

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—No. 18

SUNDAY, APRIL 30, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

Surely life sometimes needs strong words, and those which are tame may be further from the truth than those which burn.—R. H. WHITE (MARK RUTHERFORD).

The Implications of Atheism.

It cannot be too frequently or too forcibly emphasised that all supernatural beliefs signify a specific intellectual attitude. People sometimes say that feelings are safer guides than ideas; but the truth is that feelings are but ideas in solution. Theism is an idea, the idea of the existence of a personal Deity, while religion, in its popular acceptation, is an emotional condition induced by that idea. Theism is not religion, though it naturally leads to religion; and it is conceivable, though not in the least degree probable, that a man may believe in God without ever worshipping him. So, likewise, Atheism, meaning merely the absence of Theism, is simply an intellectual attitude, or posture of the mind. This is a point of the vastest importance, and, being a point almost universally misunderstood or ignored, it is necessary to make it as clear as possible. Let it be borne in mind, first of all, that Atheism is not a denial or rejection of God. The Atheist does not believe that God exists; and, surely, to deny or reject the non-existent would be to commit the silliest act imaginable. But, while not denying the existence of God, the Atheist does deny and reject, with all the vehemence at his disposal, every definition or description of God of which he has ever heard or read. In the second place, it must be remembered that the absence of Theism inevitably implies the absence of religion, in every theological sense of the word. Of course, this statement is open to serious question, because religion is a word to which so many different and conflicting meanings have been attached even by theologians. Primarily every religion is nothing but a mode of divine worship. It is well known that Nature-Religions are unethical. Their deities neither insist upon the cultivation of morality by their worshippers, nor do they possess moral qualities themselves. Ethical Religions are comparatively modern, and have never been numerous. Chief among these is Christianity, which not only enjoins a particular mode of worship, but also teaches that morality is wholly dependent upon the faith that expresses itself in that worship. Hence we find that the Christian claim practically comes to this: That "if there be no God there can be no morality." From this it logically follows that Atheism and immorality stand in the relation of parent and offspring.

The baselessness of such a claim is self-evident to scientific students of ethics. As Dr. Farnell observes, in the current number of the *Hibbert Journal*, "morality has been, is, and must remain a social phenomenon." Now, Atheism is neither a theory of the universe, nor a philosophy of life. The Atheist has dropped nothing save God and his worship. The universe remains, and so do the social relationships of mankind. How unutterably foolish, therefore, is the assertion that men adopt Atheism in order to get rid of the sense of responsibility, or to indulge in the worst forms of wickedness without fear of punishment. As a matter of fact, Atheism provides no drugs for guilty consciences, nor any immunity what-

soever from the consequences of wrong-doing. Lust degrades an Atheist just as surely as it does a Christian. Drunkenness is fully as injurious to the one as to the other. Nature recognises absolutely no difference between them. Vice lowers a man's social value whether he be a believer or an unbeliever. The only thing that the Atheist has lost is the sense of responsibility to an invisible Person the very existence of whom has never been proved; but, in most cases, that loss turns to gain; the absence of the sense of responsibility to an absentee Deity has the effect of intensifying the sense of responsible relations with a very present community. The central and most important doctrine in Christianity is that of entire dependence upon God. The most saintly believers spend the major part of their time in telling the Almighty what hideous, helpless worms they are, and how deserving of the flames, and in beseeching him to be gracious to them and do everything for them; and if God must do everything for individuals, it stands to reason that he must do everything for society. This pious waiting on God furnishes a satisfactory explanation of the awful social stagnation, and not infrequently the social retrogression, that characterised the Ages of Faith. The Atheists realise that whatever needs to be done for individuals, or for society, must be done by themselves, either as individuals or as members of society; and it is the realisation of this truth by a rapidly growing number during the last sixty or seventy years that accounts for the social progress that marks that period.

The direct implications of Atheism are that those who adopt it cease to engage in Divine worship, abandon all religious rites and ceremonies, and give up church and chapel going; and the indirect ones, the discovery that self-reliance, self-control, courage, and benevolence are the supreme virtues, and the determination to make individual and social well-being the end of all endeavors. An opponent of Atheism laughs the idea of social obligation to scorn, saying:—

"Modern society is not a philanthropic institution, but a competitive system in which cunning reaps a greater harvest than honor. It condemns thousands of Nature's noblemen to hopeless drudgery, and enthrones the minority in idleness and luxury on the agony of the majority."

We agree; but the writer of that extract forgot that the social conditions described are the inheritance of nigh two thousand years of Christian Theism. He had no right to complain, because, as Mr. Meyer said from his pulpit the other Sunday, "God assigns our places to us," and so the minority reign in idleness and luxury and the majority are doomed to hopeless drudgery by the wise ordinance of the good Lord. But the irony of the situation is seen when it cannot be denied that during the time Christian Theism has been visibly declining, the position of the workers has been as surely improving.

The Rev. Dr. Orchard, in his Correspondence Column in the *Christian Commonwealth* for April 19, discusses the implications of Atheism in such a slipshod manner as to show unmistakably that he does not understand the Atheistic position. He says:—

"If there is no God whose wisdom and care are working out a perfect consummation which shall justify creation, evolution, history, and individual experience, then, of course, it is not to be wondered at that chance

and circumstance, heredity and environment, caprice and arbitrariness do produce unfortunate results. But in that case we shall also have to accept the verdict that our judgments of good or evil are entirely subjective. *If there is no God, there is no problem of evil.* A materialistic science has no use for the idea. If, then, you can believe that there is no God, you must accept the consequences, and put out of mind the delusions under which you are suffering. The alternatives are: no God, then no problem of evil; God, then the problem."

Dr. Orchard's correspondent, however, though full of doubts about prayer and God, though even expressing her disbelief in the supernatural, yet feels that there is a problem of evil; and so there is, despite the reverend gentleman's denial. The only problem that vanishes with Theism is the theological problem of sin. Under Atheism no terrible burden of guilt in the sight of a Heavenly Judge crushes the mind. That horrible delusion, which has been an asset of such incomparable value to the Church, is completely swept away. And the problem of evil is considerably simplified. The existence of evil in the endless forms with which we are familiar could never be harmonised with the belief in a just and good God. This is, of course, a very common argument, and it is needless to enlarge on it; but we must protest, in the strongest terms, against Dr. Orchard's strange contention that an acknowledgment of the problem of evil is "a witness that faith in God is ineradicable." Without a moment's hesitation we boldly affirm that it is nothing of the sort. *It is rather a witness that faith in God is ethically impossible.* Dr. Orchard himself admits this, in effect, in the following statement:—

"Faith in ultimate justice, perfect love, infinitesimal care, lies embedded within our nature, despite the fact that, owing to the vastness of the scheme, the diversity of its operations, and the obscurity of effects within the individual, we cannot find a perfect confirmation of this faith. But neither can we get rid of it. There would be no problem at all if it were not there."

The whole of that passage is vitiated by the false assumption on which it is made to rest. The reverend gentleman has no right to assume that the faith in the ultimate justification of the processes of Nature "lies embedded within our nature." Does he not know that there are thousands of people in the City of London alone, many of whom are as competent judges as himself, who are absolutely devoid of such a faith because their reason disallows it? And is he not aware that he is guilty of false witness when he declares that for such people there is no problem of evil? Indeed, Atheists are the only people who can consistently believe in and rationally deal with it. Christians cannot admit its existence without denying their faith in the goodness of God. For Paul there was no problem of evil, for he claimed to have had revealed to him from heaven the perfect and final solution of it. In his system all things worked together for good to them that loved God, and, with equal justice, all things worked together for evil to them that loved him not. If he was right, we are living in the best of all possible worlds, and it would be an act of gross disloyalty even to imagine that anything in it could be better than it is. That is an eminently joy-giving faith to all the well-to-do, but an impossible one to all who honestly think. There is a problem of evil, and its existence annihilates God. Under Atheism, Secularism becomes the philosophy of life, and this philosophy attacks all the problems of human life, and seeks to solve them by the rational use of natural intelligence. Christian Theism is now reluctantly retiring from the field, covered with shame, having utterly failed to justify its right to survive.

Such are the implications of Atheism; and the history of the last hundred years has been full of hints and signs that when Secularism, which is possible only under Atheism, gets into full command of the field of life, the reconstruction of society will proceed on such lines as will make for the welfare of all its members without distinction of race or sex.

J. T. LLOYD.

Determinism and Morals.—II.

(Concluded from p. 259.)

THE essential question in dealing with choice, possibility, etc., is, as I have said, what facts do these words cover, and what ought we to mean when we use them. If we have been using them with meanings that are not consonant with the facts, our plain duty is to revise our meanings in the light of more accurate knowledge. It is mere childish petulance for the Indeterminist to say that unless these words mean what he says they mean, they shall not mean anything at all, and shall be discharged from our vocabulary. When gravity was conceived as a force moving downward, no one could conceive of people existing on the other side of the ether. When gravity was corrected to mean a force moving towards a centre, people did not discard the word, they simply revised their meaning in the light of facts. And, really, neither language nor the universe is the private property of the Indeterminist and he is not at liberty to annihilate either unless it comes up to his expectations. He must simply submit to the revision of his ideas, or of the meaning of his language, or of both, as facts may determine.

For instance, Mr. Schiller asks whether a man does, after all, do what he does? And, he adds, How can he, meaning thereby a distinct centre whence actions radiate into the world, do anything at all. But the only sense in which a man or a thing does anything is that he or it is the point at which a new phenomenon comes into existence. A slate falls off a roof on a man's head and kills him. The man's head is split open, and, quite correctly, we say the slate did this. But surely no one ever argued that the slate could not have split the skull unless it were a self-originating centre of action. It is the juncture of forces at a particular point in space and at a particular moment in time that gives the condition for the production of any event. And this is as true of human action as of things. The reasoning that causes Mr. Schiller to doubt whether man is the effective cause of what he does, would lead him to doubt whether anything is the effective cause of anything else. On this line there would only be one case of "doing," and that would be by some assumed creator at an assumed commencement of all things.

The question really is, not whether Determinism destroys choice, possibility, agency, etc., but what meaning Determinism can legitimately place upon these words, and is this meaning in harmony with what we know of the phenomena in question. And I do not hesitate to say that all these words have a perfectly intelligible meaning to the Determinist, and that this is in strict accordance with what we actually see and know.

Let me take, first of all, the question of choice, which forms the subject of a special chapter in Mr. Schiller's book. Mr. Schiller asks, Must not Determinism deny that "choices" mean alternatives? And his reason for so asking is that the alternatives must be unreal because the result is pre-determined. Well, let us see what is really involved in the fact of choice. If I am watching a stone rolling down a hillside, and am in doubt as to whether it will fall to the right or left of a given point, I shall not say that it does one or the other because it chose to do so. I do not recognise any resident capacity in the stone that would lead it to prefer one path to the other. But suppose instead of the stone I am watching a barefooted human being, and that one path is smooth while the other is liberally sprinkled with sharp-pointed stones. There would then be an obvious reason why one path was chosen rather than the other. Choice, then, is clearly a phenomenon of consciousness, and it involves a recognition of alternatives. It involves more than this. It implies either an organic prompting in favor of certain things, as when a baby drinks from a bottle of milk and rejects a bottle of vinegar, or a memory of certain experiences which makes one alternative more attractive than another. Without laboring the point,

we may safely say that all that is actually given in the fact of choice is the consciousness of a selection. There is nothing in it that points to whether it was possible for us to have chosen otherwise or not.

So far, then, Determinism is quite consonant with the fact of choice, and it has a perfectly reasonable theory of choice. For why is one thing or one course of action more attractive to a person than other things or other courses of action? Clearly, it can only be because it agrees best with the tastes, the capacities, in a word, the character of the organism. The alternatives are there, and they are real in the only sense in which they can be real, that is, in a recognition of their existence. But they are not real in Mr. Schiller's sense, that is, in the sense of their being equally attractive or selectable. For that would really destroy choice altogether. There is no intelligible meaning to choice unless a selection is made because one thing is more desirable or more attractive than another. A "will" that chose under any other condition could no more be credited with "choice" than our imaginary stone rolling to the right or left could be said to choose its path. And if the "will" chooses between alternatives because one is more desirable, its "freedom" is to this extent sacrificed and its selection is correspondingly determined.

The real fact of the case is, then, that Mr. Schiller, like nearly all writers on the subject, fails to see that on lines of Indeterminism "choice" has no meaning whatever. On these lines there cannot be a choice between alternatives, because, in the absence of a determinative influence exercised by one of the alternatives, the action of the "will" would be a blind expression of energy. Determinism, however, does recognise the reality of choice, and is able to give a perfectly satisfactory explanation of its existence.

I quite grant Mr. Schiller that as to which alternative shall be selected in a given case is determined, and therefore things could not have been different to what they are. But he is again using possibility in a sense not warranted by the facts. As Mr. Schiller uses the word, it means that under identical conditions opposite things may occur—at least, if he does not mean this, his language is meaningless. But, as Spinoza long ago pointed out, possibility narrows as knowledge grows. To complete ignorance everything is possible because the causes of things are unknown. As a comprehension of causes grow people speak less and less of possibility, and more and more of necessity. Possibility, then, has no reference to the actual order of events, but to our knowledge, or want of knowledge, concerning them. To say there is a possibility of a man doing this or that is only to express the fact that our knowledge concerning the man's whole nature is not enough to warrant any certainty on our part. Nor is the case altered if, instead of another person, we imagine the agent himself thinking out a probable course of action under certain circumstances. This is only saying that he is usually ignorant of the relative strengths of feeling that may be roused in him.

This, indeed, leads us to another sense in which the word "possibility" may be used. It may be said that each of us are conscious of a possibility at the moment of action. In one sense I should agree with this. But what does it mean? Obviously, when a feeling to act in a certain direction is overwhelmingly powerful, there is no sense of choice, and consequently no consciousness of possibility. We simply act. But given a consciousness of contending desires—that is, a consciousness of alternatives—and there may be aroused a sense of possibility. That is, at the moment of action I picture myself as doing the opposite of what I am actually doing. But this is no more than my perception of the fact that, under different conditions, probably with but a slight alteration in certain factors, I might act in quite another fashion to that which actually transpires. But far from this being contrary to Determinism, it is precisely what Determinism says will occur. The

question is, not whether a change of conditions will produce a different result, but whether under identical conditions two different results might alternately transpire. And this is not only untrue in fact, it is unthinkable even as a possibility. Even the old tag, "There, but for the grace of God, go I," while recognising a different possibility, also recognises that a variation in the factors—the elimination of grace—is essential if the possibility is to be realised in fact. It would indeed be strange if Determinism, which is based upon the belief that identical conditions issue in identical results, should not recognise that any alteration in antecedents involve an alteration in consequents. That the sense of possibility implies more than this may be denied with the utmost confidence.

Even though one were to agree with Mr. Schiller that it is the task of the Determinist to explain the nature of choice, and how it is that what seems to be real is not really so, Determinism does not find the task insuperable. For the fundamental question is, I must again insist, not whether choice, possibility, agency, are real, but what do they really mean, and in what sense are they real? And this question is to be answered, not by coming to the business with ready-made meanings, and asserting that unless the facts square with these meanings they must be dismissed as illusory, but by examining the facts and letting these determine the meanings of the words used. Mr. Schiller's fault is, that while quite alive to the necessity of purifying and correcting thought, he does not see the equal necessity of purifying and correcting language, so that even though we must continue using the old terminology we shall at least be on our guard against its pre-scientific implications. And, in so doing, he only partly escapes from one tyranny to fall beneath another, or rather the same tyranny when encountered by a different path.

When we observe the sound rule of allowing the facts to determine our language, instead of *vice versa*, the Determinist, instead of denying that things are false which seem to be real, asserts that choice and possibility and agency are real in the only sense in which they are, or ever could be, real. There is a real choice of alternatives, and the choice is constituted by the conjunction of objective circumstances with internal tastes and capacities. The essence of Determinism lies in this. "Choice" becomes a meaningless word unless there is something in the thing chosen when brought into relation with a consciousness that determines its selection. To talk about choice in any other sense is to make the whole thing nonsensical, and to assert substantially that there is no adequate reason in the nature of things why we select a pint of tea or coffee for breakfast instead of a pint of Epsom salts. As William James says, "Without selective interest experience is a chaos." But selective interest is unthinkable unless there is something in the things selected that renders them preferable to the things rejected. But in so far as an attraction for the things selected exists, Determinism is admitted. And, finally, if the fact of different things being selected by different people does not drive us back upon the inherited and educated capacities of the organism as one of the co-determinants to the result, then the whole problem becomes meaningless and insoluble.

The assumed moral chaos that Determinism introduces is, consequently, sheer moonshine. The moral and psychological facts remain what they were, and cannot be otherwise. The question is, what are they? In science generally a large part of its work has consisted in correcting false notions of real things. It did this when it established the motion of the earth round the sun for that of the sun round the earth. It did this when it substituted neural derangement for demoniacal possession. The phenomenon upon which both delusions were based remained unaffected by the correction; and it would, indeed, be strange if the moral life should turn out to be the only thing upon which science must not place its purifying hand, for fear of hurling the whole edifice to destruction.

C. COHEN.

The Apocalypse.—VII.

(Continued from p. 267.)

COMMENCING chapter viii., the writer of the Apocalypse says that when "the Lamb" had opened the seventh seal, "there followed a silence in heaven about the space of half an hour"—a statement which is often cited as proving that no ladies were admitted into that celestial region. But, apart from this unimpeachable evidence, the Lord God and all his holy angels were of the masculine gender; so, too, were the twenty-four elders, and the 144,000 Jew believers "which were not defiled with women"; and so also, apparently, were the great multitude of Jewish proselytes who were standing before the throne. Nowhere in the book is it so much as hinted that a single woman—or a married one—was present among the saints or the elect.

The Apocalyptist next says that he saw "the seven angels which stand before God," to whom were given trumpets (Rev. viii. 2). In the Book of Enoch we find both the names of these angels and the office which each held in heaven, the names being given as Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Sarakiel, Gabriel, and Phanuel.

The writer of the "Revelation" goes on to say:—

"And another angel came and stood over the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar.....And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints went up before God out of the angel's hand" (Rev. viii. 3-4).

Here the writer has fallen into a slight error. The angel whose province it was to see to "the prayers of the saints" was Raphael, one of the seven, not "another angel," as may be seen from the following passages in the "holy books":—

Tobit xii. 15...."I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One."

Enoch xx. 3.—"Raphael, one of the holy angels, who presides over the spirits of men."

Enoch xcvi.—"In those days you, O ye righteous, shall be deemed worthy of having your prayers rise up in remembrance; and shall have them deposited in testimony before the angels, that they may record the sins of sinners in the presence of the Most High."

Psalms cxli. 2.—"Let my prayer be set forth as incense before thee."

The writer of the "Revelation" next says that "the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound" (Rev. viii. 6), and he describes the seven as each "sounding" in succession, each blast being followed by some fresh heaven-sent catastrophe as a judgment upon the ungodly. This blowing of the trumpet was doubtless suggested by the following passage in one of the "holy books," in which the Almighty is represented as saying:—

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, it is nigh at hand" (Joel. ii. 1).

The whole of the apocalyptic narrative is a representation of what should take place on "the day of the Lord"—the great Day of Judgment. Continuing his narration, the writer says:—

"And the first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth" (Rev. viii. 7).

In one of the "holy books" the writer, speaking in the name of the Lord, pronounces the following judgment upon the heathen king Gog:—

"And I will judge him with pestilence, and blood, and sweeping rain, and hailstones; and I will rain upon him fire and brimstone, and upon all that are with him" (Ezek. xxxviii. 22, Sept. version).

The same Old Testament writer represents the Lord God as saying of the inhabitants of Jerusalem: "A third part of thee shall die with the pestilence, and with famine shall they be consumed in the midst of thee; and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee; and a third part I will scatter unto all the winds" (Ezek. v. 12). This "third part" division

of death and destruction is adopted by the writer of the "Revelation," who works it out in the most ludicrous manner imaginable. Thus, after the rain of hail, fire, and blood, which followed the first trumpet sound, he says:—

"And the third part of the earth was burnt up, and the third part of the trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up" (Rev. viii. 7).

After the second angel had sounded his trumpet the writer says:—

"And the third part of the sea became blood; and there died a third part of the creatures which were in the sea.....and the third part of the ships was destroyed" (Rev. viii. 8-9).

After the third angel had sounded, the writer says of a star fallen from heaven:—

"And it fell upon the third part of the rivers and upon the fountains of the waters.....and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters" (Rev. viii. 10-11).

After the fourth angel had blown his trumpet, we are told:—

"The third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars" (Rev. viii. 12).

Next, in Rev. ix. 15 it is stated that four angels had received the command "that they should kill the third part of men." Again, in Rev. ix. 18 we read: "By these three plagues was the third part of men killed." Lastly, in Rev. xii. 4 the tail of "the great red dragon" cast down "the third part of the stars of heaven." It is scarcely necessary to say that the only reason why the Apocalyptist represented a "third part" of persons or things as injured or destroyed is because he had found such a division recorded in some of the "holy books." Omitting the "third part," we find parallels of most of the writer's statements in the Jewish scriptures, of which the following may be taken as a sample:—

Rev. viii. 12.—"And the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; that the third part of them should be darkness, and the day should not shine for the third part of it." Joel ii. 2, 10.—"a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness.....the sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining."

Coming to chapter ix. of the "Revelation," the veracious writer says that when the fifth angel "sounded" he saw "a star from heaven fallen unto the earth," and that there was given to "him"—the star or the angel—"the key of the bottomless pit." When the latter was opened, "there went up a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace..... And out of the smoke came forth locusts upon the earth" (Rev. ix. 1-3). These "locusts" were the most remarkable species of reptiles that can be imagined, the genus being quite unknown to modern naturalists. The following is the writer's description of them:—

"The shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared for war; and upon their heads as it were crowns like unto gold, and their faces were as men's faces. And they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. And they had breastplates as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots, of many horses rushing to war. And they have tails like unto scorpions, and stings; and in their tails is their power to hurt men" (Rev. ix. 7-10).

The cherubim in the temple of Solomon were man-headed winged bulls; here we have a new variety—man-headed winged horses, with long flowing hair, having crowns on their heads and plates of armor on their breasts. The name "locust" is thus a misnomer. The Apocalyptist's description of what he calls "locusts" reads very much like the prophetic nonsense of the ancient seer Joel, who, speaking in the name of the Lord, says:—

Joel i. 6.—"For a nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number; his teeth are the teeth of a lion."

Joel ii. 4, 5.—"The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as war-horses do they run."

Like the noise of chariots on the tops of the mountains do they leap."

Nah. iii. 17.—"Thy crowned are as the locusts."

Enoch lxxxv. 2.—"And behold a single star fell from heaven."

Respecting the apocalyptic locusts, the writer says that "power was given them" to torment men for five months—"but only such men as have not the seal of God on their foreheads" (ix. 3)—the result of such torment being that "men shall seek death, and shall in no wise find it; and they shall desire to die, and death fleeth from them (ix. 6). These statements were suggested by the following passages in the "holy books":—

Ezek. ix. 5, 6.—"And to the others the Lord said..... Go ye through the city.....and smite: let not your eyes spare, neither have ye pity: slay utterly the old man, the young man and the maiden, and little children and women: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark [on his forehead]."

Job iii. 20, 21.—"the bitter in soul; which long for death, but it cometh not; and dig for it more than for hidden treasure."

The Apocalyptist further says of the creatures he calls "locusts":—

"They have over them as king the angel of the bottomless pit: his name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek he hath the name Apollyon" (Rev. ix. 11).

The name Apollyon signifies "destroyer"; Abaddon is said to mean "destruction." One would naturally suppose that the king of these horrible creatures was certainly "a bad un"; but this appears to be not the case: he was one of the holy angels that carried out the commands of the Lord God, and must not be confounded with Satan, who makes his appearance later on.

With regard to the origin of the Apocalyptist's persecuting army of "locusts," nothing of such a perfectly absurd character can be found in any of the "holy books." The following passages, however—which were certainly known to the writer—had, in conjunction with the passages already noticed, probably something to do with the matter:—

2 Esd. xv. 29, 31.—"And the nations of the dragons of Arabia shall come out with many chariots, and from the day that they set forth their hissing is carried over the earth, so that all they which shall hear them may fear and tremble.....And the dragons shall have the upper hand, remembering their nature, and shall turn in great power to persecute them."

Wisdom xvi. 9.—"For them, verily, the bites of locusts and flies did slay.....because they were worthy to be punished by such [creatures]."

Amos vii. 1.—"Thus has the Lord God showed me; and, behold, a swarm of locusts coming from the east; and, behold, one locust grub was Gog the king."

The last passage is from the Septuagint, which version was used by all educated Jews who understood Greek. The apocalyptic "locust" was really the Greek centaur, with added wings; but the name "dragon" would certainly be more appropriate to the kind of creature described by the Apocalyptist than the misleading appellation "locust."

ABRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

A Fourpenny Wilderness.

A Jeu D'Esprit on the Jew Book.

SOMEONE has sent us, presumably for review, a little volume, bound in shiny black cloth, entitled "The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments, etc." This is, doubtless, a very cheap publication. Indeed, the funereal cover bears an embossed inscription to the effect that the volume is sold "under cost," whatever that may mean. There is plenty of roading matter for fourpence. Several hundred pages of small type, strongly bound, should satisfy even a Scotchman. The contents are, however, distinctly puzzling. We have given ourselves a glorious headache by examining this book. Like

the bashful curate, who had a questionable egg given him at breakfast, we admit that "parts of it are excellent, thank you." As for the remainder, we cannot discover any sequence in this volume of undigested and disconnected tracts. The whole thing is merely a *pot pourri*—a literary Irish stew. If the indulgent reader cares to imagine *Dod's Peerage*, *Mother Shipton's Prophecies*, *Mrs. Beeton's Cookery Book*, *Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy*, *Baron Munchausen's Travels*, *The Book of Mormon*, *Rochester's Poems*, *Every Man His Own Lawyer*, *Petronius*, and some auctioneers' catalogues, all bound together in a single volume, he will get a faint idea of the incoherency and general confusion of the compilation. Its various divisions, too, like an awkward squad of Boy Scouts, are of all sizes, and equally open to criticism. From the first blunder in Genesis to the last absurdity in Revelation, we have discovered very little that merits. A few sentences in Ecclesiastes and Proverbs make some pretence to sanity; but, like the plums is a workhouse pudding, there is a cab ride between each.

The author has, occasionally, a fine flow of language, such as in the Psalm of Curses, which is the finest piece of invective we remember off hand, and might prove useful to landladies who have lodgers in arrears or to taxi-cab drivers who have to deal with hilarious Freemasons in the small hours. The so-called historical tracts are utterly useless. They are an anonymous, dateless, placeless, legendary *Salmagundi*, and of no more value than the History of Cock Robin. Indeed, the quest was as exasperating as the proverbial search for the needle in the bundle of hay.

As a numerous father and respectable husband, we must reluctantly admit that our anonymous author is very tropical in his treatment of sex matters. He is quite Oriental in his nastiness, and, as we all know, Eastern nastiness begins where Occidental pornography leaves off. The complete edition of *The Arabian Nights* is kept out of the reach of children, but the author of the Bible writes as lasciviously and unrestrainedly, and his book is open for all. Here, for a few pence, may be found plain, unvarnished accounts of sodomy, rape, unnatural vice, and adultery written with all the nasty particularity and love of detail which is the peculiar birthright of all Oriental scribes. The florid, heated rhetoric of the Song of Solomon, for example, leaves nothing to the imagination, and the least lettered juvenile can appreciate the glowing periods, which are sufficient to make a bronze statue blush. The dedication to King James the First is an anachronism; it should have been inscribed to the chaste memory of King Charles II., who would have appreciated the delicate compliment so much more fully.

We do not believe in bowdlerising any volume; but, if ever there were any occasion for such drastic treatment, it should be directed against such a pornographic book as this. Unfortunately, if all the objectionable passages were deleted, the volume would be very much reduced in bulk. Furthermore, if the portions in which our anonymous author has repeated himself were also removed, we fear the volume would be further reduced to the size of a penny novelette. So, acting on this suggestion, our fourpenny wilderness has nearly vanished. It is a thousand pities it has not really disappeared. It should be published at ten guineas, and have a lock and key on it. Selling such a book at the price of a cigar is placing a premium on pornography. Filth is cheap to-day, when so much can be had for fourpence.

MIMNERMOS.

EDUCATION.

By education most have been misled,
So we believe because we so were bred;
The priest continues what the nurse began,
And thus the boy imposes on the man.

—Dryden.

Acid Drops.

China is urging Great Britain to shorten the period agreed upon in which the opium traffic is to be abolished. The missionaries used to pretend that China was insincere in her attitude on this matter. They said that she did not want to stop the opium traffic, but merely to nurse an artificial grievance. But the event has proved how far this was from being true. China's sincerity is now too obvious to be disputed.

It is admitted in the *Daily News* (April 21) that the Indian Government is doing all it can to prevent the rapid abolition of the opium traffic, which, by the way, Christian England forced upon China at the point of the bayonet. China, on the other hand, has in three years "reduced her cultivation of opium by about 70 per cent." And the opium curse is nearly at its end in that vast empire. The opium dens have been suppressed practically everywhere. "The history of the world," the *Daily News* confesses, "cannot show such a revolution of national character in so short a period." How ridiculous, after this, sound the Christian boasts of ethical superiority! We have so often heard that no Heathen nation has any power of self-redemption. Yet here is China making swift progress on her own initiative, while Christians are doing their best to keep her back.

Sir Hiram Maxim is known to regard the Chinese as intrinsically the top nation on this planet—having the biggest brain-pan and the highest development of personal and social virtues. A somewhat similar view is held by Messrs. Glen & Co., shipowners, whose action in engaging Chinese firemen for their steamer *Gibraltar* was protested against by the National Seamen's and Firemen's Union. Messrs. Glen & Co. replied as follows:—

"We have to acknowledge receipt of your favor of yesterday's date. You are, however, quite mistaken in thinking that it is for motives of economy that we carry Chinese firemen in our steamers. The wages are practically the same as with Europeans. We would, however, be quite prepared to pay considerably higher wages to Chinese than we would to Britishers, as they are much more sober and steady and do their work much more efficiently."

This is sad reading for Britishers; also for Christians who are beaten on their own ground by the Heathen to whom they send missionaries.

Prodigious! The newspapers report an extraordinary instance of "Father Vaughan's kindness." The reverend gentleman does not ride on a donkey, like his Master; he drives a motor-car; and on his way from Nuneaton to the Convent at Atherstone he found a waggoner on the roadside with a broken leg. Would you believe it? The reverend gentleman actually let the two policemen who were attending the man lift him into the motor-car, and he was driven to the Nuneaton Hospital. One almost hesitates to believe in such a remarkable display of humanity. Who will ask, after this, what Christianity has done for the world?

Here is another instance of Father Vaughan's kindness. He has a special recipe against the spread of Mormonism. "The Mormons," he says, "should be taken by the scruff of the neck, rushed across our island, and dropped into the sea." What would the reverend gentleman say if it were proposed to serve Catholics in that way? Yet the "Mormon menace," as he calls it, is an insignificant thing to what we may call the "Catholic menace." The triumph of Catholicism would mean the total destruction of civilisation.

For the fifth year in succession the Wesleyan Methodists record a decrease in membership. The decrease this year is 3,129, making 13,120 in five years. This decrease is really larger than it seems, since no account is taken of growth of population; and when we bear in mind the extraordinary efforts made to attract members, the figures are the more surprising. The *Methodist Recorder* admits that there is nothing in any part of the census report to modify the impression they make; while the Rev. Dr. Davison points out that the decrease is distributed with "distressing uniformity" over all parts of the country. The same gentleman also offers his readers the cold comfort that this "persistent diminution in numbers" is not peculiar to Wesleyan Methodism. "It is a characteristic feature of the Christian Church at large at the present moment." This, we believe, is quite true. All Churches are in the same position. And even though one shows increase occasionally, the gain is transient; while, such as it is, it is at the expense of other Churches. Meanwhile, the number outside the Churches grows larger, not only in Great Britain, but all

over the civilised world. These are plain facts, and we are not surprised that Christians are uncomfortable in the contemplation thereof.

The fact that Christianity is losing its hold on the people is admitted by Dr. Davison in the following remark. "For better or worse," he says, "it must be acknowledged not merely that interest in theology is waning, but—what is infinitely more significant—that the hold of religion upon people generally is not what it was, not what it ought to be, not what some signs might fairly lead us to expect to find it." We are pleased to see that the steady pressure of facts has led Dr. Davison to recognise what must be, to him, a very unpleasant truth. Preachers are so fond of assuring the public that no significance should be attached to figures—when the figures are against them, and that this decrease of church membership is compensated by a "deepening spiritual life." It is all so much pulpit humbug. Look at it how we will, so long as we look at it honestly, church life is an expression of "spiritual life," and the decrease of the former marks an unmistakable decline of the latter. The newspaper distinction between Christianity and Christianity was never a real distinction. It was only one framed by lukewarm believers, or by timid unbelievers, who lacked the courage of making public how much or how completely they had ceased to believe in Christian doctrines.

For ourselves, we are strongly of opinion that in most countries the Christian Church only presents the front it does because of the tolerance of its avowed enemies on the one side, and of the hypocrisy of others who for various reasons—all more or less unpleasant—keep their differences with Christianity secret. Professions of faith in some alleged nebulous genuine Christianity, and of profound admiration for some mythical reforming New Testament Jesus, are all symptomatic of ability to see the weakness of Christian teachings, and lack of courage, that causes people to bow before the social terrorism exerted by organised religion. It is left for those who have the requisite courage to speak out, and these are naturally in the minority. Nearly forty years ago Mill said the time had come for people to speak out their minds on matters of religion, but we cannot say that things have improved greatly in the interim. What has happened is that the insistent pressure of the forces of modern civilisation have unconsciously produced a modification of belief and teaching, and, almost in spite of themselves, growing numbers have found themselves outside all the Churches. One day the process will be complete, and Christianity will then be generally recognised in its true colors as a system of essentially savage beliefs glossed over with a thin veneer of social sentiment and a civilised nomenclature.

A pretty little problem for discussion is opened up by an article in the *Church Times*. It is on the question of whether Dissent or Episcopalianism holds the greater attraction for the poor. This may be an important question for competitive Churches to settle, but a far more important one is the use the Churches make of the poor. When Mr. Charles Booth compiled his great statistical survey of London life he pointed out that the Churches were engaged in a very keen competition for the poor, not because they were vitally interested in the removal of poverty, but because they were keen on enlarging their congregations. To this end charities were so many baits held out to the unfortunate. This game is still being played, and always has been played during Christian times. And when we consider the economic importance of poverty, as a factor giving the Churches a social value, it is not surprising that the efforts of Christianity should have been directed towards its exploitation instead of towards its removal. Socially, organised Christianity battens on poverty, as it battens intellectually on depression and poverty of spirit. One day we hope the community will be intelligent enough to take the problem of poverty out of the hands of Church and Chapel alike. And if that is done we do not despair of its solution.

The following is worth reprinting, if only because it appears in such a pious journal as the *Record*:—

"A clergyman had once preached a sermon, and at the end a prayer was offered on his behalf asking that he might be blessed in his home and in his church. The closing petition was: 'Enrich his soul, strengthen his body, and, O Lord, brighten his intellect.'"

We hope the prayer was answered.

We learn by a book review in the *Daily Telegraph* that a certain Dr. Thomas Payne, who appears to hail from the office of the late Prophet Baxtor's wonderful weekly, is "honorably distressed to find so many young men of the

present day falling into infidelity." We hope—in fact, we rather more than hope, he will continue to be honorably distressed. We don't think his book is likely to stop the rush to "infidelity." We judge that he champions Bible Science against Evolution. The failure of that policy is too conspicuous already. Dr. Thomas Payne is apparently a musty back number.

The "rights" of the Roman Catholic Church in the province of Quebec seem to be pretty extensive. According to the Montreal correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, a judge of that city annulled a marriage between two Catholics which was celebrated by a Protestant minister, and this decision was upheld by the Civil Court, the marriage being thus rendered illegal and the children bastards. This is a good illustration of the brutally bigoted policy of the Romish Church wherever its opportunities match its inclination to intolerance. The marriage in this case was not even "mixed."

It appears that these "rights" were expressly reserved to the Roman Catholic Church by Great Britain when Canada became a British possession; so it is said that the Civil Court could not help itself. Yes, but Canada can help herself. She is really a self-governing colony, and could break the insolence of the Romish Church at a single blow, if she only chose to do so.

Father Gonne has been telling the truth (for once, at any rate) to the Manchester Branch of the Catholic Truth Society. According to the *Daily Despatch* he said that—

"Religion on the whole was not in popular demand. It was in demand on Sunday morning, when people put on their best clothes and wanted to join the church parade, and wanted, too, to be considered good livers. On a week day, however, there was no demand for religion of any kind."

We rejoice over the part of this statement which Father Gonne deploras. An honest man's food is a priest's poison.

"Claudius Clear" (Dr. Robertson Nicoll) evinces a mild surprise that anyone should doubt the honesty of clergymen, and asks of one who has done so, "Does he mean that Free Church ministers are in the habit of saying from the pulpit what they do not believe? Does he imply that they feign to believe in an orthodoxy which their minds have rejected? There could be no more odious charge than this. Is it true? I believe the truth is quite the other way." Well, it would be foolish indeed for one to charge *all* ministers with hypocrisy or insincerity. But it is equally foolish to go to the other extreme and credit them all—Free Church and Established Church—with honesty and straightforwardness. It is unquestionable, to our mind, that many occupants of the pulpit do deliberately teach things they know to be false. And we are proceeding on more than hearsay in making this statement. But, quite apart from this, there is another form of dishonesty besides saying that which we know to be untrue. One may suppress the truth, or suggest a falsehood, without saying that which in itself one actually believes to be untrue. And what are we to make of the thousands of clergymen who, week after week, preach certain things against them? How much would their congregations learn from them of the doubtful character of Christian teachings and documents? No one can believe that *all* the clergy are ignorant of the truth concerning such matters. Those who would save the honor of the clergy by assuming that they are, really credit them with a degree of stupidity that even an Atheist shrinks from doing. Unless the clergy are miraculously foolish, they must know better than their sermons indicate. They have doubtless many excuses for the attitude they adopt—we are familiar with a number of them—but this does not remove the stigma of dishonesty from a great many of our clerical guides. At most it only serves to emphasise the demoralising character of the profession.

The *Christian World* hardly knows how to express its indignation on finding the Vicar of Malmesbury stating that in Council schools children will be taught that Mohammedanism, Christianity, and Buddhism should be revered alike. Well, for our part, we do not hesitate to say that if religion is taught in the schools, this is the way it should be taught. What the *Christian World* wants is the Christian religion to be given first place, or the only place, and others either excluded or placed in the background. And this helps one to see how hypocritical is the cry about wishing the Bible to be kept in the schools on account of its literary and historical value. When a Church of England clergyman rounds on Dissenters, and tells them they would place Christianity in State schools on the same level as other religions, they indignantly protest that they mean to give Christianity a premier and distinctive position. When it suits them they

are equally ready to protest that they desire the State to occupy a neutral attitude in relation to religion. Such is their notion of fair play to citizens and of straightforward controversy.

Australia is apparently going to accept a scheme for spending £88,500,000 on warships. She is to take twenty-two years about it, however, and by the end of that time it is to be hoped she will not want them. She calls herself a Christian nation, and she would not be like other Christian nations if she did not spend a lot of money on preparations for war.

Benjamin Disraeli, who died Earl of Beaconsfield, for all his supposed Christianity was proud of being a Jew. His nephew, Mr. Disraeli, seems to be more of a Nazarene. Curiously enough, he is patron of the living of Hughenden, where his uncle died, and he attended the vestry meeting lately, where he complained that the Revised Version had been put in the place of the Authorised Version in the church. The Bible that was read there, he said, ought to be the same Bible that they read in their homes. We wonder what Beaconsfield would have thought of his nephew's taking part in a domestic controversy of that kind amongst Christians.

Rev. R. J. Campbell is setting up a sort of monkery near King's Cross. Eight missionary preachers are to be trained there, and will be sent out when ready to different parts of the country to spread, we presume, the gospel of the New Theology. Mr. Campbell intends to keep them as far as possible from female contact, although he probably won't go to the length of a peculiar regulation of the Middle Ages which forbade the entry even of female animals to some of the monasteries. Mr. Campbell's young men will have to do all their household work, including cooking and making the beds. Their preaching, when they get to business, is apparently to be without wages, merely for the bare cost of living. This is a regime to which we have not heard that Mr. Campbell has subjected himself.

Spurgeon used to preach that "unbelief" was the unpardonable sin. Adultery and murder could be forgiven in a minute, but "infidelity" could never be forgiven, in this world or in the next. We believe Spurgeon was quite right. Scepticism is the most deadly enemy of priestcraft, and it is natural that the men of God should decline to let Him (capital, please) make it as easy for a sceptic as for a murderer. We note that this old gospel of Spurgeon's is stoutly maintained by the Rev. Dr. Broughton, of the First Baptist Church, Houston, Texas. This reverend gentleman also believes in the second, and probably early, coming of Christ. Christ may come at any moment, even before the preacher "had done speaking"—which might be a mercy to the congregation. And how would the sceptic look then? Ha! Ha!

Rev. Dr. Broughton related how a wicked sceptic was punished by the One Above for sneering at religion:—

"Two men were sitting before a hotel, one a believer and the other a sceptic. The former suggested that they go up to the church to attend a revival. His companion refused to go and spoke sneeringly of the church. The conversation turning upon religion, the sceptic at length arose and extending his arm to heaven called upon God, if there be a God, to strike him dead. He made the challenge three times. Before the fourth was uttered a flash of lightning came from a clear sky and he was a dead man."

We rather like that story. It is good of the sort. It used to do duty in England, and it seems to have emigrated to America. Perhaps the Rev. Dr. Broughton took it over with him. We are glad to see he keeps it well aired and exercised. But what will he do if a Texas cowboy asks him for the name of that "hotel"?

Rev. Walter Wynn, pastor of the Chesham United Free Church, prints in his monthly magazine a letter he has received from Professor Alfred Russel Wallace, whose new book, *The World of Life*, seems such a godsend to the theologians, although he doesn't believe a bit in *their* God. We venture to reproduce this letter in full:—

"Old Orchard, Broadstane, Wimborne,

Rev. W. Wynn, March 3, 1911.

Dear Sir,—Thanks for your favorable notice of my book. From the age of about sixteen I was an Agnostic, and was first brought to recognise that there was a spirit-world about 1865-70, by the phenomena I inquired into on my return home in 1862. This is stated in my volume on *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism*. Without this demonstration of a spirit-world around us I might have been still groping in darkness.—Yours very truly,

ALFRED R. WALLACE."

The last sentence of this letter is very important. It bears out our contention that Professor Wallace is simply a

Spiritualist, and that his Theism, if it can be called so, is only an offshoot from his Spiritualism. He would be "groping in darkness" still if it were not that he has what he thinks a demonstration of the spirit world." His arguments in *The World of Life* are, therefore, not his real reasons for believing in a Great Spirit. They are afterthoughts—excuses. They did not convert him or convince him; neither ought they to—nor will they—convert or convince a single unbeliever. Let us sum up the position in a sentence. Dr. Wallace's book only leaves the reader "groping in darkness" unless he already has Dr. Wallace's "demonstration of a spirit world." We are glad to have his (unconscious) testimony to the value of his latest plea for God.

At the Spring Assembly of the Baptist Union, which opened at Bloomsbury Central Church on Monday, the report, presented by the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, showed a decrease in church members of 3,775, and in Sunday-school scholars of 2,794. That is the tragical side of affairs. The comical side is the announcement of an increase of 18 churches and 20 chapels. More bricks and mortar and less people. In the course of time, at this rate, every Baptist will have a church or chapel to himself.

In a fortune-telling case at the Newcastle-on-Tyne Police-court, counsel for the defendant argued that his client believed what she said, and did not impose upon or deceive anybody, and did not ask for money, and therefore it was "no more a case than that of a minister of the gospel on Sunday's prognosticating as to what is going to happen in the future." The magistrates appear to have smiled at this. But surely the Catholic priest's taking money to hurry the souls of dead people through purgatory comes well within the legal gentleman's argument.

A number of workmen going to Bibby & Sons' oil-cake mills, in Great Howard-street, Liverpool, were set upon suddenly in Eldon-place and brutally ill-used, seven of them having to be treated at the hospital. Their assailants used a variety of weapons, including bottles and iron bars. The assault was obviously planned, and a number of women were in the gang. "The outrage," the *Daily News* report says, "is thought to have been due to the bitter religious differences which have already led to so many disgraceful scenes in the city." Very likely.

General Booth addressed eight hundred convicts on Sunday afternoon in Dartmoor Prison church. Was that sort of thing included in their sentences?

The "Blood and Fire" boss represented himself as the principal author of the Home Secretary's prison-reform. We wonder how Mr. Churchill will like that?

Rev. Henry Drayton Wyatt, of Drayton Lodge, Aldershot, for twenty-one years vicar of Wyke, Guildford, left £10,626. Not so big a lump as some, but enough to make it impossible for the camel to get through the needle's eye.

The *Camberwell Borough Advertiser* has been collecting clerical views on Sunday cinematograph shows. The Rev. G. E. Thorn suggests that if the picture shows keep open till 11 o'clock the churches should do the same, instead of closing up at 11. A good idea, if the congregation would stand it. We fear the churches would have to go in for smoking pews—and Scotch.

The Tottenham Hospital has refused to accept over £1,000 offered as the proceeds of Sunday cinematograph shows, and the Wood Green Hospital declines to accept any funds from such sources. Could anything be more contemptible? It is sheer Sabbatarian bigotry. The sooner hospitals are made public institutions the better.

"The aged Scotch Sabbatarian's objection to allowing even a mechanical instrument to work on Sunday expressed itself in an abhorrence of the use of an organ or other musical instrument in church. A lady belonging to the Episcopal Church persuaded a favorite old female servant—a Presbyterian of the old school—to accompany her one morning to hear a newly-installed organ. On returning she asked her what she thought of the music. 'Oh, it was verra bonny, verra bonny,' was the reply, 'but oh, my lady, it's an awfu' way o' spending the Sabbath.'"—*Daily Chronicle*.

"Unto This Last."

My readers will see that I have begun publishing the report of my recent debate with the Rev. J. Warschauer. Let me explain why I do so.

In the last letter Dr. Warschauer wrote me, which he was careful to tell me *was* his last, he referred to my remark that, while declining my suggestions as to the publication of our debate, he had made no suggestion whatever on his own side—and this is what he said in reply:—

"Pray, why should I? To quote your words in an earlier letter, 'I am afraid you misunderstand the position.' I know what I am doing, and the course which I propose to take is—if I may hint it—my business. Wait and see."

I must wait to *see*, but I do not wait to *act*. My answer is a practical one. I start publishing the debate.

Dr. Warschauer is neither polite nor explicit. But he may be taken to mean that he is acting "on his own" in the matter of publication. Well, I am quite willing that he should do that. One of my suggestions was that, as a quarrel had arisen, he should publish the debate for Christians while I published it for Freethinkers. He appears to be acting on this basis, and this leaves me free to do the same.

I think it right to say that the present law of copyright is very perplexed and unsatisfactory. There is a much-needed new Bill before the House of Commons, but a long time may elapse before it becomes an Act of Parliament. Meanwhile the jungle of difficulty remains. Naturally, in my interpretation of the law, I leaned to the side of justice and fair play where the law seemed doubtful. Besides, it was highly advisable, not only that Dr. Warschauer and I should publish in co-operation, but also that the published debate should bear the usual announcement of "revised by both disputants." This being now impossible, I take the only course open to me. It will bring me no profit; I shall, in fact, lose money; at least I shall lose the cost of the verbatim report. But I make the sacrifice in order that Freethinkers, if no others, may have an opportunity of reading the debate, and also that it may appear in print to show how little justification there is for Dr. Warschauer's charge of "rowdyism" against the audience at Caxton Hall.

G. W. FOOTE.

THE SUN-DIAL.

The ivy o'er the mouldering wall
Spreads like a tree, the growth of years:
The wild wind through the doorless hall
A melancholy music rears
A solitary voice, that sighs
O'er man's forgotten pageantries.
Above the central gate, the clock,
Through clustering ivy dimly seen,
Seems, like the ghost of Time, to mock
The wrecks of power that once has been.
The hands are rusted on its face;
Even where they ceased, in years gone by,
To keep the flying moments' pace:
Fixing, in Fancy's thoughtful eye,
A point of ages passed away,
A speck of time, that owns no tie
With aught that lives and breathes to-day.

But 'mid the rank and towering grass,
Where breezes wave, in mournful sport,
The weeds that choke the ruined court,
The careless hours, that circling pass,
Still trace upon the dialled brass
The shade of their unvarying way;
And evermore, with every ray
That breaks the clouds and gilds the air,
Time's stealthy steps are imaged there:
Even as the long-revolving years
In self-reflecting circles flow,
From the first bud the hedgerows bears,
To wintry nature's robe of snow.
The changeful forms of mortal things
Decay and pass; and art and power
Oppose in vain the doom that flings
Oblivion on their closing hour;
While still, to every woodland vale,
New blooms, new fruits, the seasons bring,
For other eyes and lips to hail,
With looks and sounds of welcoming:
As where some stream light eddying roves
By sunny meads and shadowy groves,
Wave following wave departs for ever,
But still flows on the eternal river.

—Thomas Love Peacock.

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

(Lectures suspended for the present.)

To Correspondents.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1911.—Previously acknowledged, £225 5s. 8d. Received since:—Mark Antony, 2s.; J. K. Stirton (Texas), 4s. 1d.; T. Stringer, 4s. 6d.; R. Taylor, 5s.; J. H. R., 5s.; P. R., 2s. 6d.; J. P., 5s.; Two Little Uddington Maidens, 2s. 6d.; William A. and Lucy A. Yates, 5s.; J. G. Finlay (S. Africa), £1; B. Eiger, 1s.; C. and H. Shepherd, 5s.; W. Milroy, 5s.; J. Milroy, 2s. 6d.; A. C. B., 5s.

J. K. STIRTON (Texas).—We are not surprised to hear that the clergy in your part of the world, just as here, are making a desperate effort to "recover their lost foothold." Thanks for your wish that we may long be spared to carry on our "great work," as you are good enough to call it. Thanks also for the cuttings.

T. STRINGER.—We did not understand, and were waiting further instructions. It is all right now. We were so busy in many ways that we quite overlooked the Easter Egg Fund.

J. A. BRIGGS.—See paragraphs. Thanks for your good wishes for ourselves and your "weekly intellectual treat."

V. W. KNIGHT.—Thanks for the marked enclosures.

J. W. R.—Received.

J. PANTIDGE.—The four Birmingham subscriptions run consecutively in the list.

UDDINGTON SAINTS.—See "Sugar Plums."

E. D. E.—We are supposing you may not wish to see your full name in print. The pious Christian who trusts to faith instead of medical skill to cure a hernia is at least sincere—for he pays the penalty. But, as you say, what intelligence! And there are too many of them to be noticed separately. Pleased to hear you have found Mr. Cohen's articles so helpful. Thanks for your personal good wishes.

H. A. FOSTER.—Hardly worth attention. It seems the performance of some obscure Christian on the make.

DICK EDWARDS.—Glad you owe so much to the *Freethinker*. Our readers in general will be pleased with the following extract from your letter: "My father being a Methodist local preacher, and myself being brought up in chapel, mine was a bad case, but the cure effected by your paper has been so complete that I can hardly conceive my mental condition of a few years ago as possible."

G. COOKSON.—You will see that the matter has taken a fresh turn.

W. A. YATES writes: "My sister, who has taken to reading the *Freethinker* lately—and is still nominally a Christian—says she must admit that the parsons' sermons are certainly 'poor stuff' compared to the contents of your paper. She asks me to send you her best wishes and hearty approval of the great work you are doing." Good!

J. G. FINLAY (S. Africa) says: "I am glad to see that you keep up to old fighting form." We shall do that until the sword drops from our hands.

JAMES GRANT.—Perhaps worth 2s.

E. S. DUBBEE.—We cannot answer such queries by post. Your friend may be referring to Archbishop Temple's article in *Essays and Reviews*.

ROBERT IRVING.—Pleased to learn that we were mistaken, and that the question of the Sunday picture shows at Brighton is not yet closed.

J. MURHEAD.—Pleased you liked what you call our "masterly article" on Shakespeare last week. With regard to your wish for more, we may say that we have a Shakespeare volume on the stocks, but it progresses slowly, owing to our scanty leisure. The other questions you raise could not be dealt with in a few sentences in this column.

W. J. NOVELL.—The Book of Enoch is not in the Bible. It is not very accessible either. It is included in some collections of "apocryphal" literature. Unless you are a close student of such matters you would not be repaid for your trouble in obtaining it. It is of no interest apart from "Abracadabra's" argument.

E. B.—Sorry we have been unable to get your letter into this week's make-up of the paper.

When the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the secretary, Miss E. M. Vance.

LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LECTURE NOTICES must reach 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Manager of the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.

PARSONS remitting for literature by stamps are specially requested to send *halfpenny stamps*.

THE *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

Sugar Plums.

Next Thursday (May 4) is the date of the "social" under the auspices of the National Secular Society's Executive. It will take place, as usual, at Anderton's Hotel, Fleet-street starting at 8 p.m., and ending well before midnight. The program will include some dancing as well as vocal and instrumental music and a "few words" by the President. Members of the N. S. S. are at liberty to introduce a friend. Non-members, who cannot get an introduction that way, should write to the general secretary, Miss E. M. Vance, at 2 Newcastle-street, E.C. She will be happy to send them a (free) ticket of admission.

The South African Rationalist Association, which was referred to last week in this column, dates from Johannesburg; its secretary is Mr. J. D. Stevens, and its address P.O. Box 1782. "From the commencement of the year," Mr. Stevens writes to us, "we have organised a series of Sunday evening lectures—taking a bioscope theatre for the purpose—and the attendance has been most gratifying, the theatre being comfortably filled. You are, no doubt, more or less aware that we (shall we say?) enthusiasts who keep the ball rolling, etc., are to a man, I think, regular readers of the *Freethinker*. We make an occasional raid on these subscribers and distribute say a gross or so of the numbers among our congregation." Mr. Stevens asks us to supply some cheap pamphlets and leaflets for distribution, which we shall have pleasure in doing. We wish the South African Rationalist Association all success, and shall be glad to hear from it as to its progress occasionally.

When we were going down the stairs after our morning lecture at Glasgow we came across a pleasant-looking lady with two bonny little maidens on the first landing. We are always delighted to see ladies at our meetings, and we are in love with all bonny little maidens, so we lifted our hat and smiled our best smile, and stopped to exchange greetings with the group. The mother in conversation bore out the promise of her appearance. The little maidens had been in hospital with diphtheria, and were just winning back the roses in their cheeks. We exchanged a few merry words with them, and took a nice kiss from each, and went our way. Now the mother, who conceals her identity, with her husband's, under the description of "Uddington Saints," writes to say that the little maidens have not forgotten. They want to see us and hear us again. They say we were the first stranger to kiss them after their return from the hospital—and we were all the way from London too! So like a child's remark, the mother says, and we "ought to feel flattered." We do. Bless them! But we've forgotten the object of this paragraph. It is to explain a certain little item in the President's Honorarium Fund this week.

The North London Branch begins the open-air lecturing season at Parliament Hill Fields on Sunday, May 7. The General Executive is taking the responsibility for the season's work in Finsbury Park, which opens the same day. Camberwell and Kingsland Branches also start operations on May 7.

Secular Education is declared to be "impossible" in England. It seems, however, to be not only the possible but actual in Burma—under British rule. Take the following answer recently given by Mr. Montagu in the House of Commons to a question *re* religious education in Barma put by Sir John Jardine:—

"Mr Montagu: As an experimental measure, facilities are being afforded for the imparting of religious instruction in those Government and local Board schools in Burma where parents and guardians ask for it. Such instruction may be given in the school building out of school hours by teachers selected by the parents, subject to a veto by the Inspector of Schools in the case of undesirable persons. No member of the school staff may be employed to teach religion. I may add that no preference is given to any particular religion; that pupils can only be taught religion at the request of their parents; that public funds do not contribute to the cost; and that no ceremony or ritual is permitted on school premises. (Ministerial cheers.) As regards Bombay, the subject has been discussed at a conference over which Sir George Clarke presided last April, and a handbook of moral lessons for the use of teachers is in course of preparation."

Why cannot we have here in England the system that works so well in Burma? Because the Government here is held in thrall by warring religious sects, whom it is afraid to offend; while the Government in Burma has a free hand and is able to act honestly, giving the people secular education, and leaving their religious training to the parents and spiritual advisers.

"Theism or Atheism?"

A Public Debate

HELD AT

CAXTON HALL, WESTMINSTER,

ON

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY MARCH 30 & 31, 1911.

BETWEEN

REV. DR. J. WARSCHAUER

AND

MR. G. W. FOOTE.

FIRST NIGHT.

Chairman: REV. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE.

IN opening the proceedings, the CHAIRMAN said: Ladies and gentlemen, we do not want to begin this debate until everybody has found a seat, but I am quite sure you will agree with me that it does not matter at all if I give my few remarks while they are moving about. As you know, the discussion to-night—the debate—is between these two gentlemen only, I mean, sometimes a man may stroll into a debate who knows nothing in the world about these debates, and he thinks a great deal depends upon him—how far he can show his sympathy or can get "Hear, hear," and so on, in the right place. Well, for the benefit of amateurs, I would point out that this debate—this great discussion—is between two members only, and we shall be very pleased to hear how the audience take it, and all that, but, of course, the audience will play the game. They will not interrupt either disputant, however enthusiastic they may be for their own champion. Another point is that some of us are very busy men, and we have a long way to get home, and there is a tendency not to listen to the last speech. Now, it is sufficient for me, I am sure, just to mention the fact for you to listen to the end of Mr. Foote's speech, and the same applies to Dr. Warschauer's speech to-morrow night. Well, then, Dr. Warschauer begins to-night. He has half-an-hour. He is followed by Mr. Foote, who will also have half-an-hour. Then Dr. Warschauer has a quarter of an hour, and Mr. G. W. Foote a quarter of an hour, and each of them has a quarter of an hour to conclude. There will be a warning note given to both speakers when there is ten minutes left of their half-hour; another warning when they get within three minutes of the end of their half-hour; and in their quarter of an hour speeches the warning will be three minutes from the end; so, if you notice a conversation going on up here—unfortunately, we do not possess a bell—you will know what I am doing. I am not giving the tip to either disputant, but am warning him that he has very little time left in which to vanquish his opponent. No new matter is to be introduced into the last speech of either speaker either night. Well, it remains only for me to say how great a pleasure it is for me to come and preside to-night. It is a great pleasure for two reasons; first of all, we all agree, I am sure, upon one point, however different our opinions may be on everything else under the sun,—we all agree with regard to one point, and that is that nobody's opinion is worth anything at all unless he is a careful and sympathetic listener to the other side as well. (Hear, hear.) The man who loses his temper as soon as the other party begins to put the other side—well, his opinion is worth nothing. It gives me great pleasure to come here to-night because all of us, I think, have come with the object of listening patiently to both sides equally before making up our minds which of the champions has won. Also, it gives me great pleasure to come here because in my experience these audiences always behave excellently. Our opinions are cut and dried. Very often we feel very strongly one way or the other; but I think on no occasion is such large-mindedness and a sense of fair play shown as at these debates. This is not the first, of course, at which I have been present and presiding, so I venture to think my task to-night will be a very easy one because I have to keep order, and I am sure that no interference on my part will be necessary. No doubt always on these occasions, one section predominates. Well, they like to show they are in the majority. I hope to-night the majority are Christians, and they will like to show it; but, of course, they must not do more than that, even if they are one hundred to one. This debate is between these two gentlemen, and the audience are not invited to take any part more than ordinary applause. It is quite likely, but I am not in a position to say more,—it is very likely that this debate will be printed. (Applause.) Personally, I hope that it may, because if it is a good thing for us to hear, it is a good thing for the British public also to read it. I will not now waste any more of your time, as I see that practically everybody has found a seat, and I will call upon Dr. Warschauer to speak to you for half-an-hour. (Applause.)

DR. WARSCHAUER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Foote, ladies and gentlemen, the title of this debate is happily so concise as practically to do away with the possibility of misunderstanding it. A Theist, I take it, is simply one who believes in God; an Atheist is one who disbelieves in such a supreme Being. But while belief in God is practically tantamount to an affirmation of God's existence, it does not necessarily follow that disbelief is equivalent to a denial. What the Theist affirms, and what the Atheist denies, is that we have sufficient evidence of the existence of God. I am, of course, aware that there have been dogmatic Atheists like Feuerbach who said: "It is clear as the day, and evident as the sun, that there is no God"; but that, I take it, is not the position of my opponent to-night, as it was not the position of the late Charles Bradlaugh. Mr. Bradlaugh in his *Plea for Atheism* said "The Atheist does not say there is no God, but he says 'I know not what you mean by God; I am without idea of God'; and my friend Mr. Foote, has put on record his considered opinion, "Atheism does not deny the existence of God; that is to say of any God. Atheism is opposed to every form of Theism which has yet been propounded to the world. The Atheist is a person who, if there be anything in Theism, is desirous of ascertaining what it is, and if it be true, of accepting it." (Applause.) I venture to quote these words, chiefly to in order to show that I at least understand the position of my opponent—an important condition which is not always fulfilled. But to-night I have no more to say directly on the subject of Atheism, because my task is that of commending Theism, only, with your permission I shall not start by laying down any kind of definition or proposition and then proceed to demonstrate it; my method is the less showy, but, as I think, more scientific one of inductive reasoning; that is to say, I shall start with the known, and argue from that to the less known; I shall look at facts, and from my facts draw inferences; I shall examine data, and then ask whether those data warrant us in arriving at the conclusion of Theism. Such a method as this should surely commend itself to those Atheists who, if there be anything in Theism, are desirous of ascertaining what it is, and if it be true, accepting it. That is an admirably sane attitude, such as is enjoined upon Christians in the words "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Permit me one other preliminary word. I have read somewhere an utterance of Mr. Foote's in which he says he declines to accept responsibility for any theory of the universe; but may I put it to Mr. Foote and to you, that Theism and Atheism are both just that—that they are theories of the universe. The Theist accounts for the sum of phenomena by the hypothesis of a supreme Being; but, on the contrary, the Atheists are counter to it. After all, Theist and Atheist, we have the same lock to open; the one maintains that Theism, the other that Atheism is the key which will open the lock. In other words, we both have a theory of the universe.

Now permit me to begin by laying down two perfectly simple axioms, which, indeed, are truisms, and quite undisputed; firstly, every phenomenon has a cause—an uncaused phenomenon is of course unthinkable; secondly, every cause is at least adequate to produce its own effects; there can be no more in an effect than there is in the cause; that is implied in the very notion, the very idea of cause. With these universally accepted and universally applicable commonplaces, I am prepared to go to work. We are going to look at the world as if we were really seeing it for the first time, and ask ourselves with the luxury of wonder, "How did this kind of thing come to pass?" You will admit that what is true of any single phenomenon must be true of the sum of phenomena. If every single phenomenon is caused, then the world, then the universe, must also be caused. And the only question for us to ask is what sort of cause lies at the back of this visible, tangible, physical universe. I submit you are not in a position to say "I am not interested," if you are not interested your presence here to-night is a very strange fact, and to say you are not interested is to give up the problem, which is precisely the same thing as solving it. But do you think that you can eliminate the idea or cause for this problem by saying that the world has always been—that there has been no beginning? I want you to be so good as to look at the theory for a moment, because although my friend Mr. Foote says he will not be responsible for any theory of the universe, that really happens to be his theory. He says "I would prefer to think the matter never began to be, that as it exists now and did exist eternally in the past, so it will continue to exist eternally in the future." Now I confess to a certain amount of curiosity as to the extraordinary channels of information which enable Mr. Foote to say positively that matter did always exist eternally in the past, because I should have thought the only a being who has himself eternally existed in the past could be absolutely sure on the point. Can it be that Mr. Foote has derived this information from a Mahatma? For myself, I shrink from the

supposition. The theory of the eternity of matter is, as a matter of fact, I believe, open to serious scientific objection, but I am quite willing to let it pass. Granting for argument's sake the eternity of matter, that does not get rid of the necessity of postulating a cause for the universe as it now is, because there have been certain changes, an infinite number of changes, that have changed the original fire-mist into the universe with which we are acquainted. At some time, however remote, the change commenced, at the same time an impetus was required to set the process going; so you do not get rid of the idea of cause; you only push it further back. But the cause of the universe must be adequate to produce this effect. So, then, we ask ourselves what sort of cause do the phenomena imply? Let me give you a simple illustration. If you took up any printed page and saw that it contained a mere jumble of numerals, capitals, and stops, all mixed up together, making no sense, you would say at once "Oh, that is printer's pie; nobody has set up that conglomerate deliberately"; but if you took up the page and found that it made sense, that the letters divided into words, and the words made sentences, then you would immediately say "Ah, those letters were arranged by someone." Do not you see if you get meaning out of it, it is because someone first put meaning into it? In other words, intelligibility in an effect is a sure criterion of intelligence in the cause. Whatever is intelligible as an effect bears witness of a cause that is intelligent. This applies immediately to our subject. With the inevitableness of logic, then we ask what sort of cause? Well, I say, look at the universe; is it remotely likely—does it look as if the phenomena of nature occurred in any haphazard fashion; are the processes of nature chaotic, incalculable, capricious? No; all our enterprises are based on the assumption of the uniformity of nature, the integrity of the cosmos; and that assumption is verified and justified every time we put it to the test. In other words, to return to my illustration, we can read the book of nature—at least, we have spelt out a few pages, and those pages make sense; they are not chaos. Therefore, I maintain Nature being intelligible, its cause must be intelligent—intelligent, and therefore conscious, because the greater includes the less—unconscious intelligence would be a contradiction in terms—even though unconscious humor is a fact of experience! (Laughter.)

But I will take you along another road to show you that it leads to the same goal. This universe is not only intelligible, but its phenomena include intelligence and consciousness on our part; the cause must be adequate to produce its effects—an unintelligent cause could not produce intelligent effects. What is in the effect must have been in the cause, or where did it come from? So then, my first answer to those Atheists who wish to know what, if anything, there is in Theism, and if it be true to accept it, is that the universe has a cause—that which so unorthodox a thinker as Herbert Spencer called an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed, and that cause or energy is conscious and intelligent. Let me now add a third truism to my other two. As all phenomena have causes, so all causes fall under two categories, and two only; every phenomenon is due either to accident or design—either to chance or to purpose. Those roses in your garden, of which you were so proud last summer, did not spring up by accident; those weeds which it took you such trouble to keep down—well, they did not spring up by any design on your part. If you grow roses, with creditable taste, that is hardly a matter of accident; on the other hand, if two strings on your fiddle break just as you were beginning to play, well, you may say in your vexation "It happened on purpose"; but I put it to you, you do not really believe it. Now I will make a suggestion to you. When anything whatever happens over and over again, if it is only the giving of three knocks, you infer a will, a contrivance, an intention. That intention may be obscure to you, just as you may see signals without understanding what they mean, but you may say, "Oh, yes, it means something or it would not be so regular." If things happen anyhow, if there is no uniformity, then you conclude that there is no control, but where there is order you infer will; where there is uniform action you infer directivity; all regularity suggests a regulating mind; though the possessor of that mind might be unseen, his existence would be undoubted, because only such a cause could produce such an effect.

It brings me to the question: Is the universe caused by chance or purpose? There is really no third alternative. If you saw at this desk a lump of clay, shapeless, and without any visible agency (the Chairman and Mr. Foote, and myself removing to a respectable distance), that clay began to assume gradually the shape of a bird or beast, you would at once guess there was a hidden artist somewhere; if that shape began to live and move and make sounds, your amazement would know no bounds. Here are certain millions of atoms—phosphorous, nitrogen, carbon, hydrogen, sodium, potassium—in fact, the common combination which

we call an egg. Well, you expose these millions of atoms to gentle warmth, and within twenty-one days they will have changed their structure and position entirely; they will have become the tissue, organs, bones, beak, eyes, feathers of a bird; there must have been infinite re-arrangement of those atoms, and yet every one has gone to its right place; every one has been properly used. I ask you—is it due to accident? Queer accident, I say, which is always repeated with unfailling regularity. But if not accident, the other alternative is design. But someone may be inclined to interpose and say, "Oh, yes, there is a third alternative after all; it is neither accident nor design, it is natural law." Let me say that is no explanation at all; that would be a mere verbal juggle; a law of nature is only a concise statement of facts; it says that things have been observed to happen in a certain fashion; it does not tell you why they so happen. Natural law describes a thing, it does not explain it. To say that the uniformity of nature is explained by natural law would be tantamount to saying that the facts are explained by themselves—they happen this way because this is the way they happen; which leaves something to be desired as an explanation. It is being driven back to two alternatives only, purpose or chance. In order to ask which of these two accounts for the sum of phenomena; if I showed you a faultless sonnet, and said that the way it came about was not that anyone composed it, but that a blindfolded person dragged letters out of a box and put them together, and that these made up the sonnet, you would not believe me. If I showed you a fine specimen of landscape painting—I had almost said Lausdowne painting, you see, my mind runs on the Mill (Laughter) and said nobody ever painted it; it represents the chance daubs of a child made in the dark, you would not believe me. If somebody was playing a charming tune next door, and I told you the tune was produced by a baby striking at random the keys in order to amuse himself, you would not believe me. Neither do I believe that this majestic universe, pervaded by natural law and uniformity, can be the outcome of any sort of cosmic freak or accident. If I must give an explanation I should say that *prima facie* it looks to me as if it had been planned.

As a matter of fact it is that purpose in nature almost exactly, as according to the proverb: "Drive it out with a pitchfork and it comes back" or rather, the truth is, you come back to it. Here is Haeckel who says in his *History of Creation* "The much talked of purpose in Nature has no existence." Yet Mr. Haeckel, in the same work, defines an organic body as one in which the various parts work together for the purpose of producing the phenomena of life. And that is no isolated slip of the pen. He says again in the same work that the cells in an organism are following diverse occupations and yet working together for a common purpose.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when we find the great Haeckel first denying purpose *in toto*, and then having to admit it when he comes to details, admitting it, that should be sufficiently significant. We might almost say, what need have we of further witnesses? (Applause.)

But let us go a step further. Only an intelligent cause could account for the universe even if there were only an endless repetition of the same phenomena. The fragile beauty of snow crystals, always arranged at 60 or 120 angles, the color of the butterfly, or the petals of a rose, the artistry of a shell, all these reiterated to infinity would attest the vast intelligence rejoicing in its work. But there is more than repetition. The one lesson we have learned from the closer study of nature is the master principle of the evolution of man. The history of the world is a constant reaching upward and forward. The watchword, the motto to which the whole creation moves is not only order but progress. We have not the spectacle of infinite monotony but of infinite ascent with further possibilities that are inexhaustible. Life has risen from the lowest and lower to the higher and highest strata culminating in a race capable of looking before and after, living the right and doing the good for their own sakes. If the story of the world is of a steady ascent to a far-off summit it is the less possible for us to say that the origin of this was chance because you know from personal experience that an upward path is seldom taken by accident. On this same subject of purpose versus chance, I may be allowed to quote an amusing remark of Kepler's. If it moves you to a smile I hope it will also move you to reflection. He writes: "Yesterday, when weary with writing, and my mind quite dusty with considering these atoms I was called to supper, and a salad I had asked for was set before me. It seems then said I, if pewter dishes, leaves of lettuce, grains of salt, drops of vinegar and oil, and slices of eggs had been floating about in the air from all eternity, it might at last happen by chance that there would come a salad. 'Yes,' says my wife, 'but not so nice' and well dressed as this of mine." I must say I very much relish the shrewd common sense of Mrs. Kelper. Not even a salad of decent calibre could be accounted for by chance, how much less this

Universe! So then my second answer is this, that cause of the Universe which we are obliged to postulate, in addition to being conscious and intelligent is purposive.

Now I come to my last point in this short opening address; is this conscious, intelligent purpose or cause of the universe personal? There is a difficulty about this in many minds, but the difficulty is due, if you will allow me to say so, to inexact and superficial thinking. The fallacy is fairly obvious: because we have only known personality in conjunction with a material brain and a visible body, and because the cause of the universe has no such material brain, and no such visible body, therefore it cannot be personal. Now let me ask you a question: How do you know you are personal? Because you have got organs, eyes and ears, arms and brains, and viscera, and all the rest of it. All these might be complete, yet they would not make up a personality, but only a corpse. Personality is that which no sense can perform, which no scalpel can lay bare. Personality consists in mind, intelligence, will, directive power, and so forth. Mill showed many years ago that there was no reason in the nature of things why those emotions, volitions, and even sensations, should not exist apart from material brain structure just as well as with it. The body no more makes us personal than Kubelik's genius is in his violin, the violin is only the instrument for its expression. All that is most real in ourselves is invisible. I ask your attention to this: If mind, will, directive power, constitute human personality, then the same attributes must constitute personality in the cause of the universe; but we have already seen that their cause is conscious, intelligent, and purposive; therefore I submit that it is personal, (hear, hear,) in fact where there is a purpose there is a person, and this person the cause and ground of all existence, the life of all life, the energy of all energy, the planning and sustaining power in all and through all and above all, the Theist calls God.

I am perfectly aware that I have left many tracks in this wide domain untouched. I shall have pleasure in dealing with those points to-morrow evening when my friend Mr. Foote has presented you with Atheism; but to-night I take it that it is my prerogative as the opener of the debate to lay down the lines which the discussion must follow. I hope Mr. Foote will deal in his answer with the issues I have actually raised, and I will cordially address to him certain questions which, in order to facilitate his task, I will give him in writing:—

1. Does Mr. Foote accept the axiom that every phenomenon must have a cause adequate to produce it?
2. If so, does he admit that the universe must have a cause? Or if not, why not?
3. Does Mr. Foote agree that whatever is intelligible bears witness to a cause that is intelligent?
4. If so, does he admit that the universe, being intelligible, proclaims its cause to be intelligent? Or if not, why not?
5. Does Mr. Foote agree that in all phenomena controlled by human agency regularity and uniformity are evidences of design and intention?
6. If so, does he admit that the universe being full of uniformity and regularity, demands for its explanation a purposive causative agency? Or if not, why not?
7. Does Mr. Foote agree that human personality is constituted by the attributes of consciousness, intelligence and purposive will?
8. If so, would not the same attributes constitute personality in the cause of the universe which is, in effect, the contention of Theism? Or if not, why not?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, that you are entitled to have plain answers to these plain questions, and for my part I await those answers with the utmost interest. (Loud applause.)

The CHAIRMAN: It now gives me great pleasure to call upon Mr. Foote to speak to you for half-an-hour.

Mr. G. W. FOOTE: Mr. Chairman, my friendly opponent, and ladies and gentlemen,—I have been in many debates in my time, although not in many quite lately, and I confess that this is the very first time I ever listened to an opponent's introductory speech which I supposed contained his case, and then was the unadvised recipient of eight carefully drawn conundrums,—(applause)—which I am supposed to give my half-hour in answering, Aye or No. My opponent forgets that I am not in the witness-box. I am one of the counsel in this case. He may put in the witness-box whom he pleases, but he cannot put in the counsel on the other side. Moreover, I venture to say that if anyone really wanted answers to those questions he would have delivered them to me beforehand. (Hear, hear.) I do not pretend to have the wonderfully trained intelligence of some of the gentlemen with whom I find myself in opposition. I am only a poor ordinary mortal

who requires to think over an intricate question before answering it, and who requires a good deal of time to think over eight intricate questions before answering them. I have the greatest pleasure in the world in handing Dr. Warschauer his conundrums back. (Applause.) I beg to say that there is nothing in the conditions, the signed conditions, of this debate which would entitle Dr. Warschauer to put questions to me or me to put questions to him. We are to speak for half-an-hour each. One states his case, the other replies to it. I repeat that my function is that of counsel for Atheism. I do not want to put him in the witness-box, and he shall not put me. (Applause.)

Another point I want to clear off. Dr. Warschauer skilfully read a passage from some speech of mine—it might have been from the debate with the Rev. W. T. Lee—I am not sure; but he made me say I should prefer to believe the eternity of matter, and that as matter exists now to it eternally existed in the past. The second part of the sentence is obviously governed by the introduction to the first. I did not say that matter has existed from eternity. I said that I should prefer to believe in the eternal existence of matter rather than in its creation by God. And I gave this reason—I do know something about matter; I do not know anything about God. (Applause.)

I do not quarrel with Dr. Warschauer's opening statement that Theism is belief in God and Atheism is disbelief in God, because I have said exactly the same thing. I contended, too, against George Jacob Holyoake that disbelief was not denial. I might disbelieve a man's honesty without being prepared to say he was dishonest. There is always a certain amount of open-mindedness about disbelief—you do not go on to absolute denial, and I, as an Atheist, am willing to accept Theism the very moment it intellectually and ethically commends itself to my intelligence and conscience. (Applause.)

DR. WARSCHAUER was skilful in saying, and very designing if he will pardon the word, but it belongs to his side of the case (laughter)—in intending not to offer any definitions. We shall see the misfortune of that presently. It is said I have denied that Atheism is a theory of the Universe. Perfectly true, I was invited to debate many years ago, with the Rev. W. T. Lee, whether Atheism or Theism was the more rational theory of the Universe, and I said that although I was an Atheist and therefore a person who thought for himself and thought a good many of his neighbors thought wrongly. I had not yet reached the degree of swelled-headedness to imagine that I was capable of accounting for the Universe. (Laughter.) There are heaps of things in the Universe I do not understand. I venture to suggest that there may be heaps of things in the Universe that Dr. Warschauer does not understand. I put forward no theory of the Universe, but I take my stand on this, as I think the rock of commonsense, that it is more rational to think that the Universe in substance as we know is eternal, than that it was created by a being who, if you take the trouble to define him will turn out to have no sort of relativity to the matter which he produced. (Applause.) And I know that in this world it is not the lofty spirit of man that can create the lowest sentient in this world. The process of evolution of which we have heard something, is from the lowest form to the highest. Dr. Warschauer says from the cause the effect must follow, and it cannot be in itself anything more than was contained in its cause. I say that is in flat contradiction to the whole course of our knowledge of Nature. (Hear, hear.) Why, you take two gases, invisible, and in a certain rough sense, imponderable, and by a well-known process you turn them into water. You have a definitely ponderable substance which you can take up just as I do this glass. You can measure it, weigh it, see it, and scientifically it is a fact that you can resolve your water back by another process into its constituent gases. If anybody means to tell me that there is not to our sensations, characteristics in the water which were not in the constituent gases, I say he and I run different dictionaries of the English language.

It is rather this world than the universe at large that we should consult for our evidences of Theism or Atheism. I notice that whenever anyone wants to get over the difficulty of details, he usually flies off into the widest abstractions; the further he gets from this world the safer his flight, and the nearer he gets to God the less is he controlled by the highest qualities of man. Let us take these three axioms. Every effect has a cause. Tautology! To call that an axiom is an abuse of language. To say that a thing is an effect is to say that it is caused, and to say a thing is a cause is to say that it has produced an effect. Surely philosophy does not consist in trite tautology of that description. Perhaps I may be allowed to suggest that both cause and effect are merely subjective ideas, that there is no solution of continuity in nature at all. Finite intelligence has to work with the conception of time and space; but there is no break in nature; there is no solution of continuity between

this part of a process and that. We arbitrarily arrest the process at a given point, because we want to study it, but Nature goes on; it is we that pause. I deny that my opponent's conception of cause and effect has any binding force upon Nature, or even upon God, if God is the creator of nature. At the highest step cause is able to produce its effect. Tautology again! It is only the cause because it does produce the effect; the proof that it is able to do is that it does. I defy Dr. Warschauer to give me any other reason for believing it can. A thing is done, you see it, and then to say that it was done and could be done is only to say the same thing over again.

My opponent took the ground that the universe was caused. How does he know it? What reason has he for believing it? He used the word "phenomenon"; but the universe is not a phenomenon; it is the matrix of all phenomena. By the universe we mean all the phenomena which we can perceive, and all the causes of those phenomena. And what are the causes of those phenomena? They are carried back as far as science can trace them—I leave metaphysics and theology aside—to the physical elements, some of which Dr. Warschauer recited; and then you have scientists coming forward, like Sir Oliver Lodge—(applause and Oh's)—well, you are both right and both wrong (I said scientists, not theologians)—(applause)—like Sir Oliver Lodge coming forward and suggesting that even these elements, which cannot at present be resolved into each other, are nevertheless all in some way or other produced out of the primitive ether. Now, I am not giving my poor scientific corroboration of that theory; I am only mentioning it as being put forward by eminent scientific authorities. Well, then, supposing we get back to the ether. My opponent says God created it; I say, How do you know that?—how do you know it ever was created? How do you know that it ever began to be? And if you do not know that it ever began to be, I say the principle of continuity in Nature would rather carry you back to the eternity of the primitive substance than to the Creator who must himself have been metaphysically defined as the primitive substance of the primitive substance.

Dr. Warschauer took the case of a lot of type. If it were all in a heap you would say it was pie. Well, it might be thrown out for sweeping. There might have been an intention in the pie in that case, but if you saw the type set up in words you would know that an intelligence had been at work; and when I see the type of nature set up in the same way I shall believe in the type-setter. If there was a type set up he was intelligent; if intelligent, he was conscious; if conscious, he was personal! That follows with a mathematical necessity if you accept the "if"; but that is the stumbling-block. I do not accept the "if," and I say that Dr. Warschauer has not yet given me any reason for doing so.

Every phenomenon, we are told, must be the result of design or accident. Now we see why Dr. Warschauer shrank from definitions. He did not tell us what he meant by accident, or chance. If a coin is tossed in the air and you cry "Heads" or "Tails" it is chance—unless it is a bad one. But what do you mean by chance? You do not mean that it will not fall head or tail by natural causation; you mean that you are not individually in a position to foresee which it will be. One man backs his guess against another man's; that is all. But the coin is going to fall head or tail by natural causation. Chance is an impossible conception of nature. Chance is purely relative to man's ignorance. If you walk an unknown road in the night, you may come to grief; but it is not the road itself that leads you to grief, it is your own luck in the road in your ignorance. Chance is simply a term to cover human conclusions formed in ignorance; no more. I deny that you can put the term "chance" upon nature at all. How could things happen anyhow, if things did not happen according to their natural qualities? We should not be here; there would be no here, neither would there be a there. Nature would then indeed be the chaos over which the theologians tell us the spirit of God originally moved. Although if it were as chaotic as that the difficulty would arise, how did he discover it? (Laughter.) I rule out chance as a theory; I do not accept it; I say this is not fair. Dr. Warschauer must know that that has been pointed out again and again by Atheists, agnostics, and materialists. First, we do not admit that the universe in substance began, and we do not see any necessity for accounting for the creation of that which we do not know that it is utterly inconceivable that anything that exists can exist at all without inherent qualities, (hear, hear,) and these inherent qualities will decide its career, either solitary, if you can conceive such a thing, or in combination with other portions of the infinite universe. I do not choose to follow Dr. Warschauer's alternative, because I say it is no alternative; the alternative I accept, if I must accept alternatives for the universe, is design on one side, and natural

causation on the other. I am willing to make my stand one against the other.

Now let us follow Dr. Warschauer on this other alternative, as I accept it, and see the difficulties of his position. He talks about the beauty in the world; that shows beautiful design. How about the ugliness in the world? And he denies ugliness, I ask him to take a walk even through any great Christian city. Dr. Warschauer forgets that his theory must bear the burden of all the facts. It was delightful to me, the ease with which he gave himself away when he was talking about the roses and the weeds in the garden. You know he said there were the roses—you were growing them; you designed them in the sense that you designed them *there*; but the weeds came—you did not design *them*; and Dr. Warschauer led you to think that the weeds must have come by accident or chance; but his own theory is that outside man's design there is no accident or chance—it is all the design of God. So that you grow the roses, and God sends the weeds. (Laughter and Applause.)

Is everything in the universe planned? Then I say it is a most astonishing thing that Dr. Warschauer's Deity has so planned it that the evidence of His own existence are as difficult to discover now as they were two thousand years ago at least. At this time of day, after the human race itself may have existed, ruder and ruder the farther we go back, for a quarter of a million years, now, at the apex of civilisation that Dr. Warschauer has referred to, half the people in this room at least are not satisfied that there is a God.

What a plan! If I were God and planned the universe I would at least plan it so that my own creatures that I designed—intelligent, conscious, and personal—should understand and believe. (Applause.)

A last word about evolution. I accept that challenge: Evolution is what? From the lowest to the higher, and from the higher to the highest. And on paper it looks beautiful. By-and-by the pyramid of evolution will be complete, and some future Dr. Warschauer will be at the apex, and he will be able to look down on all the records of strife, and pain, and agony, and the struggle for existence below and say: "It might have been brutal; it might have been horrible; it might have been unspeakable, but I, even I, am the result of it all, and my grandeur justifies the inhumanity." (Applause.) I want no part or lot in that I cannot conceive a God of any intelligence, any wisdom, any humanity, bringing evolution through a great track of blood. (Loud and continued applause.)

(To be continued.)

MECANOPHILUS.

As we surpass our fathers' skill,
Our sons will shame our own;
A thousand things are hidden still,
And not a hundred known.
And had some prophet spoken true
Of all we shall achieve,
The wonders were so widely new,
That no man would believe.
Meanwhile, my brothers, work, and wield
The forces of to-day,
And plough the Present like a field,
And garner all you may! —Tennyson.

MEDITATION.

Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is. —Tennyson.

TRUTH.

Enough, and too much, of the sect and the name;
What matters our label so truth be our aim? —Whittier.

Obituary.

It is with regret I have to record the decease of still one more of the old brave band of Secularists in Huddersfield, Mr. John Boothroyd, who died in his sixty-ninth year, and was interred at the Huddersfield Cemetery on Monday. He had been ailing more or less for a few years back, and finally had to lay up six weeks ago. Of a kind and genial nature, and fortified with the principles of Secularism when in sickness, and with the knowledge that he would not recover again, he met his end calmly, with one desire—that he should have a Secular funeral. The Secular Burial Service was read at the graveside by Mr. A. B. Wakefield, of Hipperholme, in a most impressive manner.—W. H. SPIVEY.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 3.15, C. Cohen, a Lecture.

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7, J. Hecht, "Meteorology: Biblical and Scientific."

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Highbury Corner): 12 noon, Ivan Paperno, a Lecture. Wednesday, at 8, Ivan Paperno, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford): 7, J. J. Darby, "Christianity Judged by its Fruit."

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon, Annual Business Meeting, for Election of Office Bearers, etc.; 6.30, Social Meeting.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Sydney A. Gimson, "The Future of Secularism."

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): 7.30, Members' Meeting.

OUTDOOR.

Huddersfield and District Branch N. S. S. (Market Cross): Saturday, at 8, Geo. T. Whitehead, an Address.

Ralph Cricklewood,

A Twentieth Century Critical and Rational Exposé of Christian Mythology.

(IN THE FORM OF A NOVEL.)

By **STEPHEN FITZ-STEPHEN.**

A Well-Wisher of the Human Family.

388 pages, cloth. Price 3s. 6d.

Post Free.

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.

J. W. GOTT is anxious to send patterns of his unrivalled samples of all-wool Suits to measure at 30s. Fit, style, and wear guaranteed.—Address 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.

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

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

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

THE SECULAR SOCIETY

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

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

Secretary—Miss E. M. VANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Batcock, 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 Bequests to Secular or other Free-thought Societies, for the maintenance and propagation of heterodox opinions on matters of religion, on the same conditions as apply to Christian or Theistic churches or organisations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Improvement by all just and wise means of the conditions of daily life for the masses of the people, especially in towns and cities, where insanitary and 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 VESBY 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-stree E.C.

A LIBERAL OFFER—NOTHING LIKE IT.

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

Most Grateful Testimonials From Everywhere.

Gudivoda, India: "It is a store of medical knowledge in plainest language, and every reader of English would be benefited by it."—W. L. N.
 Triplicane, India: "I have gone through the book many times, and not only benefited myself but many friends also."—G. W. T.

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

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

Price EIGHT SHILLINGS by Mail to any Address.

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

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 is 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.