible translation, and that, too, in a special kind of English, which was never used for any other purpose. Mr. Chesterton will see how the "translators of the 1611 Bible wrote themselves if he reads their Preface and their Dedication to King James.

We are not very sorry to see some leading Socialists getting into trouble—especially the high and mighty "literary" ones. They are far too haughty to take notice of the persecution of common Freethinkers and poor Malthusians; the Fabians particularly, with their gospel of "culchaw." These gentlemen are beginning to find that there is a lot of active and effective persecution that stops short of criminal proceedings. Freethinkers have known this all the time, and often by bitter experience; and there is some consolation, of a kind, in perceiving that other people are finding it out too. Mr. H. G. Wells, for instance, is face to face with a determined boycott of his latest novels at Birmingham and elsewhere. Free Library Committees are clearing them off the tables and shelves in the interest of "public morality." We wonder whose turn will come next. Will it be Mr. Blatchford's? He has been taking up the marriage question lately; and, as usual, with all the airs of a Christopher Columbus. Perhaps he'll make a few slips and get into trouble when he publishes that epoch-making book on the tritest subject in the world. And we should not be greatly grieved if he did. We should rather like to see Mr. Blatchford fighting for his own liberty; we never saw him fighting for anyone else's. His book *God and My Neighbor* was on the list of books which the Birmingham Branch of the National Secular Society was "reported" for selling at its Town Hall meetings. He was duly apprised of the fact, and he promised to raise his protest at the right moment. Well, the right moment came; the Birmingham Branch was forbidden to sell any literature at all at Town Hall meetings. Mr. Blatchford was duly apprised again, but he never lifted his pen, not even to reply to those who apprised him that the hour had struck. This was not a very brilliant defence of liberty. But it is just possible that Mr. Blatchford would wake up if he were attacked himself. And we repeat that we should not mind his having the opportunity. Just for once, anyhow.

Rev. Canon Rees, vicar of Pendleton, Manchester, says that "morality without God is rotten." Well, God without morality is rottener, and there's heaps of it about.

Dr. Marsh, B.A., lecturing for the Catholic Truth Society at Edinburgh, denounced the false scientists who sneer at religion. The real scientists acknowledged the existence of "God" and bowed their heads before "Him." Haeckel is such a poor creature after the world-renowned Marsh.

Louis Berndt, who shot his wife and afterwards himself at Pluckley Grange, near Ashford, Kent, left a letter for the coroner in which he said, "May the Almighty God have mercy on both our souls." Evidently not an Atheist, as, according to Talmage and Torrey, he ought to have been.

During a violent thunderstorm at Silla (according to the Valencia correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*) the belfry of the parish church was struck by lightning and the turret entirely destroyed. A service was going on inside the church and a panic ensued. In their frenzied haste to leave the building the faithful trampled upon each other and many were injured. Such was their anxiety to sing the "Glory Song" in the beautiful land above.

To a "First Great Cause."

IMPERSONAL or personal Great Cause—
Whose advent triumphed over all thy laws—
Why stay the human reason at the doors
Of Death and Life?
Where hide the springs of th' insatiable jaws
Of cosmic strife?

Far from this planet whirling into space—
In vain to try its whereabouts to trace—
We count revolving systems, mark their pace.
But in our years,
The universal being, height and base,
Timeless appears.

Culling from Truth full many a golden strand—
The affinity of sky and sea and laud—
Obdurate logic bade us understand
The dual force
Polarity; beyond thee lies that grand
Eternal Source.

Light thou art not; nor was life born of thee.
Earth's clay responds to light with eyes to see.
So clay and light, even with life must be,
Since shadowing clay
Nurses its offspring death, dread penalty
For seeing day.

And how canst thou have everlasting light?
All life is ruled by day's companion night.
Eternal slumber covers up its sight.
Should suns go cool,
Thy freak creative mould must have been quite
A useless tool!

All power is One, potentially congealed;
Atom and molecule with force is sealed.
Nothing from its own law itself can shield.
Open thy door!
Effect compels thee, First Great Cause, to yield
To thy own law.

How then to reign alone? Effect has claim
To share those honors of omnific fame;
How couldst thou play a world Creator's game
When worlds revealed
Effect and Cause were one, but two in name?
Thy doom is sealed!

A. S. VICKERS.

"My simple way is to judge no man, and to ax others as a favor, not to judge me," said Aaron. "Leave judgment with the Lord. We've all got to face it some day, and 'tis an uneasy thought at the best; but in this world nought's gained by it, and for my part I've a hearty contempt for anybody so silly as to think they can do the Lord's work and save, or damn, their neighbors."

"They've been axing in the *Daily Mercury* whether Christians did ought to smoke," said Mr. Grills, from his seat by the fire.

"I know it Teddy. Letters and letters they've printed. They'll be axing next whether Christians did ought to keep rabbits, or wear elastic-sided boots. Very sad, and sets one against they dissenters, because they must be judging their betters, or they ban't happy. The Church have her faults, but that oily righteousness that pours out of a dissenter ban't one of 'em. Scratch 'em ever so light and out ooses unction, like gravy from a goose. 'Tis a great pity they be so canting, for there's many very respectable men among them, though not what we call gentlefolk. The best bred people are only to be found along with the Establishment or the Atheists."

"I'd sooner believe nought than trust to they Methodies and Pastor Bliss," said Grills; and Mr. Cottle replied, "There it lies in a nutshell; for, if you don't believe in 'em, you might just as well believe nought, from their point of view. 'Many are called and few are chosen' be their motto, and them as ban't Methodies be out of the hunt for Kingdom Come, whatever they may do."—*Eden Phillpotts*
"Demeter's Daughter."

"Come, come," said Tom's father, "at your day of life, There's no longer excuse for thus playing the rake; It is time you should think, boy, of taking a wife."
"Why, so it is, father whose wife shall I take?"

—Thomas Moore.

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Thursday and Friday, March 30 and 31, Caxton Hall, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W.; at 8 p.m., Public Debate with Rev. Dr. Warschauer.

Sunday, April 2, Stratford Town Hall: at 7.30, "The Bible."
Free admission to all seats.

April 9, Glasgow.

To Correspondents.

- J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—April 2, Manchester; 23, Liverpool.
- J. R. HOLMES.—Your letter is too long for our space. We admitted that you had "provided counsel for Mr. White's defence." What more could we say? Your business relations with Mr. White are, of course, no concern of ours; nor does it concern us, in any special way, that you consider you have had to pay excessively. We are sorry that you have paid, or engaged to pay, nearly £200. We are still more sorry that the Malthusian League has made such a poor show for itself. The National Secular Society seems the only body that knows how to fight for free publication—or anything else. Finally, you are mistaken in supposing that we had any previous knowledge of James White.
- W. P. BALL.—Your cuttings are always very welcome.
- E. NORWOOD.—Will see what is possible.
- J. BATES.—Thanks for cuttings and good wishes. The severe return of winter at the end of March is trying.
- J. TOMKINS.—Perhaps next week. The enclosure shall be returned.
- H. B. DODDS.—We will write you when the Warschauer-Foote debate is over about a possible early lecture visit to Newcastle.
- J. W. HACKETT writes: "I read the *Freethinker* before and during your imprisonment, and have read it ever since. It is as helpful to my convictions to-day as it ever was, and, forgive me for saying it, a greater intellectual treat." We are pleased to hear it.
- L. VALDAR.—Shall have attention.
- W. LAMB.—We don't quite understand it, but thanks all the same.
- L. E. S. (Brighton).—If these gentlemen, by exerting their occult powers, can prove the reality of the "spirit world" and a future life, they ought to be ashamed of themselves to let money stand in the way. We fear you will never bring them near the winning post—or the starting post either. Archdeacon Colley strikes us as a remarkably foolish person.
- G. GARRETT.—Pleasant news. See paragraph. We note that you now wish to hear from "saints" willing to form a good working branch of the N. S. S. at Mountain Ash, and that your address is 14 Albert-street.
- JOHN LATHAM (S. Africa).—We shall be writing you on the matter very shortly.
- W. DURANT.—The atrocities and vandalism of the "punitive expedition" sent out by the Christian Powers to China are too well established to be disposed of in a few lines by a paper like the *Western Daily Mercury*. Sir Hiram Maxim knows what he is talking about.
- G. HOWELL.—Please don't send lecture notices in the form of a letter. Send them on the model of our printed list. Whatever you have to say to us say separately.
- H. B. (Lowestoft).—You don't understand. The copyright of Dr. Warschauer's speeches belongs to him, and are not publishable by us in any form whatever without his consent. It is a very nice idea that "the copyright belongs to all thinking men." If you made boots, would you like them to belong to all men who wanted to wear them?
- T. S. NEWELL.—It will be useful. Thanks. Dixon will get it. We know he is writing letters repeating his vile slanders against Ingersoll—the "proofs" of which all got burnt in a fire. Dixon's little joke!
- W. OWEN.—Subjects noted.
- J. HEWITT.—Pleased to have a veteran's letter, and glad the *Freethinker* is more to you than ever.
- W. DODD.—We know your good wishes are sincere. 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. 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.

President's Honorarium Fund, 1911.

Twelfth List of Subscriptions.
Previously acknowledged, £162 19s. 8d. A. E. Maddock
£2; P. C. Clarke, 5s.; J. W. Hackett, 2s. 6d.; W. Dodd, £1;
A. Firth, 2s. 6d.

Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote winds up the Stratford Town Hall course of lectures this evening (April 2). His subject is simply "The Bible." But there is plenty of room in it for any number of eye-openers to Christians, besides up-to-date information for Freethinkers. The local "saints" should let this lecture have all the advertisement they can give it.

London was a bitter place on Sunday evening. Winter had suddenly returned with great severity. A keen east wind swept the streets, and even the least stay-at-home people were tempted to keep by the fireside. In these circumstances there was a very gratifying audience at Queen's Hall, where Mr. Foote wound up a three-months' course of Sunday evening lectures with one on "Christianity and Peace." Prior to the lecture there was the usual musical program, and Miss Florence Foote read a powerful short poem of Robert Brownings, which was much applauded. Mr. F. A. Davies, who took the chair, made an appeal for members for the new Rationalist Peace Society. Mr. Foote's lecture was closely followed and loudly cheered, and followed by a number of questions.

South Scottish "saints" will remember that Mr. Foote's visit to Glasgow had to be postponed a couple of months ago in consequence of an attack of influenza. His visit is to take place next Sunday (April 9). It is rather late in the Glasgow season, but the N. S. S. President has many friends in the district, and is pretty sure to have good audiences. The lectures will be at 12 noon and 6.30 p.m. as usual in the Secular Hall, Brunswick-street.

Mr. Lloyd lectures to-day (April 2), afternoon and evening, in the Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, Manchester. We hope to hear of good audiences. The lectures are sure to be good. They close the winter lecture season at Manchester.

Mr. F. A. Davies pays Liverpool a visit to-day (April 2) and delivers two lectures, afternoon and evening, for the N. S. S. Branch at the Alexandra Hall. We hope the local "saints" will give him a hearty welcome.

We are glad to hear from Mr. Lloyd, who went down to Manchester from London to represent the National Secular Society and the Secular Society, Ltd., at the funeral of the late Mr. George Payne, that the public hall of the Crematorium was crowded with men and women gathered there to pay the deceased a last tribute of respect.

We have already explained that we cannot publish the Warschauer-Foote's debates in the *Freethinker*. That would have suited us all right, but naturally it doesn't suit Dr. Warschauer. It wouldn't suit us if we were in his place.

The agitation against Sabbatarianism has succeeded at Mountain Ash, in spite of all the efforts and all the prayers of the mon of God. At last a ballot has been taken as to whether the Workmen's Institute, Library and Public Hall should be open on Sunday; and the result is 1,980 for and 547 against—showing a clear majority of 1,433, on a 2,527 poll, or nearly four to one. It was a black hour when the great Galileo muttered "And still it moves." But the world *does* move, and the very bigots have to go round with it. And let us not forget to congratulate the free-minded workmen at Mountain Ash who have fought that long and hard battle—and won.

Here is an extract from the letter of a Northumberland miner:—

"I was a member of the Presbyterian Church a while ago, but a friend lent me a few pamphlets to read, some of your own and a lot of Ingersoll's, and my wonder now is how I remained so long in the dark."

This should encourage the "saints" to go on sowing the seed of Freethought. Some of it is sure to spring up—as in this instance.

Here is another extract from a Shanghai correspondent:—

"I have been an enthusiastic reader of the *Freethinker* for the past five years with deserving admiration. I hope you will live long enough to see the object of your life realised."

The imperfection of the writer's English is due to the fact that he is a Western Asiatic.

Christian Science Again.

"The feet of Christian Science are red with blood of those killed by sheer deliberate ignorance, by wilful blindness, by purposeful refusal to raise a finger for them. Christian Science put them to death, and when they were dead said they died of want of faith."—STEPHEN PAGET, F.R.C.S.

THE *British Medical Journal* has lately dealt with Christian Science, Faith Healing, The Occult, etc. It has also referred to the miracle cures at Lourdes and other such shrines of healing. The articles are scholarly, though verbose, and the main interest to the Freethinker is found in the fact that they are nearly all distinctly antagonistic to Christian Science.

The "Reverend" Mary Baker G. Eddy is dead; but the Science has not died with her. It has taken a spasmodic lease of life since the head and front of the whole offending vanished. This is not remarkable. But it won't last, for Christian Science is not true, only well invented. While we affirm that it is not true, we *do* believe that it has for its superstructure a rock of fact—mist hidden and wave beaten—but a rock of fact in the shape of thought dominance. This is what makes it dangerous, and this is the only admission in its favor we can make.

Mrs. Eddy herself could not, or did not, give the reason for the assertions she made. In fact, we look for reason and fail to find it throughout her long-winded writings. But she has succeeded in erecting on this little rock of truth an edifice of exceedingly clever imagination and plausible conjecture which has bamboozled thousands of half-thinkers. It is an edifice which sways dangerously in the wind of criticism.

Originally, she said too much, even for a romance-loving world, when she affirmed with Jesus that poisons should not harm those with true unadulterated belief or faith. We know the result upon the human economy of sulphuric or nitric acid—Christian Science or no Christian Science, faith or no faith. If Jesus, "who was God," was the first "Scientist," why have we been two thousand years finding it out? And why is there only one person to tell us?

The influence of the mind over the body has become a stock phrase. Yet we know it does exist in more or less tangible form. We have cessation of the digestive processes through fear or shock. Proof of this has been forthcoming in those condemned to death. Grief or anger results similarly. But who knows the *reason*? We concede that these feelings of fear, grief, anger, are really mind action; though when confronted with that mind action as exemplified in physical change, we usually accept the fact without questioning the reason. Mind action can produce actual physical change to our knowledge and to our astonishment. Hence the invention of Christian Science out of a fundamental truth.

Sir Clifford Allbutt, K.C.B., M.D., F.R.S., who is Regius Professor of Physic at Cambridge, in an article entitled "Faith Healing," finds no compunction in dealing with the wonder cures of Epidaurus, of the Tiber Island, of Apollonius of Tyana, or of the mediæval saints. When, however, he comes to Jesus and his alleged miracles, there is a full stop. Yet he says, and we heartily agree:—

"The life of a sick man depends, not upon prayer, but upon the timely arrival of the physician with the antidote. In bitter certainty we know that the mother who in the hour of crisis betakes herself to prayer only will lose the child which is spared to the prayerless mother who has learned the path of infection and how to outwit it.....By no invocation can we purify the cradles of disease."

Well, if "no invocation can purify disease," then prayer, which is invocation, is useless; and this is what we have always thought.

Suggestion, mesmerism, and animal magnetism are forms of mental healing, we are told, and this we are personally inclined to favor, say in neurosis and

allied ailments, but certainly not in cases of physical deformity and broken bones. Allbutt says:—

"Curative effects or results appear to be brought to light by the influence of strong or vivid thought, they seem a subtle energy other than physical upon the abnormal or morbid bodily state."

In this matter, also, Sir Henry Morris, M.B., F.R.C.S., asks:—

"What is the psychological process by which this power or energy [suggestion] works the cure? Well, it would require a consideration of the theories of 'unconscious cerebration' and of 'dual mind'; or, in other words, the relation of the conscious or objective side of the mind to the subjective or subconscious side."

Yet Sir Henry also declares that "hypnotic and religious suggestion are quite different from what is understood in metaphysics as mental suggestion." It may be so. Latter day inquiry and research have made some difference, though we can hardly exclude those phases of religious exaltation which so often culminate either in recovery or graver symptoms. Surely some of these results are as hypnotic as the results gained by the rotation of a piece of glass. We believe that religious hypnosis is as real as any other hypnosis, even though its results are clouded by indefiniteness and unreliability. Though the actual basic reason underlying hypnotic suggestion has not yet been demonstrated, we have enough data to enthral us. The world is still in its infancy, and faith in the past has been the most potent of all. Who knows but that Mesmer may turn out to be the greatest of men? Culpeper hardly will, for he only spoke of "the nervous Divine liquor!" Moreover, Mesmer is crowned already by the creation of a word out of his name. Tooth extraction and other minor operations were performed painlessly under the mesmeric influence of Dods, Collyer, and others in the old days, and there was once the "Mesmeric Crisis." Yes, and it is just worth while remembering that this mesmeric crisis *followed* the production of intoxication for painful operations, and *preceded* the introduction of chloroform as an anæsthetic. Indeed, anæsthetics dealt the death blow to mesmerism and ousted the method of producing intoxication by the evaporation of spirit in the days of Skey and Savory. Certainly suggestion now has no chance with nitrous oxide gas. The uncertainty attending mind domination by mesmerism makes its possible future as a therapeutical agent sink into the background in face of unerring results from chemical agents.

Sir Henry says: "In faith-healing, the suggestion is that cure will be worked by spiritual or divine power.....This divine power is *supposed to act* by neutralising or overcoming sickness, disease, and the ill consequences of accidents." So we are confronted with the fact that Divinity has not been merciful in the long past. He continues:—

"The faith-healer does not doubt the reality of matter or of diseases, but believes that he can draw upon a spiritual force to subdue or annihilate an existing evil.....Faith-healing and hypnotic suggestion are forms of treatment by an idea exercisable upon only a very limited range of disease."

Quite so; and we find now that Christian Science has elaborated this idea to the extent of absurdity. Then he says: "There are none of the magnificent manifestations of Lourdes, of which I have read, which could not be paralleled by cases in the practice of medical men of wide experience." He quotes the "case of Mdlle. Lovégne, claimed to be one of the most strikingly important ever seen, but easily explained by the escape, during the woman's journey to Lourdes, or just after her arrival, of a fragment of necrosed bone from the inflamed, suppurating, and painful wound." But Lourdes, of course, claimed the honor. Then we are told that—

"Mdlle. Rosarie Monnier, after nineteen years of illness, had a 'sudden intuition' that she would obtain her cure from the Immaculate Virgin if she went willingly to Lourdes. She went, and was instantaneously cured after receiving the Holy Communion at the chapel of the hospital of the Holy Lady of the Seven Sorrows."

If this is so, we can only express regret that God

chose to torture her for nineteen years before directing her steps to the Holy Lady.

There are some interesting details of hysterical or purposive deception which simulated real disease. Some were cured, not by the Virgin or Lady of Seven Sorrows, but by other very understandable means. One case we may refer to here. This was a peculiar skin rash which puzzled the medical attendants until the charming and interesting lady sufferer was discovered causing it herself by persistent rubbing with pumice-stone! And all for notoriety and effect! Think of the possible advent of the Christian Science Healer in such a case. He might have pocketed the pumice-stone and claimed a cure. It is immediately suggestive.

Sir Henry admits his scepticism as to miracles by doubting that they are the immediate and direct interposition of the Divinity. So far, so good; though a few hundred years ago he would have been burned for saying so. He says:—

"Faith-healing differs from Christian Science in not masquerading in senseless and meaningless metaphysics, in not asserting the non-existence, the nothingness of matter. The very heart of Christian Science is said to be contained in the following 'immortal sentence': There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All in All. Spirit is immortal Truth; matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal. Spirit is God, and man is His image and likeness; hence man is spiritual and not material."

Mrs. Eddy—for the foregoing are her words—also asserts that disease has no existence; in effect the individual only thinks he's ill, and if he thinks powerfully enough in the opposite direction, well—he isn't. He is, as she says, only "laboring under a false belief," and "sin, sickness, disease, and death" are phantoms. Perhaps an illustrated joke in the *Winning Post Annual* of last Christmas well depicts this absurdity. A Christian Scientist mistress says to her maid who has returned from a fortnight's leave on account of the illness of her father: "Now, Jane, I hope you explained to your father that he is not really ill, he only imagines he is; there is no such thing as suffering; how does he think he is now?" Well, ma'am, I suppose he thinks he's dead now? —we buried him last week!"

Mrs. Eddy declares that Christian Science "healing consists in an increase of spiritual force whereby the Divine influence dispels the illusions associated with matter," and Sir Henry truly enough complains that she is "perplexingly inconsistent." But we, personally, said much more than this, and Frederick Dixon failed to answer a single argument levelled in these columns against Christian Science. Now we have eminent medical authorities largely agreeing. We declared, and still declare, Christian Science to be a contradictory mass of pseudo-scientific phraseology, and a veritable jargon of metaphysics, an artful hashing-up of religious, medical, and metaphysical matters. And we add that this conglomeration, served up on hot plates, becomes absolutely irresistible to the miracle-monger, and forms a kind of resurrection pie over which the psychical glutton smacks his lips. Mrs. Eddy originally asked: "Must Christian Science come through the churches?" Well, we see now that it has not come through the hospitals. And we have known all along that the churches are blindly opposed to it tooth and nail, as they always have been to anything new. She says "disease is an error of mortal mind." If so, why do the lower animals die of disease? Stephen Paget rightly asks why millions of fishes, reptiles, and birds, die of disease? Certainly why they should become a conundrum if we are to imagine they can't think they have got it. Paget puts the question, "Is lockjaw in the horse an error of equine mind? If it is not, why does the horse die of tetanus?" But Christian Science says death itself is an illusion. In which case the horse isn't dead. Farther, is the horse in real pain, or is that pain a dream in us or in it? If the "error" be in us, why does Christian Science give "absent treatment," as in the case of

Mr. Hibbert's broken-winded mare? Why did Mrs. Eddy give "absent treatment" all the way from New York to a pet dog at Beyreuth if the dog's illness was all in the owner's mind and none in the dog's mind? Moreover, what of the millions of animals that perished before "mortal mind" appeared? Why didn't divine will come into action long ago? What, too, about the transmission of disease from animals to us—glanders, anthrax, tubercle, etc.—are they only real in the animals and not in us? And yet we die, or think we do. The fact is, as Paget says, Mrs. Eddy was so busy making a god of man that she forgot the animals; yet the brute creation was here, suffering and dying for countless ages before the creation of man! Cases of diphtheria, hemorrhage, cancer, strangulated hernia, and intestinal obstruction happen, and Christian Science fails. It is no answer to say that medicine and surgery fail also, for they never made Christian Science claims. As for appendix-abscess, Paget affirms that he "has not heard of a single case where the patient did not die, whereas the operation for removal of the appendix to prevent the risk of an abscess has a mortality of about 1 per cent."

The *British Medical Journal* tells us that Mrs. Eddy was "a seeker after notoriety," and we have no reason to doubt it. Everything points that way. That she "was called" (and she herself says this) we do doubt. That she "had a fall" we may concede, though we should not mention it unless she did. If Mrs. Eddy was "dissatisfied with the world," who knows, perhaps the "Divine Spirit" was the lodger responsible for a lot. But she actually herself seemed to have had some regard not only for "matter," but for "man," for she contracted what she tried to explain was a "spiritual union" by marrying a third husband in the person of Mr. Eddy. One would expect to find Mr. Eddy at least a *savant*, or a student of nature, or a psychologist of the first water; but instead he was "agent for a sewing-machine concern"! And this individual, long since dead, was, according to Mrs. Eddy, carried off by "an idea" of poisoning! Yet he must still be alive if there is no death, though he isn't, because he never was. Sir Humphrey Davy frequently exclaimed after the nitrous oxide, "Nothing exists but ideas!" The gas of Christian Science seems similar in its action.

(To be concluded.)

A. FAGG.

The Flatheads.

(From the *New York "Truthseeker."*)

THERE is a tribe of Indians known as flatheads. When a child is born, a piece of dried hide or bark is bound on the forepart of the head, and it is compressed, so that it is a true slant from the eyebrows to the top of the head. It is said that this process does not impair the intellect. Among the Indians this custom is confined to a single tribe, but in all Christian countries it is largely practised, though in a different way. Instead of compressing the solid wall of the head, they compress the intellect. Instead of the skull, it is the mind that is flattened—which is a hundred times worse in its effects. There are temples all over the country devoted exclusively to this mind-flattening process. Parsons whose minds have been treated to the flattening process seldom or never see things in their true light.

They are made to believe the most absurd and impossible stories ever written or told.

There is an old book, long since discarded by all scientific minds, which contains some of the most unreasonable, inhuman, and barbarous statements ever concocted in the brain of man; yet these flatheads are not only led to believe them, but to call them holy.

The Catholics have a Bible, the Jews have a different one, the Protestants have one that differs from the other two; the Mormons have a Bible,

Mohammedans have one; and so, taking all of those different sects together, they have a dozen or fifteen different Bibles; the flatheads of each religious sect firmly believing that they have got the only Bible ever written by the finger of the Almighty—that all the others are man-made and spurious.

The Catholic fights the Jew; the Jew fights the Catholic and Protestant; all three fight the Mormons; while a Mohammedan wants to cleave the skull of every man who does not believe that Mohammed was a true prophet. These different systems of religion have been the cause of more contentions, tortures, wars, and bloodshed than all other causes combined. Every flathead wants to fight everyone who differs from him. For three hundred years, during the holy wars, wherever a crusader set his foot human blood gushed up from the ground. The country is paved with human bones from the north of Europe to the Holy Land.

Each book which the different sects regard as holy gives the devotee a different idea of God. Then these worshipers will do anything they think will please the God which they formed in their minds, whether it is to torture a heretic, hang a witch, burn a Bruno, or murder a Ferrer. The Christian is not only a flathead, but he worships a flathead God who, he thinks, can do the impossible. The God can divide himself into three equal parts and have each part equal to the whole, as it was before the division was made. The three parts can be joined together and still have three separate and distinct parts, each part equal to all three. One part can die and yet all three parts be alive. One part can beget a son and the other two parts be the father of it. Demmed queer, ain't it?—but it's all clear to a flathead. "Believe or be damned."

People who have been put through the flattening process lose their reason and believe anything written in the book. Can a man really believe that the dead were brought to life, that snakes and asses could talk, that a man had the strength of forty horses, and that his strength lay in his hair? That a man ever navigated the high seas in the belly of a big fish, that dead folks ever dug out of their graves and ran about the country? Anything in Baron Munchausen that is an overmatch for such stories? But they are not only reasonable, but sacred, to the flatheads. Whew! Scat!

Thousands have died of hunger praying for bread; the ocean's bed is lined with the bones of those who went down praying to be rescued. In all of the world's history not one prayer was ever answered, and yet the flathead mumbles over the same prayer every day, and keeps it up year after year, firmly believing that if he only exercises sufficient faith his prayers will be answered.

Now I want to show you what faith can do. An old hunter had killed hundreds of deer with the same gun—it never missed. At length he got such faith in that gun that he could bring down a deer when the gun was not loaded. When will the flatheads learn that they always pull the prayer trigger with an empty barrel?

If a Christian is mistaken about everything else, he is sure that he has a soul, though he never felt, heard, or saw a soul—cannot describe one—and has no more idea of one than he has of a whirlwind on the planet Mars. He can form no conception of it as to shape, substance, quality, or quantity. Question him closely, and he cannot bring one spark of evidence that such a thing as a soul exists.

Not long ago I read of a man who was unconscious a hundred and twenty hours. Where was his soul during that time? If he had one, he could not realise it, for his brain did not act and he had no sense of anything. That is the condition of the dead. When his reason returned he had no more sense of a soul than he had while unconscious. What kind of a thing can a soul be when one cannot be conscious of having one?

When one can neither feel, hear, see, taste, nor smell, for the time being he is virtually dead. Death is simply a continuation of that condition. Accord-

ing to flathead philosophy, when a man is in an unconscious state, if a bullet is sent through his brain it will wake him up; it will actually bring him to life and he will live forever! The truth is it will continue that unconscious state, and he will be dead forever.

Try to think of your condition before you had an existence. The song of a bird, the opening of a flower, the shock of an earthquake, would be all the same to you. You knew nothing before you had an existence; you will know nothing after that existence ceases. You knew nothing before you were born; you will know nothing after you are dead. As it was before this life, so it will be after this life ceases. Anything which has neither weight, form, nor measurements, and which we can neither feel, hear, see, taste, or smell, is so near nothing that no scientific test can determine the difference.

Christians claim that the soul will never die. That which lasts forever is indestructible. That which is indestructible never had a beginning. Therefore all the souls that are to animate the millions yet unborn are in existence now. Not a man on the face of the earth can in any way get any knowledge of these souls. Is it possible that people will know more after they are dead than they know when alive?

Every flathead is sure there is a God, and every one has a different God. If this statement is doubted, question twenty Christians, and it will be found that each has a different idea of God, the best evidence in the world that all the God there is is a creature of the imagination. If a man does not see God in the "clouds" and hear him in the "wind," the Christian thinks that he is intrinsically bad—bad from top to bottom—bad through and through. If a man does not see the work of his hand in all that he beholds in the broad field of nature, he is not only stupid, but vile. And yet I have questioned many Christians, and in no instance has one brought forth evidence to prove the existence of a God which would be accepted in a court of justice.

When cleared of faith and smoke, all the arguments that I have known to be brought forth to prove the existence of a God amounts to just this: "I believe." And as far as bad men are concerned, some of the most liberal, humane, and charitable men that I have ever known did not believe in a supernatural power. And I believe it may be safely stated that most of the intelligent men do not believe in the God of the Bible; while some of the most cowardly, dastardly human sneaks have been the most devout Christians.

There is nothing in this world, or any other, but the natural. In a long life I have never witnessed anything supernatural. I have known the most terrible and destructive effects produced by lightning, wind, and water. If God had anything to do with these calamities, instead of being worthy of praise and adoration, he is entitled only to horror and contempt.

Hills and mountains, by their drainage, will form rivers and lakes. Millions of tons of earthy matter is transported to the oceans by these rivers. While the land is losing this matter, the oceans are being filled up. The revolution of the earth upon its axis has forced the matter toward the equator and piled it up, so to speak, until the equatorial diameter is much greater than the polar. Therefore rivers running toward the equator, like the Mississippi, must actually run up-hill. Great swells are raised on the ocean by the attraction of the sun and moon. Water finds a passage into the internal fires of the earth and generates gas and steam, which find a vent through the chimneys of the volcanoes, so that millions of tons of matter are brought up from the bowels of the earth and deposited on the surface. The sun, shining on falling drops of water, produces the beautiful rainbow. When all the operations of nature are fully understood, it will be seen that there is no use for any God, because there is nothing for him to do.

As long as priests and ministers continue their nefarious work of reducing those blest with common

sense to idiotic flatheads, there will be little progress made in exploring the field of nature. There must ever be a war between superstition and freedom of thought. Catholicism is a menace to the free institutions of this country. No Catholic should be allowed to hold an office here. What would be thought of putting an Englishman in office who owes allegiance to the crown? Every Catholic owes allegiance to a foreign head. If a true Catholic, he will be true to the Pope; if true to the Pope, he will betray the free institutions of this country. He cannot serve two masters. The principles of Catholicism and those of the Declaration of Independence can never be harmonised. A pope hates the principles of democracy as a mad dog hates water.

The minds of flatheads are so much engaged in the affairs of another world that they neglect the affairs of this world.

During the Dark Ages the chief concern was to prepare for a heaven which they knew nothing about. Never was there found a worse condition of society. Monks and priests were the guides and leaders, and of all men they were the most dishonest and treacherous. According to their view, God favored belief more than good conduct. A man might wade in the mire of dissipation, but it was not as dangerous as unbelief.

Reason teaches that those who live good and pure lives, and are really fitted to live in this world, are fitted for any other world. The flatheads view things in a different light. No matter how vile and corrupt a man may be, if he has full faith in the efficacy of the blood of Christ his name will be written in the lamb's book of life, and he will be permitted to join the vast throng of slipshod flatheads who wear crowns, and to play on a harp of a thousand strings and prance about in the streets of the New Jerusalem singing praises to the great Whangdoodle, world without end. Amen.

JOHN PECK.

Religion and Moonshine.

THE "glimpses of the moon" have moved men from the twilight of human history. From remote ages poets have sung the moon's praises, and the superstitions to which her supposed influence has given rise are almost inexhaustible. According to legend, she not only determined weather and affects madness, but influences a multitude of other things. Those great and good men, Old Moore and Zadkiel, seem to think that there are few things, from pitch and toss to marriage and manslaughter, in which Phoebe has not a finger. Like the Rosicrucian in *Hudibras*, they appear to have an intimate acquaintanceship with,—

"The man in the moon,
That to the ancients was unknown."

Indeed, the ancients were so chivalrous that they identified the beauteous goddess Artemis and the chaste Diana with the moon. To them she was a virgin deity attended by her maidens, and her temple at Ephesus was one of the seven wonders of the world. Other times other faiths. The "Heathen Chinese" have a legend that a rabbit exists in the moon and makes those shadows on its face which have so often attracted the curious and the amorous. This legend is transformed by the pious Buddhists into the hare which met Gautama when the Teacher was poor and hungry. The hare offered assistance in a manner worthy of a courtier of the Grand Monarque, saying: "If you are hungry, kill me." Buddha lighted a fire, into which the hare jumped, but the Teacher plucked it from the flames and hurled it to the moon, where it remains an awful warning of the danger of politeness in a sinful world.

The fancy of the American Indian shapes the marks on the moon into human form. The little

Hiawatha, seeing the moon rise from the water, asked Nokamis, and was told:—

"Once a warrior, very angry,
Seized his grandmother—threw her
Up into the sky at midnight,
Right against the moon he threw her.
'Tis her body that you see her."

Some of the Pacific Islanders likewise believe in a woman in the moon. To the Scandinavian, the shadows appear to be made by two children whom the moon kidnapped. The Poles call the man in the moon Pan Twasdowski and have a long legend to account for his whereabouts. It is delightful to find a number of Biblical characters associated with this lunar asylum. The Jews placed Jacob there. Others saw Isaac bearing the faggots for the sacrifice on Horeb. The Italian imagination bodied forth Cain and a load of thorns, said to be the fruits mentioned in Genesis. One wonders what freak of human fancy procured Cain his admission to the moon. The legend was current before the time of Dante, who says:—

"Onward now
For now doth Cain, with fork of thorns, confine
On either hemisphere, touching the wave
Beneath the tower of Seville."

When the poet and Beatrice enter the moon, he asks anxiously:—

"Tell, I pray thee, whence the gloomy spots
Upon this body, which below on earth,
Give rise to talk of Cain in fables quaint."

The English Milton makes the celestial Raphael the sponsor of his views on the subject. The spots, he thought, were neither measles nor pimples, but:—

"Unpurged
Vapors not yet into her substance turned."

Neither the gifted Florentine of the fourteenth century nor the educated Englishman of the seventeenth, knew aught of the mountains of the moon. Medieval writers refer to the man in the moon as carrying a burden of stolen sticks. Chaucer supports the same tradition in the "Testament of Cressid":

"On her brest a chorle painted full even,
Bearing a bush of thorns on his backe,
Which, for his theft, might climbe no ner the heaven."

The man in the moon is sometimes used as a synonym for Mr. Nobody. Stephano mystifies the monster Caliban in *The Tempest*, on their first meeting. When Caliban asks him if he has dropped from heaven, he replies:—

"Out of the moon I do assure thee! I was the
man in the moon when time was."

If the universality of any belief be a test of its truth, there is much to be said for this faith in moonshine. As Shakespeare says, "Truly the moon shines with a good grace."

MIMNERMOS.

ACT OF A CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN.

From the college days of William H. Baldwin, Jr., until his too-early death there are no unfilled gaps, writes John Graham Brooks in *An American Citizen*. He won success with clean hands and unstained honor. He believed that all men were bound together to help their fellows. "To do good together is to tolerate and forbear together," he said in a public address.

Before him in the audience were men of different color, nationality and religion. He spoke of the exasperations between capital and labour, of race misunderstandings and the national rivalries that create wars. He illustrated his point by the following:

"I must tell you a story that a Jewish woman told me only a few days ago. She is a woman who devotes her time to the people on the poorer side of New York City. She lives in a tenement house on the East Side, and passes daily by the door of a Chinese laundry.

"Each day she would stop and speak, and say, 'Hello, John!' and they would say, 'Hello, lady!'

"After a couple of weeks, as she passed, she saw only one Chinaman where there had been two, and she asked, 'Where is the other, John?'

"'Him in the hospital. Clistian gentleman struck him in the head with a blick.'"

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**

CAXTON HALL (Victoria-street, Westminster): Thursday and Friday, March 30 and 31, at 8, Debate, Rev. J. A. Warschauer and G. W. Foote, "Theism or Atheism?"

STRATFORD TOWN HALL: 7.30, G. W. Foote, "The Bible."

OUTDOOR.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Highbury Corner): 12 noon, Ivan Paperno, a Lecture.

COUNTRY.**INDOOR.**

ABERTILLERY, MON. (New Era Union, Metropole Theatre): Joseph McCabe, 3, Lantern Lecture, "Wonderful Chapters in the Story of the Earth"; 6, "The Churches and Social Progress."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon, Class; 6.30, Jas. Reid, sen., "Savonarola."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Entertainment by Sunday-school Children.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): F. A. Davies, 3, "Jesus, the Light that Failed"; 7, "The King and the Bible."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints): J. T. Lloyd, 3, "Is Life Worth Living?" 6.30, "The Tragedy of Calvary and Criticism." Tea at 5.

RHONDDA BRANCH N. S. S. (Parry's Temperance Bar, Tony-pandy): 3, Debate, S. Holman and H. Green, "Is the Bible Unworthy of Our Implicit Trust?"

WEST STANLEY BRANCH N. S. S. (Co-operative Ante-Room): 6, Important Business Meeting.

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.

HARRY BOULTER, the Freethinker's Tailor, 108 City-road (2nd floor), opposite Old-st Tube Station. Suits from 37s 6d.; Ladies' Costumes from 45s. Catholics, Churchmen, Jews, and Nonconformists support their own. Go thou and do likewise!

FREETHINKERS! You will not do justice to yourselves if you buy a Suit before seeing patterns of my 30s. and 50s. Suits to measure. Patterns and self-measure form post free. Fit, style, and wear guaranteed.—J. W. Gorr. 28 Church-bank, Bradford.

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 all the purposes of the Society.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

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

Principles and Objects.

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

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

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

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

Membership.

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

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

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

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

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

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

Immediate Practical Objects.

The Legitimation of Requests 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 incommodious 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 VESEY STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

A NEW (THE THIRD) EDITION

OF

FROM FICTION TO FACT.

By F. BONTE.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

REVISED AND ENLARGED.
SHOULD BE SCATTERED BROADCAST.

SIXTY-FOUR PAGES.
PRICE ONE PENNY.

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

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 or 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.

GREAT PUBLIC DEBATE
ON
THEISM OR ATHEISM?

BETWEEN

The Rev. Dr. J. A. WARSCHAUER
(Representing the North London Christian Evidence League.)

AND

Mr. G. W. FOOTE
(Representing the National Secular Society.)

AT

CAXTON HALL

ON

Thursday and Friday, March 30 and 31.

Chairmen: Rev. C. DRAWBRIDGE & Mr. HERBERT BURROWS

RESERVED SEATS, 2s. FRONT SEATS, 1s. BACK SEATS, 6d.
Doors Open at 7.30 p.m. Chair Taken at 8 p.m.

STRATFORD TOWN HALL.

Sunday Evening Freethought Lecture

(Under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd.)

APRIL 2.—

Mr. G. W. FOOTE: "The Bible."

ALL SEATS FREE.

Doors open at 7 p.m. Chair taken at 7.30. p.m. Collection. Questions and Discussion Invited.

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.